

JUDAISM

The Talmud

Berakhot

A massive, multi-volume compendium of rabbinic debates and commentary on the Torah that forms the basis of Jewish religious law, ethics, and practice. Presents all 37 tractates with Gemara, via Sefaria's William Davidson Talmud (the Koren Talmud Bavli translation, CC BY-NC), plus Avot and Eduyot (which have no Gemara) via Michael L. Rodkinson's 1896-1918 translation.

Presented by Earth's Sacred Texts — blackbetty.space

Contents

Berakhot

Berakhot

Chapter 1

¹ The beginning of tractate Berakhot, the first tractate in the first of the six orders of Mishna, opens with a discussion of the recitation of Shema, as the recitation of Shema encompasses an acceptance of the yoke of Heaven and of the mitzvot, and as such, forms the basis for all subsequent teachings. The Mishna opens with the laws regarding the appropriate time to recite Shema: MISHNA: From when, that is, from what time, does one recite Shema in the evening? From the time when the priests enter to partake of their teruma. Until when does the time for the recitation of the evening Shema extend? Until the end of the first watch. The term used in the Torah (Deuteronomy 6:7) to indicate the time for the recitation of the evening Shema is beshokhbekha, when you lie down, which refers to the time in which individuals go to sleep. Therefore, the time for the recitation of Shema is the first portion of the night, when individuals typically prepare for sleep. That is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer.

² The Rabbis say: The time for the recitation of the evening Shema is until midnight.

³ Rabban Gamliel says: One may recite Shema until dawn, indicating that beshokhbekha is to be understood as a reference to the entire time people sleep in their beds, the whole night.

⁴ The mishna relates that Rabban Gamliel practiced in accordance with his ruling. There was an incident where Rabban Gamliel's sons returned very late from a wedding hall. They said to him, as they had been preoccupied with celebrating with the groom and bride: We did not recite Shema. He said to them: If the dawn has not yet arrived, you are obligated to recite Shema. Since Rabban Gamliel's opinion disagreed with that of the Rabbis, he explained to his sons that the Rabbis actually agree with him, and that it is not only with regard to the halakha of the recitation of Shema, but rather, wherever the Sages say until midnight, the mitzva may be performed until dawn.

⁵ Rabban Gamliel cites several cases in support of his claim, such as the burning of fats and limbs on the altar. Due to the quantity of offerings each day, the priests were often unable to complete the burning of all of the fats and limbs, so they continued to be burned into the night, as it is written: "This is the law of the burnt offering: The burnt offering shall remain upon the pyre on the altar all night until morning, while the fire on the altar burns it" (Leviticus 6:2). And, with regard to all sacrifices, such as the sin-offerings and the guilt-offerings that are eaten for one day and night; although the Sages state that they may be eaten only until midnight, by Torah law they may be eaten until dawn. This is in accordance with the verse: "On the day on which it is offered must you eat. Do not leave it until the morning" (Leviticus 7:15). If so, why did the Sages say that they may be eaten only until midnight? This is in order to distance a person from transgression, as if one believes that he has until dawn to perform the mitzva, he might be negligent and postpone it until the opportunity to perform the mitzva has passed.

⁶ GEMARA: The Mishna opens with the laws concerning the appropriate time to recite Shema with the question: From when does one recite Shema in the evening? With regard to this question, the Gemara asks: On the basis of what prior knowledge does the tanna of our mishna ask: From when? It would seem from his question that the obligation to recite Shema in the evening was already established, and that the tanna seeks only to clarify details that relate to it. But our mishna is the very first mishna in the Talmud.

⁷ The Gemara asks: And furthermore, what distinguishes the evening Shema, that it was taught first? Let the tanna teach regarding the recitation of the morning Shema first. Since most mitzvot apply during the day, the tanna should discuss the morning Shema before discussing the evening Shema, just as the daily morning offering is discussed before the evening offering (Tosefot HaRosh).

⁸ The Gemara offers a single response to both questions: The tanna bases himself on the verse as it is written: “You will talk of them when you sit in your home, and when you walk along the way, when you lie down, and when you arise” (Deuteronomy 6:7). By teaching the laws of the evening Shema first, the tanna has established that the teachings of the Oral Torah correspond to that which is taught in the Written Torah. And based on the Written Torah, the tanna teaches the oral law: When is the time for the recitation of Shema of lying down as commanded in the Torah? From when the priests enter to partake of their teruma. Just as the Written Torah begins with the evening Shema, so too must the Oral Torah.

⁹ However, there is another possible explanation for why the mishna opens with the evening Shema rather than with the morning Shema. If you wish, you could say instead that the tanna derives the precedence of the evening Shema from the order of the creation of the world. As it is written in the story of creation: “And there was evening, and there was morning, one day” (Genesis 1:5). According to this verse, day begins with the evening and not the morning. For both of these reasons it was appropriate to open the discussion of the laws of the recitation of Shema with the evening Shema.

¹⁰ The Gemara asks: If so, why does the latter clause of the mishna, which appears later in the chapter, teach: In the morning one recites two blessings before Shema and one blessing afterward, and in the evening one recites two blessings before Shema and two afterward? Based upon the above reasoning, the mishna should have taught the blessing recited before and after the evening Shema first.

¹¹ The Gemara answers: Indeed, the tanna began by discussing the laws regarding the recitation of the evening Shema, and then taught the laws regarding the recitation of the morning Shema. Once he was already dealing with the morning Shema, he explained the matters of the morning Shema, and then explained the matters of the evening Shema.

¹² The Gemara proceeds to clarify the rest of the mishna. The Master said in the mishna that the beginning of the period when one recites Shema in the evening is when the priests enter to partake of their teruma. However, this does not specify a definitive time. When do the priests enter to partake of their teruma? From the time of the emergence of the stars. If that is the case, then let the tanna teach that the time for the recitation of the evening Shema is from the time of the emergence of the stars.

¹³ The Gemara responds: Indeed it would have been simpler to say that the time for the recitation of the evening Shema begins with the emergence of the stars, but the particular expression used by the tanna teaches us another matter in passing: When do priests partake of their teruma? From the time

of the emergence of the stars. And the tanna teaches us a new halakha parenthetically: failure to bring an atonement offering does not prevent a priest from eating teruma. In cases where an impure priest is required to immerse himself in a ritual bath and bring an atonement offering, even if he already immersed himself, he is not completely ritually pure until he brings the atonement offering. Nevertheless, he is still permitted to partake of teruma. Taught in passing in our mishna, this is articulated fully in a baraita, based on a close reading of the biblical passages. As it was taught in a baraita with regard to the laws of ritual impurity, it is said: “One who touches it remains impure until evening. He should not eat of the consecrated items and he must wash his flesh with water. And the sun sets and it is purified. Afterwards, he may eat from the teruma, for it is his bread” (Leviticus 22:6–7). From the passage: “And the sun sets and it is purified,” that the absence of the setting of his sun prevents him from partaking of teruma, but failure to bring the atonement offering does not prevent him from partaking of teruma, may be inferred.

¹⁴ The Gemara discusses the proof offered in the baraita: From where do we know that the phrase: “And the sun sets” refers to the complete setting of the sun, and therefore, “and it is purified” refers to the fact that the day is pure, i.e., and the sun sets and it is purified is one phrase meaning that the sun will set, the air will clear, and the stars will emerge (Rav Hai Gaon)?

¹⁵ Perhaps the expression: “And the sun sets and it is purified” refers to the very beginning of sunset, the setting of the sun’s light. According to that explanation, what does the expression and it is purified mean? It means that the person will become purified. After immersing, he will wait until the beginning of sunset, and only then will he be able to eat of his teruma (Tosafot).

¹⁶ Rabba bar Rav Sheila said: If so, that: And it is purified, means that the priest goes and purifies himself, then let the verse say unambiguously: And he will become purified. Since the Torah does not employ that language, the conclusion is: What is the meaning of the expression: And it is purified? It means the day is pure, no residue of day remains, as people say colloquially: The sun has set and the day is purified.

¹⁷ In the West, Eretz Yisrael, they did not hear this explanation given by Rabba bar Rav Sheila. They raised the dilemma: Does the expression: And the sun sets, refer to the actual setting of the sun, and does: And it is purified, mean the day clears away? Or perhaps it refers to the setting of its light at sunset, in which case what is the meaning of: And it is purified? It refers to the purification of the person. In other words, in Eretz Yisrael, they attempted to clarify the halakha based on the biblical passage, but were unable to do so.

¹⁸ Ultimately they resolved this dilemma from a baraita. It was taught in a baraita that the time for the recitation of the evening Shema corresponds to the time when priests are permitted to eat of their teruma, a sign for which is the emergence of the stars. Therefore, derive from here that “and the sun sets” refers to the complete sunset, and the expression “and it is purified” means the day clears away, as the Sages in Babylonia concluded.

¹⁹ In our mishna, the Master said: The beginning of the time for the recitation of the evening Shema is: From the time when the priests enter to partake of their teruma. The Gemara raises a contradiction to this opinion from a baraita that states that the time for the recitation of the evening Shema is: From when a poor person enters to eat his bread with salt until he rises from his meal.

²⁰ The Gemara begins its analysis by clarifying whether there is an actual contradiction here, or whether different expressions are being employed to describe the same time. The latter clause of the

baraita, which established that the time for the recitation of the evening Shema ends when a poor person rises from his meal, certainly disagrees with our mishna. Since the poor person clearly does not continue eating until the end of the first watch, this baraita certainly contradicts our mishna. With regard to the first clause of the baraita, however, which establishes the beginning of the time for the recitation of the evening Shema, shall we say that it disagrees with our mishna?

²¹ The Gemara immediately rejects this idea: No, the time when the poor person eats and the time when the priest is purified and permitted to partake of his teruma are one and the same time.

²² The Gemara raises a contradiction from the Tosefta: From when does one begin to recite Shema in the evening? From the time when people enter to eat their bread on Shabbat eve. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. As they do in our mishna, the Rabbis say: From the time when the priests are eligible to partake of their teruma, a sign for which is the emergence of the stars. And although there is no explicit proof that the emergence of the stars is when one may begin to recite the evening Shema, there is an allusion in the book of Nehemiah to the fact that the emergence of the stars is generally considered the beginning of the night. As it is stated with regard to the building of the walls of Jerusalem: “And we perform the work, and half of them grasp their spears from dawn until the emergence of the stars” (Nehemiah 4:15). And it says: “That in the night they may be a guard to us, and may labor in the day” (Nehemiah 4:16). From here we ascertain that the day ends with the emergence of the stars.

²³ Even before analyzing these sources, the Gemara seeks to clarify a confusing element in the Tosefta. In their biblical proof, the Rabbis do not suffice with one verse, but rather they say: And it says...and they cite an additional verse. What is added by this use of: And it says? It seems superfluous, as the entire proof appears in the first verse.

²⁴ The Gemara answers that the first verse was not sufficient. As, if you say that night begins when the sun sets, but the workers stayed late and arrived early; i.e., due to the importance of their task they worked even into the night. In anticipation of this objection, the second verse was cited to teach: Come and hear, as it is stated: “That in the night they may be a guard to us, and may labor in the day,” the time between dawn and the emergence of the stars is explicitly referred to as “day,” proving that night begins with the emergence of the stars.

²⁵ In analyzing the three opinions regarding the beginning of the period for the recitation of the evening Shema, the Gemara begins with the supposition: It might enter your mind to say that the time when the poor person typically eats his meal and the time when ordinary people eat their Shabbat evening meal are one and the same time, since in both cases those eating would seek to begin their meals as early as possible, as, for different reasons, they are unable to kindle additional lights to illuminate their meal. And, if you say that the time of the poor person’s meal and the time when the priest is purified and permitted to partake of his teruma are one and the same time, then the opinion of the Rabbis is identical to that of Rabbi Meir. What is their disagreement?

²⁶ Rather, what we said previously must be rejected, and instead learn from this that there is a separate time for the poor person and a separate time for the priest. However, this conclusion is based on the assumption that the time of the poor person and the time of people are the same. That too can be rejected with the assertion that, no, the time of the poor person and the priest are one and the same time, and the time of the poor person and people are not the same. Accordingly, the opinion

expressed by the tanna in our baraita is identical to that of the other tanna'im, and only Rabbi Meir disagrees with them.

²⁷ And is the time of the poor person and the priest the same? The Gemara raises a contradiction to this approach from another baraita, in which other opinions regarding the time for the recitation of the evening Shema are cited: From when does one begin to recite the evening Shema? From the time when the day becomes sanctified on the eve of Shabbat, this is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer, who established an earlier time for Shema. Rabbi Yehoshua, like our mishna, says: From the time when the priests are eligible to partake of their teruma. Rabbi Meir says: The time for the recitation of Shema begins before the priests were purified, from when the priests immerse themselves in order to partake of their teruma. Rabbi Yehuda said to Rabbi Meir: How is it possible that the time for the recitation of the evening Shema corresponds to the time of the priests' immersion? Do the priests not immerse themselves during the day, so that with nightfall and the onset of a new day they will be purified? If so, how can that time be called night? Rabbi Ḥanina says that the time for the recitation of the evening Shema begins when the poor person enters to eat his bread with salt. But Rabbi Aḥai, and some say Rabbi Aḥa, says: From the time when most people enter to recline at their meal during the week.

²⁸ The preceding was the text of the baraita. Returning to our question, if you say that the time of the poor person and the priest are one and the same time, then the opinion of Rabbi Ḥanina is identical to that of Rabbi Yehoshua. However, the fact that they are cited together indicates that they are not, in fact, the same.

²⁹ Rather, must one not conclude from this the time for the poor person is separate and the time for the priest is separate? Since no objection is raised, the Gemara concedes: Indeed, conclude from this.

³⁰ Having established that the time of the poor person and that of the priest are different, the Gemara seeks to determine: which one is later? The Gemara suggests that it is reasonable to conclude that the time of the poor person is later. As if you say that the poor person is earlier, it would be impossible to establish a time earlier than that established by Rabbi Yehoshua, unless we hold that night begins with sunset, in which case the opinion of Rabbi Ḥanina is identical to that of Rabbi Eliezer. Rather, must one not conclude from this that the poor person is later? The Gemara notes: Indeed, conclude from this.

³¹ We learned that the Master said in a baraita that the time for the recitation of the evening Shema according to Rabbi Meir begins with the time of the immersion of the priests. Regarding this, Rabbi Yehuda said to Rabbi Meir: Do the priests not immerse themselves during the day?

³² The Gemara notes: What Rabbi Yehuda said to Rabbi Meir seems correct, and how can Rabbi Meir respond? Rabbi Meir's response is connected to the fundamental dispute over when night begins. After sunset, a period begins which is neither day nor night. The tanna'im disagree over the precise duration of this period known as twilight [bein hashemashot]. Rabbi Yehuda holds that twilight extends a full hour after sunset. Rabbi Neḥemya agrees in principle, though he disagrees over the specifics. Rabbi Yosei maintains that twilight is very brief, and occurs immediately before the emergence of the stars, which marks the beginning of the night. Regarding Rabbi Meir's argument, Rabbi Yehuda asks that since the priests immerse themselves before twilight, they have a long wait until nightfall; clearly their immersion takes place while it is still day.

³³ The Gemara answers that Rabbi Meir said to Rabbi Yehuda as follows: Do you maintain that I am speaking of your definition of twilight? I am speaking of Rabbi Yosei's definition of twilight, as Rabbi Yosei said: Twilight is like the blink of an eye; night begins and day ends and the time between them is so brief, it is impossible to quantify. According to this opinion, the priests immerse themselves just before the emergence of the stars, when it is already considered night.

³⁴ The previous baraita cited Rabbi Meir's opinion that the time for the recitation of Shema begins when the priests immerse before partaking of their teruma. In the Tosefta, it was taught that Rabbi Meir holds that one begins to recite Shema from when people enter to eat their meal on Shabbat eve. One opinion of Rabbi Meir seems to contradict another opinion of Rabbi Meir. The Gemara responds: Two tanna'im, students of Rabbi Meir, expressed different opinions in accordance with Rabbi Meir's opinion.

³⁵ So too, the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer cited in the mishna contradicts the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer cited in the baraita. In the mishna, Rabbi Eliezer holds that the time for the recitation of Shema begins with the emergence of the stars: From the time when the priests enter to partake of their teruma, while in the baraita, he states that the time for the recitation of Shema begins when the day becomes sanctified on the eve of Shabbat.

³⁶ The Gemara responds: There are two possible resolutions to the apparent contradiction in Rabbi Eliezer's opinion. Either two tanna'im expressed different opinions in accordance with Rabbi Eliezer's opinion, or if you wish, say instead that the first clause of the mishna, according to which we begin to recite Shema when the priests enter to partake of their teruma, is not actually Rabbi Eliezer's opinion. Only the second half of the statement: Until the end of the first watch, was stated by Rabbi Eliezer.

³⁷ In the mishna, we learned that Rabbi Eliezer establishes that one may recite the evening Shema until the end of the first watch. These watches are mentioned in the Bible as segments of the night, but it must be established: Into precisely how many segments is the night divided, three or four? Moreover, why does Rabbi Eliezer employ such inexact parameters rather than a more precise definition of time (Tosefot HaRosh)?

³⁸ What does Rabbi Eliezer actually hold? If he holds that the night consists of three watches, let him say explicitly that one recites the evening Shema until the fourth hour. If he holds that the night consists of four watches, let him say explicitly until the third hour.

³⁹ The Gemara responds: Actually, Rabbi Eliezer holds that the night consists of three watches, and he employs this particular language of watches in order to teach us: There are watches in heaven and there are watches on earth; just as our night is divided into watches, so too is the night in the upper worlds. As it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Eliezer says: The night consists of three watches, and over each and every watch, the Holy One, Blessed be He, sits and roars like a lion in pain over the destruction of the Temple. This imagery is derived from a reference in the Bible, as it is stated: "The Lord roars [yishag] from on high, from His holy dwelling He makes His voice heard. He roars mightily [shaog yishag] over His dwelling place, He cries out like those who tread grapes, against all the inhabitants of the earth" (Jeremiah 25:30). The three instances of the root shin-ales-gimmel in this verse correspond to the three watches of the night.

⁴⁰ And signs of the transition between each of these watches in the upper world can be sensed in this world: In the first watch, the donkey brays; in the second, dogs bark; and in the third people begin to rise, a baby nurses from its mother's breast and a wife converses with her husband.

⁴¹ With regard to these earthly manifestations of the three heavenly watches as established in the baraita, the Gemara asks: What did Rabbi Eliezer enumerate? If he enumerated the beginning of the watch, why do I need a sign for the beginning of the first watch? It is when evening begins; an additional sign is superfluous. If he enumerated the end of the watches, why do I need a sign for the end of the last watch? It is when day begins; an additional sign is similarly superfluous.

⁴² The Gemara answers: Rather, he enumerated the signs for the end of the first watch and the beginning of the last watch, both of which require a sign, as well as the middle of the middle watch. And if you wish, say instead: He enumerated the ends of all of the watches. And if you say that a sign indicating the end of the final watch is unnecessary because it is day, nevertheless, that sign is useful.

⁴³ What is the practical ramification of this sign? It is relevant to one who recites Shema while lying in a dark house, who cannot see the dawn and who does not know when the time for reciting Shema arrives. That person is provided with a sign that when a woman speaks with her husband and a baby nurses from its mother's breast, the final watch of the night has ended and he must rise and recite Shema.

⁴⁴ Rav Yitzhak bar Shmuel said in the name of Rav: The night consists of three watches, and over each and every watch the Holy One, Blessed be He sits and roars like a lion, because the Temple service was connected to the changing of these watches (Tosefot HaRosh), and says: "Woe to Me, that due to their sins I destroyed My house, burned My Temple and exiled them among the nations of the world."

⁴⁵ Incidental to the mention of the elevated significance of the night watches, the Gemara cites a related story: It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei said: I was once walking along the road when I entered the ruins of an old, abandoned building among the ruins of Jerusalem in order to pray. I noticed that Elijah, of blessed memory, came and guarded the entrance for me and waited at the entrance until I finished my prayer. When I finished praying and exited the ruin, Elijah said to me, deferentially as one would address a rabbi: Greetings to you, my rabbi. I answered him: Greetings to you, my rabbi, my teacher. And Elijah said to me: My son, why did you enter this ruin? I said to him: In order to pray. And Elijah said to me: You should have prayed on the road. And I said to him: I was unable to pray along the road, because I was afraid that I might be interrupted by travelers and would be unable to focus. Elijah said to me: You should have recited the abbreviated prayer instituted for just such circumstances.

⁴⁶ Rabbi Yosei concluded: At that time, from that brief exchange, I learned from him three things: I learned that one may not enter a ruin; and I learned that one need not enter a building to pray, but he may pray along the road; and I learned that one who prays along the road recites an abbreviated prayer, so that he may maintain his focus.

⁴⁷ And after this introduction, Elijah said to me: What voice did you hear in that ruin? I responded: I heard a Heavenly voice, like an echo of that roar of the Holy One, Blessed be He (Maharsha), cooing like a dove and saying: Woe to the children, due to whose sins I destroyed My house, burned My Temple, and exiled them among the nations of the world. And Elijah said to me: By your life and by your head, not only did that voice cry out in that moment, but it cries out three times each and every

day. Moreover, any time that God's greatness is evoked, such as when Israel enters synagogues and study halls and answers in the kaddish prayer, May His great name be blessed, the Holy One, Blessed be He, shakes His head and says: Happy is the king who is thus praised in his house. When the Temple stood, this praise was recited there, but now: How great is the pain of the father who exiled his children, and woe to the children who were exiled from their father's table, as their pain only adds to that of their father (Rabbi Shem Tov ibn Shaprut).

⁴⁸ The Sages taught, for three reasons one may not enter a ruin: Because of suspicion of prostitution, because the ruin is liable to collapse, and because of demons. Three separate reasons seem extraneous, so the Gemara asks: Why was the reason because of suspicion necessary? Let this halakha be derived because of collapse.

⁴⁹ The Gemara answers: This halakha applies even in the case of a new, sturdy ruin, where there is no danger of collapse. Therefore, the reason because of suspicion is cited in order to warn one not to enter a new ruin as well.

⁵⁰ The Gemara continues to object: And let this halakha be derived because of demons? The Gemara answers: Demons are only a threat to individuals, so because of demons would not apply to a case where two people enter a ruin together.

⁵¹ The Gemara objects: But if there are two people entering a ruin together, then there is no suspicion either. There is no prohibition against two men to be alone with a woman as, in that case, there is no suspicion of untoward behavior. Consequently, if two men enter a ruin together, there is no room for suspicion. The Gemara answers: If two individuals known to be immoral enter together, there is suspicion even though there are two of them.

⁵² The Gemara considers why because of collapse is necessary. Let the prohibition be derived from suspicion and demons.

⁵³ The Gemara responds: There are times when this reason is necessary, e.g., when two upstanding individuals enter a ruin together. Although there is neither concern of suspicion nor of demons, there remains concern lest the ruin collapse.

⁵⁴ The Gemara considers the third reason, because of demons. Why is it necessary to include: Because of demons? Let the prohibition be derived from suspicion and collapse.

⁵⁵ The Gemara responds: There are cases where this is the only concern, for example where it is a new ruin into which two upstanding individuals enter, so there is neither concern lest it collapse nor of suspicion.

⁵⁶ The Gemara points out, however, that if there are two people, there is also no concern of demons. As such, the question remains: In what case can demons be the sole cause not to enter a ruin?

⁵⁷ The Gemara responds: Generally speaking, two individuals need not be concerned about demons; but, if they are in their place, i.e., a place known to be haunted by demons (see Isaiah 13:21), we are concerned about demons even with two people. And if you wish, say instead: Actually, this refers to the case of an individual entering a new ruin located in a field. There, there is no suspicion, as finding a woman in the field is uncommon; and since it is a new ruin, there is no danger of collapse. However, there is still concern of demons.

⁵⁸ The Sages taught in a Tosefta: The night is comprised of four watches; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Rabbi Natan says: The night is comprised of three watches.

⁵⁹ The Gemara explains: What is Rabbi Natan's reasoning? As it is written: "And Gideon, and the one hundred men who were with him, came to the edge of camp at the beginning of the middle watch" (Judges 7:19). It was taught in the Tosefta: Middle means nothing other than that there is one before it and one after it. From the fact that the verse refers to a middle watch, the fact that the night is comprised of three watches may be inferred.

⁶⁰ And what does Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi say about this proof? He argues that it is inconclusive, as one could say: To what does middle refer? It refers to one of the two middle watches.

⁶¹ And how would Rabbi Natan respond? He would say: Despite Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's objection, is: One of the middle watches, written in the verse? The middle watch is written. This indicates that the night is comprised of only three watches.

⁶² What is Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's reasoning? Rabbi Zerika said that Rabbi Ami said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's opinion is based on a comparison of two verses. One verse says: "At midnight I rise to give thanks for Your righteous laws" (Psalms 119:62), and the other verse says: "My eyes forestall the watches, that I will speak of Your word" (Psalms 119:148). Taken together, these verses indicate that their author, King David, rose at midnight, two watches before dawn, in order to study Torah. How is it possible to reconcile these two verses? Only if there are four watches in the night does one who rises two watches before dawn rise at midnight.

⁶³ And how does Rabbi Natan reconcile these two verses? He holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua, for we learned in a mishna that Rabbi Yehoshua says: One is permitted to recite the morning Shema during the time when people rise, until the third hour of the day, as it is the custom of kings to rise during the third hour. Since it is customary for kings to rise during the third hour of the day, if David rose at midnight, he would be awake for six hours of the night and two hours of the day, which amounts to two watches. Therefore King David could say that he "forestalls the watches," as he rose two watches before the rest of the kings in the world.

⁶⁴ Rav Ashi said that the verses can be reconciled in accordance with Rabbi Natan's opinion in another way: One and one-half watches are still called watches in plural. Therefore King David could rise at midnight yet maintain that he "forestalls the watches."

⁶⁵ Following this discussion, another halakha that Rabbi Zerika said that Rabbi Ami said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said is cited: Before the dead, one may speak only of matters relating to the dead, as speaking of other matters appears to be contemptuous of the deceased, underscoring that he is unable to talk while those around him can. Therefore, one must remain fully engaged in matters relating to him.

⁶⁶ Two traditions exist with regard to the details of this halakha in the name of Rabbi Abba bar Kahana. According to one version, Rabbi Abba bar Kahana said: This halakha was only said with regard to matters of Torah. Speaking of other matters, however, is not prohibited, since no contempt is expressed for the deceased by the fact that he is unable to speak of such topics.

⁶⁷ Others say another version of this halakha in the name of Rabbi Abba bar Kahana: This halakha was said even with regard to matters of Torah, and all the more so with regard to other matters. If one must refrain from speaking of matters of Torah, regarding which one is commanded to speak, and limit himself to matters concerning the deceased, all the more so should he refrain from speaking of other matters, regarding which one is not commanded to speak.

⁶⁸ Incidental to the Gemara's mention of King David, other sources are cited that describe his actions. Regarding that which was cited above, that he would rise in the middle of the night in order to serve his Creator, the Gemara asks: Did David rise at midnight? He rose in the evening. As it is written: "I rose with the neshef and cried, I hoped for Your word" (Psalms 119:147). And how do we know that this neshef is the evening? As it is written: "In the neshef, in the evening of the day, in the blackness of night and the darkness" (Proverbs 7:9). Apparently, King David did indeed rise when it was still evening.

⁶⁹ The Gemara suggests several ways to resolve this contradiction. Rabbi Oshaya said that Rabbi Aḥa said: David said as follows: Midnight never passed me by in my sleep. Sometimes I fulfilled the verse, "I rose with the neshef and cried," but I always, at least, fulfilled the verse, "At midnight I rise to give thanks for Your righteous laws."

⁷⁰ Rabbi Zeira said: Until midnight, David would doze like a horse, as a horse dozes, but never sleeps deeply. From midnight on, he would gain the strength of a lion. Rav Ashi said: Until midnight, he would study Torah, as it is written: "I rose with the neshef and cried, I hoped for Your word," and from midnight on, he would engage in songs and praise, as it is written: "At midnight I rise to give thanks."

⁷¹ To this point, the discussion has been based on the assumption that neshef means evening. The Gemara asks: Does neshef really mean evening? Doesn't neshef mean morning? As it is written: "And David slew them from the neshef until the evening of the next day" (I Samuel 30:17). Doesn't this verse mean from the morning until the night, in which case neshef must mean morning?

⁷² The Gemara responds: No, this verse means that David slew them from one evening until the next evening.

⁷³ The Gemara rejects this response: If so, let the verse be written: From the neshef until the neshef, or from the evening until the evening. Why would the verse employ two different terms for a single concept?

⁷⁴ Rather, Rava said: There are two times referred to as neshef, and the word can refer to either evening or morning. Neshef must be understood in accordance with its Aramaic root: The night moves past [neshaf] and the day arrives, and the day moves past [neshaf] and the night arrives.

⁷⁵ When King David said: At midnight I rise, the assumption is that he rose precisely at midnight. The Gemara asks: Did David know exactly when it was midnight? Even Moses our teacher did not know exactly when it was midnight. How do we know this about Moses? As it is written that he said to Pharaoh: "Thus said the Lord: About midnight, I will go out into the midst of Egypt" (Exodus 11:4). The word about indicates that it was only an approximation.

⁷⁶ The Gemara clarifies: What is the meaning of the expression: About midnight? Did Moses say it or did God say it? If we say that the Holy One, Blessed be He, Himself, said: About midnight, to Moses, is there doubt before God in heaven? Rather, this must be understood as follows: God told Moses: At midnight, but from the fact that when Moses came to Pharaoh he said: About midnight; apparently, Moses was uncertain about the exact moment of midnight. Moses, the greatest of all the prophets, was uncertain, and David knew?

⁷⁷ The Gemara offers several answers to this question: David had a sign indicating when it was midnight. As Rav Aḥa bar Bizna said that Rabbi Shimon Ḥasida said: A lyre hung over David's bed,

and once midnight arrived, the northern midnight wind would come and cause the lyre to play on its own. David would immediately rise from his bed and study Torah until the first rays of dawn. Once dawn arrived, the Sages of Israel entered to advise him with regard to the various concerns of the nation and the economy. They said to him: Our master, the king, your nation requires sustenance. He said: Go and sustain one another, provide each other with whatever is lacking. The Sages of Israel responded to him with a parable: A single handful of food does not satisfy a lion, and a pit will not be filled merely from the rain that falls directly into its mouth, but other water must be piped in (ge'onim). So too, the nation cannot sustain itself using its own resources. King David told them: Go and take up arms with the troops in battle in order to expand our borders and provide our people with the opportunity to earn a livelihood.

⁷⁸ The Sages immediately seek advice from Ahitophel to determine whether or not it was appropriate to go to war at that time and how they should conduct themselves, and they consult the Sanhedrin in order to receive the requisite license to wage a war under those circumstances (Tosefot HaRosh). And they ask the Urim VeTummim whether or not they should go to war, and whether or not they would be successful.

⁷⁹ Rav Yosef said: Upon what verse is this aggada based? As it is written: "And after Ahitophel was Benayahu son of Yehoyada and Evyatar, and the general of the king's army, Yoav" (I Chronicles 27:34).

⁸⁰ The individuals named in this verse correspond with the roles in the aggada as follows: Ahitophel is the adviser whose advice they sought first with regard to going to war, and so it says: "Now the counsel of Ahitophel, which he counseled in those days, was as a man who inquires of the word of God; so was the counsel of Ahitophel both with David and with Absalom" (II Samuel 16:23).

⁸¹ Benayahu ben Yehoyada corresponds to the Sanhedrin, since he was the head of the Sanhedrin, and Evyatar corresponds to the Urim VeTummim, as Evyatar ben Ahimelekh the priest would oversee inquiries directed to the Urim VeTummim (see I Samuel 23:9).

⁸² And so it says regarding Benayahu ben Yehoyada's position as head of the Sanhedrin: "And Benayahu ben Yehoyada was over the Kereti and over the Peleti" (II Samuel 20:23). And why was the Sanhedrin called Kereti UPeleti? It was called Kereti because they were decisive [koretim] in their pronouncements. It was called Peleti because their pronouncements and wisdom were wondrous [mufla'im]. The head of the Kereti UPeleti was the head of the Sanhedrin. According to the order of the verse, upon being instructed by King David to go to war, the Sages first consulted with Ahitophel, then with the Sanhedrin, then they would ask the Urim VeTummim, and only thereafter was the general of the king's army, Yoav, given the command to ready the military for battle.

⁸³ Rav Yitzhak bar Adda, and some say Rav Yitzhak, son of Rav Idi, said: From what verse is it derived that David's lyre would wake him at midnight? "Awake, my glory; awake, harp and lyre; I will wake the dawn" (Psalms 57:9). This means that the playing lyre has already woken, and now I must engage in Torah study until dawn.

⁸⁴ Rabbi Zeira offered a different solution to the question of whether Moses and David knew exactly when it was midnight and said: Moses certainly knew when it was midnight, and David also knew.

⁸⁵ The Gemara asks: If David knew, then why did he need the lyre? The Gemara answers: He needed the lyre to wake him from his sleep.

⁸⁶ Similarly with regard to Moses, since Moses knew the precise moment of midnight, why did he say: About midnight, instead of: At midnight? Moses did so because he maintained: Lest Pharaoh's astrologers err and believe midnight to be earlier. Since no disaster would have occurred, they would say: Moses is a liar. Moses spoke in accordance with the principle articulated by the Master: Accustom your tongue to say: I do not know, lest you become entangled in a web of deceit.

⁸⁷ Rav Ashi said: This question is unfounded, as Moses was standing at midnight of the thirteenth, leading into the fourteenth, when he pronounced his prophecy, and Moses told Israel that the Holy One, Blessed be He, said that tomorrow, at the exact time like midnight tonight, I will go out into the midst of Egypt. This indicates that the passage should not be understood to mean about midnight, an approximation; but rather, like midnight, as a comparison, likening midnight tomorrow to midnight tonight.

⁸⁸ The Gemara further explores King David's character. It is said: "A prayer of David...Keep my soul, for I am pious" (Psalms 86:1–2). Levi and Rabbi Yitzhak debated the meaning of this verse and how David's piety is manifest in the fact that he went beyond his fundamental obligations. One said: David's declaration of piety referred to his awakening during the night to pray, and so said David before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, am I not pious? As all of the kings of the East and the West sleep until the third hour of the day, but although I am a king like them, "At midnight I rise to give thanks" (Psalms 119:62).

⁸⁹ And the other Sage said: David said the following before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, am I not pious? For all of the kings of the East and the West sit in groups befitting their honored status, but I sit as a judge who issues rulings for the people. Women come with questions of ritual impurity and my hands become soiled with their blood as I labor to determine whether or not it is blood of impurity and she has menstruating woman status, and with a fetus that miscarried at a stage of development before it was clear whether or not it is considered a birth, and with placenta, which women sometimes discharge unrelated to the birth of a child (see Leviticus 15:19–30 with regard to blood, and 12:1–8 with regard to miscarriage and placenta). King David went to all this trouble in order to render a woman ritually pure and consequently permitted to her husband. If, after examination, a Sage declares the woman ritually pure, she is permitted to be with her husband, which leads to increased love and affection, and ultimately to procreation (Rabbi Yoshiyahu Pinto). And not only do I engage in activity considered to be beneath the station of a king, but I consult my teacher, Mefivoshet, son of King Saul's son, Jonathan, with regard to everything that I do. I say to him: Mefivoshet, my teacher, did I decide properly? Did I convict properly? Did I acquit properly? Did I rule ritually pure properly? Did I rule ritually impure properly? And I was not embarrassed. Forgoing royal dignity should make me worthy to be called pious.

⁹⁰ Rav Yehoshua, son of Rav Idi, said: What verse alludes to this? "And I speak Your testimonies before kings and I will not be ashamed" (Psalms 119:46). This verse alludes both to David's commitment to Torah, in contrast to the kings of the East and the West, as well as to the fact that he was not ashamed to discuss matters of Torah with Mefivoshet, a descendant of kings. David was not afraid to have his mistakes corrected by Mefivoshet.

⁹¹ It was taught in a Tosefta from a tannaitic tradition: His name was not Mefivoshet, but rather Ish Boshet was his name. Why was Ish Boshet referred to as Mefivoshet? Because he would embarrass [mevayesh] David in matters of halakha. According to this approach, Mefivoshet is an abbreviation

of boshet panim, embarrassment. Because David was not embarrassed to admit his errors, he merited that Kilav, who, according to tradition, was exceedingly wise, would descend from him.

⁹² Rabbi Yoḥanan said: His name was not Kilav; rather, his name was Daniel, as it appears in a different list of David's descendants. Why was he called Kilav? Because he would embarrass [makhlim] Mefivoshet, the teacher or authority figure [av] in matters of halakha.

⁹³ In his book of wisdom, Solomon said about this wise son: "My son, if your heart is wise, my heart will be glad, even mine" (Proverbs 23:15), as David enjoyed witnessing his son Kilav develop into a Torah luminary to the extent that Kilav was able to respond to Mefivoshet. And Solomon says about Kilav: "Be wise, my son, and make my heart glad, that I may respond to those who taunt me" (Proverbs 27:11).

⁹⁴ With regard to David's statement, "Keep my soul, for I am pious," the Gemara asks: Did David call himself pious? Isn't it written: "If I had not [luleh] believed to look upon the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living" (Psalms 27:13). The dots that appear over the word luleh in the text indicate doubt and uncertainty of his piety, and whether he was deserving of a place in the land of the living (see Avot DeRabbi Natan 34). In the name of Rabbi Yosei, it was taught in a Tosefta: Why do dots appear over the word luleh, as if there are some reservations? Because David said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe. I have every confidence in You that You grant an excellent reward to the righteous in the World-to-Come since God's ultimate goodness is manifest in the land of eternal life, but I still harbor uncertainty with regard to myself, and I do not know whether or not I definitely have a portion among them. In any case, apparently David was uncertain whether or not he deserved to receive a portion of God's reward for the righteous; how, then, could he characterize himself as pious?

⁹⁵ The Gemara responds: His concern does not prove anything, as King David knew that he was pious. He was simply concerned lest a transgression that he might commit in the future will cause him to lose his opportunity to look upon the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living.

⁹⁶ The Gemara cites a proof that there is room for one to fear lest he commit a transgression in the future in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Ya'akov bar Idi, as Rabbi Ya'akov bar Idi raised a contradiction between two verses. It is written that God told Jacob in his vision of the ladder: "Behold, I am with you and I guard you wherever you go" (Genesis 28:15), yet when Jacob returned to Canaan and realized that Esau was coming to greet him, it is written: "And Jacob became very afraid, and he was pained" (Genesis 32:8). Why did Jacob not rely on God's promise? Jacob had concerns and said to himself: Lest a transgression that I might have committed after God made His promise to me will cause God to revoke His promise of protection.

⁹⁷ Apparently, at times, transgression does cause God's promise to go unfulfilled, as it was taught explicitly in a baraita with regard to the ostensibly redundant language in a verse in the Song of the Sea: "Until Your people will cross, Lord, until the people You have acquired will cross. You bring them in and plant them in the mountain of Your inheritance, the place, Lord, which You made for Your dwelling" (Exodus 15:16–17).

⁹⁸ The Gemara interprets homiletically that until Your people will cross refers to the first entry into Eretz Yisrael during the time of Joshua, while until the people You have acquired pass over refers to the second entry following the exile in Babylonia. Based on the juxtaposition of these two entries in this single verse, the Sages said: Israel was worthy of having a miracle performed on its behalf in the

time of Ezra the scribe, just as one was performed on their behalf in the time of Joshua bin Nun. However, transgression caused the absence of a miracle.

⁹⁹ The Gemara returns to explain what we learned in the mishna: And the Rabbis say: The time for the recitation of the evening Shema is until midnight. The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion do they hold in explaining the verse: “When you lie down”? If they explain this verse in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who says that “when you lie down” is the time when people customarily go to sleep, then let the Rabbis also say that the time for the recitation of Shema extends, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, until the end of the first watch.

¹⁰⁰ And if they explain this verse in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Gamliel who says that “when you lie down” refers to the entire night, then let the Rabbis also say that one may recite the evening Shema until dawn, in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Gamliel.

¹⁰¹ The Gemara answers: Actually, the Rabbis hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Gamliel, and the fact that they say until midnight is in order to distance a person from transgression. As it was taught in a baraita, the Rabbis created a “fence” for their pronouncements with regard to the recitation of Shema in order to prevent a situation where a person comes home from the field in the evening, tired from his day’s work, and knowing that he is permitted to recite Shema until dawn says to himself: I will go home, eat a little, drink a little, sleep a little and then I will recite Shema and recite the evening prayer. In the meantime, he is overcome by sleep and ends up sleeping all night. However, since one is concerned lest he fall asleep and fail to wake up before midnight in order to recite Shema at the appropriate time, he will come from the field in the evening, enter the synagogue, and until it is time to pray, he will immerse himself in Torah. If he is accustomed to reading the Bible, he reads. If he is accustomed to learning mishnayot, a more advanced level of study, he learns. And then he recites Shema and prays as he should. When he arrives home, he eats his meal with a contented heart and recites a blessing.

¹⁰² The baraita concludes with a warning: Anyone who transgresses the pronouncements of the Sages is liable to receive the death penalty.

¹⁰³ This is a startling conclusion. What is different in all other places that it is not taught that one is liable to receive the death penalty and what is different here that it is taught that he is liable to receive the death penalty? There is no unique stringency apparent in the rabbinic restriction on the recitation of Shema.

¹⁰⁴ The Gemara offers two answers, explaining that the conclusion of the baraita essentially stems not from the magnitude of the transgression, but rather from concern that the “fence” created around this particular mitzva may be neglected. If you wish, say that one returning from work is quite anxious to go to sleep, and due to the risk that he will be overcome by sleep, he must be particularly vigilant in the recitation of Shema. And if you wish, say instead that strong language is employed here in order to exclude the opinion of he who says that although the morning prayer and the afternoon prayer are mandatory, the evening prayer is optional. Therefore, it teaches us that the evening prayer is mandatory, and anyone who transgresses the pronouncement of the Sages in this regard is liable to receive the death penalty.

¹⁰⁵ In this baraita, the Master said that when one returns from work in the evening, he enters the synagogue, recites Shema, and prays. From this baraita, we see that at night, just as during the day, one first recites Shema and then prays. This supports the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, as Rabbi

Yohanan said: Who is assured of a place in the World-to-Come? It is one who juxtaposes the blessing of redemption, recited after Shema, to the evening prayer. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi says: The prayers were instituted to be recited between the two recitations of Shema. According to Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, one recites the morning Shema, then recites all of the prayers and only after the recitation of the evening prayer does he recite the evening Shema.

¹⁰⁶ Although the practical difference between these two positions is clear, the Gemara seeks to determine: With regard to what do they disagree? What is the basis of their argument?

¹⁰⁷ The Gemara answers: If you wish, say that they disagree over the interpretation of a verse; if you wish, say instead that they disagree on a point of logic.

¹⁰⁸ If you say that they disagree on a point of logic, then the argument relates to the redemption recited after Shema, whose focus is the exodus from Egypt, the first redemption. The question is whether that redemption began at night, which would render it appropriate to juxtapose redemption to the blessing of the evening prayers as well, in prayer for immediate redemption. Or, perhaps, the redemption from Egypt only began during the day.

¹⁰⁹ Rabbi Yohanan holds: Redemption occurred in the evening as well; however, the full-fledged redemption was only in the morning. Since the redemption began in the evening, it is appropriate to juxtapose the blessing of redemption to the daily evening prayer. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, on the other hand, holds: Since full-fledged redemption only occurred in the morning, and the redemption of the previous evening was not a full-fledged redemption, there is no need to juxtapose the blessing of redemption to the evening prayer.

¹¹⁰ And if you wish, say instead that the dispute between Rabbi Yohanan and Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi is not a difference over a point of logic, but over the interpretation of a verse. Both derived their opinions from the same verse: "When you lie down, and when you rise." Both interpreted that the juxtaposition in this verse of the recitation of Shema at night and the recitation of Shema in the morning draws a parallel between them.

¹¹¹ Rabbi Yohanan holds: The verse juxtaposes lying down and rising. Just as when one rises, the recitation of Shema is followed by prayer, as everyone agrees that in the morning one juxtaposes redemption to the morning prayer, so too, when one lies down, the recitation of Shema is followed by prayer. And Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi maintains: The verse juxtaposes lying down and rising in a different sense. Just as when one rises, he recites Shema adjacent to rising from his bed, as the verse, when you rise, means when one awakens, so too when one lies down, he recites Shema adjacent to lying down in his bed. Therefore, the recitation of the evening Shema should be performed as close as possible to the moment when one actually lies down.

¹¹² According to Rabbi Yohanan, it is a mitzva to recite Shema before the evening prayer. Mar, son of Ravina, raises an objection from a mishna: How can one do that? We learn in a later mishna: In the evening, one recites two blessings prior to the recitation of Shema and two blessings afterward. And if you say that one must juxtapose redemption to prayer, doesn't he fail to juxtapose redemption to prayer, as he must recite: Help us lie down [hashkivenu], the blessing recited after the blessing of redemption, which constitutes an interruption between redemption and prayer?

¹¹³ They say in response: Since the Sages instituted the practice of reciting: Help us lie down, it is considered one extended blessing of redemption, and therefore does not constitute an interruption. As

if you fail to say that the sections added by the Sages are considered no less significant than the original prayers, then can one juxtapose redemption to prayer even in the morning? Didn't Rabbi Yoḥanan say: Before every prayer one recites the verse: "Lord, open my lips, that my mouth may declare Your glory" (Psalms 51:17) as a prelude to prayer? Afterward, one recites the verse: "May the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart be acceptable before You" (Psalms 19:15). Doesn't the verse: Lord, open my lips, constitute an interruption between redemption and prayer?

¹¹⁴ Rather, there, since the Sages instituted that one must recite: Lord, open my lips, it is considered as an extended prayer and not as an interruption. Here, too, with regard to the evening prayer, since the Sages instituted to recite the blessing Help us lie down, it is considered as one extended blessing of redemption.

¹¹⁵ Tangential to Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement that one who juxtaposes redemption and prayer is assured of a place in the World-to-Come, a similar statement is cited. Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Avina said: Anyone who recites: "A Psalm of David" (Psalms 145) three times every day is assured of a place in the World-to-Come.

¹¹⁶ This statement extolling the significance of this particular chapter of Psalms, usually referred to as ashrei because its recitation is preceded by recitation of the verse, "Happy [ashrei] are those who dwell in Your House, they praise You Selah" (Psalms 84:5), raises the question: What is the reason that such significance is ascribed to this particular chapter?

¹¹⁷ If you say that it is because it is arranged alphabetically, then let us say: "Happy are they who are upright in the way" (Psalms 119) where the alphabetical arrangement appears eight times.

¹¹⁸ Rather, if you suggest that this particular chapter is recited because it contains praise for God's provision of sustenance to all of creation: "You open Your hand and satisfy every living thing with favor" (Psalms 145:16), then let him recite the great hallel (Psalms 136), in which numerous praises are written, including: "Who provides food to all flesh, Whose kindness endures forever" (Psalms 136:25).

¹¹⁹ Rather, the reason why tehilla leDavid is accorded preference is because it contains both an alphabetic acrostic as well as mention of God's provision of sustenance to all creation.

¹²⁰ Additionally, with regard to this psalm, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Why is there no verse beginning with the letter nun in ashrei? Because it contains an allusion to the downfall of the enemies of Israel, a euphemism for Israel itself. As it is written: "The virgin of Israel has fallen and she will rise no more; abandoned in her land, none will raise her up" (Amos 5:2), which begins with the letter nun. Due to this verse, ashrei does not include a verse beginning with the letter nun.

¹²¹ In order to ease the harsh meaning of this verse, in the West, in Eretz Yisrael, they interpreted it with a slight adjustment: "She has fallen but she shall fall no more; rise, virgin of Israel." Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak adds: Even so, David went and provided support, through divine inspiration. Although King David did not include a verse beginning with the letter nun alluding to Israel's downfall, he foresaw the verse that would be written by Amos through divine inspiration; and the very next verse, which begins with the letter samekh, reads: "The Lord upholds the fallen and raises up those who are bowed down" (Psalms 145:14). Therefore, through divine inspiration, David offered hope and encouragement; although the virgin of Israel may have fallen, the Lord upholds the fallen.

¹²² After this discussion of the statement that Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Avina said, another statement of Rabbi Elazar is cited. Rabbi Elazar bar Avina said: What was said about the angel Michael is greater than what was said about the angel Gabriel. As about Michael, it is written: “And one of the seraphim flew to me” (Isaiah 6:6), indicating that with a single flight, the seraph arrived and performed his mission, while regarding Gabriel, it is written: “The man, Gabriel, whom I had seen at the beginning, in a vision, being caused to fly swiftly, approached close to me about the time of the evening offering” (Daniel 9:21). The double language used in the phrase “to fly swiftly [muaf bias],” indicates that he did not arrive at his destination in a single flight, but rather, that it took him two flights.

¹²³ To Rabbi Elazar bar Avina, it is clear that “one of the seraphim” refers to Michael, and the Gemara asks: From where is it inferred that the one mentioned in the verse is Michael?

¹²⁴ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: This is derived through a verbal analogy between the words one and one. Here, it is written: “And one of the seraphim flew to me” (Isaiah 6:6), and there, it is written: “And behold, Michael, one of the chief ministers of the king, came to my aid” (Daniel 10:13). Since the verse from Daniel refers to Michael as “one,” which aggadic midrash interprets as “the unique one,” so, too, “one of the seraphs” described in Isaiah must also refer to the unique one, Michael.

¹²⁵ This discussion in the Gemara concludes with a Tosefta that arrives at a hierarchy of angels based on the number of flights required by each to arrive at his destination. It was taught in a Tosefta: Michael, as stated above, in one flight; Gabriel, in two flights; Elijah the Prophet, in four flights; and the Angel of Death, in eight flights. During a time of plague, however, when the Angel of Death seems ubiquitous, he arrives everywhere in one flight.

¹²⁶ Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Even though one recited Shema in the synagogue, it is a mitzva to recite it upon his bed in fulfillment of the verse: “When you lie down.” Rabbi Yosei said: What verse alludes to the fact that one must recite Shema in the evening, upon his bed, as well? “Tremble, and do not sin; say to your heart upon your bed and be still, Selah” (Psalms 4:5). This is understood to mean: Recite Shema, about which it is written, “on your hearts,” upon your bed, and afterward be still and sleep.

¹²⁷ With regard to Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi’s statement, Rabbi Naḥman said:

¹²⁸ If one is a Torah scholar, he need not recite Shema on his bed since he is always engaged in the study of Torah and will likely fall asleep engrossed in matters of Torah. Abaye said: Even a Torah scholar must recite at least one verse of prayer, such as: “Into Your hand I trust my spirit; You have redeemed me, Lord, God of truth” (Psalms 31:6).

¹²⁹ Incidental to the verse, “Tremble, and do not sin,” the Gemara mentions that Rabbi Levi bar Ḥama said that Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: One should always incite his good inclination against his evil inclination, i.e., that one must constantly struggle so that his evil inclination does not lead him to transgression, as it is stated: “Tremble, and do not sin.” If one succeeds and subdues his evil inclination, excellent, but if he does not succeed in subduing it, he should study Torah, as alluded to in the verse: “Say to your heart.” If he subdues his evil inclination, excellent; if not, he should recite Shema, which contains the acceptance of the yoke of God, and the concept of reward and punishment, as it is stated in the verse: “Upon your bed,” which alludes to Shema, where it says: “When you lie down.” If he subdues his evil inclination, excellent; if not, he should remind himself of the day of death, whose silence is alluded to in the continuation of the verse: “And be still, Selah.”

¹³⁰ And Rabbi Levi bar Ḥama said that Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: God said to Moses, “Ascend to Me on the mountain and be there, and I will give you the stone tablets and the Torah and the mitzva that I have written that you may teach them” (Exodus 24:12), meaning that God revealed to Moses not only the Written Torah, but all of Torah, as it would be transmitted through the generations. The “tablets” are the ten commandments that were written on the tablets of the Covenant, the “Torah” is the five books of Moses. The “mitzva” is the Mishna, which includes explanations for the mitzvot and how they are to be performed. “That I have written” refers to the Prophets and Writings, written with divine inspiration. “That you may teach them” refers to the Talmud, which explains the Mishna. These explanations are the foundation for the rulings of practical halakha. This verse teaches that all aspects of Torah were given to Moses from Sinai.

¹³¹ The Gemara continues its treatment of the recitation of Shema upon one’s bed. Rabbi Yitzḥak said: Anyone who recites Shema on his bed, it is as if he holds a double-edged sword, guarding him from all evil, as it is stated: “High praises of God in their mouths, and a double-edged sword in their hands” (Psalms 149:6). The Gemara asks: From where is it inferred that this verse from Psalms refers to the recitation of Shema? Mar Zutra, and some say Rav Ashi, said: We derive it from the preceding verse, as it is written: “Let the pious exult in glory; let them joyously sing upon their beds.” The praise of God from one’s bed is the recitation of Shema. And it is written thereafter: “High praises of God in their mouths, and a double-edged sword in their hands.”

¹³² And Rabbi Yitzḥak said: Anyone who recites Shema upon his bed, demons stay away from him. This is alluded to, as it is stated: “But man is born into trouble, and the sparks [reshef] fly [uf] upward” (Job 5:7). The verse is explained: The word fly [uf] means nothing other than Torah, as Torah is difficult to grasp and easy to lose, like something that floats away, as it is stated: “Will you set your eyes upon it? It is gone; for riches certainly make themselves wings, like an eagle that flies into the heavens” (Proverbs 23:5). The word “sparks” means nothing other than demons, as it is stated: “Wasting of hunger, and the devouring of the sparks [reshef] and bitter destruction [ketev meriri], and the teeth of beasts I will send upon them, with the venom of crawling things of the dust” (Deuteronomy 32:24). Here we see reshef listed along with ketev meriri, both of which are understood by the Sages to be names of demons.

¹³³ Regarding this unclear verse, Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: If one engages in Torah study, suffering stays away from him, as it is stated: “And the sparks fly upward.” And fly means nothing other than Torah, as it is stated: “Will you set your eyes upon it? It is gone; and sparks means nothing other than suffering, as it is stated: “Wasting of hunger, and the devouring of the sparks,” equating devouring sparks with wasting hunger, as both are types of suffering. From here, we derive that through Torah, fly, one is able to distance himself, upward, from suffering, sparks.

¹³⁴ Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: Even schoolchildren, who learn only the Written Torah, know this concept as it is stated: “And He said you shall surely hear the voice of the Lord your God, and what is upright in His eyes you shall do and you shall listen to His mitzvot and guard His statutes; any disease that I have placed upon Egypt I will not place upon you for I am the Lord your healer” (Exodus 15:26). Rather, one must interpret the verse: Anyone who is able to engage in Torah study yet does not engage in that study, not only does the Holy One, Blessed be He, fail to protect him, but He brings upon him hideous afflictions, that embarrass him and trouble him, as it is stated: “I was mute with silence; I was silent from good, and my pain was strong” (Psalms 39:3). The word good

means nothing other than Torah, as it is stated: “For I have given you a good portion, My Torah, do not abandon it” (Proverbs 4:2). The verse should be understood: “I have been silent from the study of Torah, and my pain was strong.”

¹³⁵ With regard to the verse: “For I have given you a good portion,” Rabbi Zeira, and some say Rabbi Ḥanina bar Pappa, said: Come and see how the characteristics of the Holy One, Blessed be He, are unlike the characteristics of flesh and blood. It is characteristic of flesh and blood that when one sells an object to another person, the seller grieves the loss of his possession and the buyer rejoices. With regard to the Holy One, Blessed be He, however, this is not so. He gave the Torah to Israel and rejoiced, as it is stated: “For I have given you a good portion, My Torah, do not abandon it.” A good portion is understood as a good purchase; although God sold Torah to Israel, He rejoices in the sale and praises the object before its new owner (Rabbi Yoshiyahu Pinto).

¹³⁶ Previously, the Gemara discussed suffering that results from one’s transgressions. The Gemara shifts the focus and discusses suffering that does not result from one’s transgressions and the suffering of the righteous. Rava, and some say Rav Ḥisda, said: If a person sees that suffering has befallen him, he should examine his actions. Generally, suffering comes about as punishment for one’s transgressions, as it is stated: “We will search and examine our ways, and return to God” (Lamentations 3:40). If he examined his ways and found no transgression for which that suffering is appropriate, he may attribute his suffering to dereliction in the study of Torah. God punishes an individual for dereliction in the study of Torah in order to emphasize the gravity of the issue, as it is stated: “Happy is the man whom You punish, Lord, and teach out of Your law” (Psalms 94:12). This verse teaches us that his suffering will cause him to return to Your law.

¹³⁷ And if he did attribute his suffering to dereliction in the study of Torah, and did not find this to be so, he may be confident that these are afflictions of love, as it is stated: “For whom the Lord loves, He rebukes, as does a father the son in whom he delights” (Proverbs 3:12).

¹³⁸ So too, Rava said that Rav Sehora said that Rav Huna said: Anyone in whom the Holy One, Blessed be He, delights, He oppresses him with suffering, as it is stated: “Yet in whom the Lord delights, He oppresses him with disease; to see if his soul would offer itself in guilt, that he might see his children, lengthen his days, and that the desire of the Lord might prosper by his hand” (Isaiah 53:10). This verse illustrates that in whomever God delights, he afflicts with illness.

¹³⁹ I might have thought that God delights in him even if he does not accept his suffering with love. Therefore the verse teaches: “If his soul would offer itself in guilt.” Just as a guilt-offering is brought knowingly, as it is one of the sacrifices offered willingly, without coercion, so too his suffering must be accepted knowingly.

¹⁴⁰ And if one accepts that suffering with love, what is his reward? As the second part of the verse states: “That he might see his children, lengthen his days.” Moreover, in addition to these earthly rewards, his Torah study will endure and his Torah study will be successful, as it is stated: “The purpose of the Lord,” the Torah, the revelation of God’s will, “might prosper by his hand.”

¹⁴¹ With regard to the acceptance of affliction with love and what exactly this entails, Rabbi Ya’akov bar Idi and Rabbi Aḥa bar Ḥanina disagree. One of them said: Afflictions of love are any that do not cause dereliction in the study of Torah, i.e., any which do not afflict his body to the extent that he is unable to study Torah, as it is stated: “Happy is the man whom You afflict, Lord, and teach from Your Torah.” Afflictions of love are when You “teach from Your Torah.”

¹⁴² And one said: Afflictions of love are any that do not cause dereliction in the recitation of prayer, as it is stated: “Blessed is God Who did not turn away my prayer” (Psalms 66:20). Despite his suffering, the afflicted is still capable of praying to God.

¹⁴³ Rabbi Abba, son of Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba, said: My father, Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba, said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said as follows: Both, even afflictions that cause dereliction in the study of Torah and those that cause dereliction in the recitation of prayer, are afflictions of love, as with regard to one who suffers without transgression it is stated: “For whom He loves, He rebukes,” and inability to study Torah and to pray are among his afflictions.

¹⁴⁴ What then, is the meaning when the verse states: “And teach him from Your Torah”? Do not read and teach to mean and teach him, rather, and teach us. You teach us the value of this affliction from Your Torah.

¹⁴⁵ This is taught through an a fortiori inference from the law concerning the tooth and eye of a slave: The tooth and eye are each a single limb of a person and if his master damages either, the slave thereby obtains his freedom; suffering that cleanses a person’s entire body all the more so that one attains freedom, atonement, from his sins.

¹⁴⁶ And that is the statement of Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish, as Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: The word covenant is used with regard to salt, and the word covenant is used with regard to afflictions. The word covenant is used with regard to salt, as it is written: “The salt of the covenant with your God should not be excluded from your meal-offering; with all your sacrifices you must offer salt” (Leviticus 2:13). And the word covenant is used with regard to afflictions, as it is written: “These are the words of the covenant” (Deuteronomy 28:69). Just as, in the covenant mentioned with regard to salt, the salt sweetens the taste of the meat and renders it edible, so too in the covenant mentioned with regard to suffering, the suffering cleanses a person’s transgressions, purifying him for a more sublime existence.

¹⁴⁷ Additionally, it was taught in a baraita with regard to affliction: Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai says: The Holy One, Blessed be He, gave Israel three precious gifts, all of which were given only by means of suffering, which purified Israel so that they may merit to receive them. These gifts are: Torah, Eretz Yisrael, and the World-to-Come.

¹⁴⁸ From where is it derived that Torah is only acquired by means of suffering? As it is said: “Happy is the man whom You afflict, Lord,” after which it is said: “And teach from Your Torah.”

¹⁴⁹ Eretz Yisrael, as it is written: “As a man rebukes his son, so the Lord your God rebukes you” (Deuteronomy 8:5), and it is written thereafter: “For the Lord your God will bring you to a good land” (Deuteronomy 8:7).

¹⁵⁰ The World-to-Come, as it is written: “For the mitzva is a lamp, the Torah is light, and the reproofs of instruction are the way of life” (Proverbs 6:23). One may arrive at the lamp of mitzva and the light of Torah that exists in the World-to-Come only by means of the reproofs of instruction in this world.

¹⁵¹ A tanna taught the following baraita before Rabbi Yoḥanan: If one engages in Torah and acts of charity

¹⁵² and buries his sons, all his transgressions are forgiven.

¹⁵³ Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: What is your source for this? Granted, if one engages in Torah and acts of charity, his transgressions are forgiven, as it is written: “With mercy and truth, iniquity is expiated” (Proverbs 16:6); mercy refers to acts of charity, as it is stated: “He who pursues charity and mercy finds life, charity and honor” (Proverbs 21:21), mercy and charity are listed together. And truth refers to Torah, as it is stated: “Buy truth and do not sell it; also wisdom, guidance and understanding” (Proverbs 23:23). However, from where is it derived that the transgressions of one who buries his sons are also forgiven?

¹⁵⁴ An answer was provided to Rabbi Yoḥanan when a certain elder taught him in the name of Rabbi Shimon bar Yoḥai: This conclusion is derived from a verbal analogy between the words iniquity and iniquity. Here, it is written: “With mercy and truth, iniquity is expiated,” and there it is written: “He repays the iniquity of the fathers onto the bosom of their children” (Jeremiah 32:18). Because he “repays the iniquity of the fathers onto the bosom of their children,” the father’s transgressions are forgiven.

¹⁵⁵ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Leprosy and suffering due to children are not afflictions of love.

¹⁵⁶ The Gemara asks: Is leprosy not an affliction of love? Didn’t we learn in a baraita: If one has any of the four signs of leprosy (Leviticus 13) they are nothing other than an altar of atonement?

¹⁵⁷ The Gemara answers: Although the signs of leprosy are an altar of atonement for one’s transgressions, they are not an affliction of love.

¹⁵⁸ And if you wish, say instead: This baraita, which says that leprosy is an affliction of love, is for us in Babylonia, because outside of Eretz Yisrael we are not as careful of the laws of ritual impurity, and one afflicted with leprosy may interact with others, mitigating his suffering. And that statement of Rabbi Yoḥanan, that leprosy is not an affliction of love, is for them in Eretz Yisrael, where they are exceedingly careful of the laws of ritual impurity and the suffering of a leper is great because he is banished from society (Rav Hai Gaon).

¹⁵⁹ And if you wish, say instead: This baraita, which says that leprosy is an affliction of love, refers to concealed leprosy that only strikes the concealed areas of one’s body. But that statement of Rabbi Yoḥanan refers to visible leprosy that causes those who see it to distance themselves from the leper.

¹⁶⁰ The Gemara continues to object: And suffering due to children is not an affliction of love? The Gemara clarifies: What are the circumstances? If you say that he had children and they died, didn’t Rabbi Yoḥanan himself say, while consoling the victim of a catastrophe: This is the bone of my tenth son? Rabbi Yoḥanan experienced the death of ten of his children, and he kept a small bone from his tenth child as a painful memorial. He would show that bone to others in order to console them, and since he showed it to them, the deaths of his children must certainly have been affliction of love. He consoled others by displaying that there is an element of intimacy with God that exists in that suffering (Tosafot). Why, then, would Rabbi Yoḥanan have said that suffering due to children is not afflictions of love? Rather, one must conclude that when Rabbi Yoḥanan said that those afflictions are not afflictions of love, he was speaking with regard to one who has no children, and when one had children who died, this could very well be considered afflictions of love.

¹⁶¹ The Gemara continues to address the issue of suffering and affliction: Rabbi Yoḥanan’s student, Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba, fell ill. Rabbi Yoḥanan entered to visit him, and said to him: Is your suffering dear to you? Do you desire to be ill and afflicted? Rabbi Ḥiyya said to him: I welcome neither this

suffering nor its reward, as one who welcomes this suffering with love is rewarded. Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: Give me your hand. Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba gave him his hand, and Rabbi Yoḥanan stood him up and restored him to health.

¹⁶² Similarly, Rabbi Yoḥanan fell ill. Rabbi Ḥanina entered to visit him, and said to him: Is your suffering dear to you? Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: I welcome neither this suffering nor its reward. Rabbi Ḥanina said to him: Give me your hand. He gave him his hand, and Rabbi Ḥanina stood him up and restored him to health.

¹⁶³ The Gemara asks: Why did Rabbi Yoḥanan wait for Rabbi Ḥanina to restore him to health? If he was able to heal his student, let Rabbi Yoḥanan stand himself up.

¹⁶⁴ The Gemara answers, they say: A prisoner cannot generally free himself from prison, but depends on others to release him from his shackles.

¹⁶⁵ The Gemara relates that Rabbi Elazar, another of Rabbi Yoḥanan's students, fell ill. Rabbi Yoḥanan entered to visit him, and saw that he was lying in a dark room. Rabbi Yoḥanan exposed his arm, and light radiated from his flesh, filling the house. He saw that Rabbi Elazar was crying, and said to him: Why are you crying? Thinking that his crying was over the suffering that he endured throughout his life, Rabbi Yoḥanan attempted to comfort him: If you are weeping because you did not study as much Torah as you would have liked, we learned: One who brings a substantial sacrifice and one who brings a meager sacrifice have equal merit, as long as he directs his heart toward Heaven. If you are weeping because you lack sustenance and are unable to earn a livelihood, as Rabbi Elazar was, indeed, quite poor, not every person merits to eat off of two tables, one of wealth and one of Torah, so you need not bemoan the fact that you are not wealthy. If you are crying over children who have died, this is the bone of my tenth son, and suffering of that kind afflicts great people, and they are afflictions of love.

¹⁶⁶ Rabbi Elazar said to Rabbi Yoḥanan: I am not crying over my misfortune, but rather, over this beauty of yours that will decompose in the earth, as Rabbi Yoḥanan's beauty caused him to consider human mortality. Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: Over this, it is certainly appropriate to weep. Both cried over the fleeting nature of beauty in the world and death that eventually overcomes all.

¹⁶⁷ Meanwhile, Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: Is your suffering dear to you? Rabbi Elazar said to him: I welcome neither this suffering nor its reward. Upon hearing this, Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: Give me your hand. Rabbi Elazar gave him his hand, and Rabbi Yoḥanan stood him up and restored him to health.

¹⁶⁸ The Gemara relates another story regarding acknowledgement of the justice of divine punishment: Four hundred barrels of Rav Huna's wine fermented and turned into vinegar, causing him great financial loss. Rav Yehuda, the brother of Rav Sala the Pious, along with the Sages, and some say Rav Adda bar Ahava, along with the Sages, entered to visit him, and said: The Master should examine his actions, as perhaps he committed a transgression for which he is being punished. Rav Huna said to them: Am I suspect in your eyes? Have I committed a transgression on account of which you advise me to examine my behavior? They said to him: Is the Holy One, Blessed be He, suspect that He exacts punishment without justice? Your loss was certainly just, and you must examine your conduct to find out why. The Sages were aware of a flaw in Rav Huna's conduct, to which they alluded (Tosafot).

¹⁶⁹ Rav Huna said to them: If someone has heard something improper that I have done, let him say so. They said to him: We have heard that the Master does not give a share of his grapevines to his tenant farmers. A tenant farmer is entitled to a portion of the crop grown on his landlord's property, as well as a share of the vines planted during a given year.

¹⁷⁰ Rav Huna said to them: Does this tenant farmer leave me anything from the produce that he grows on my property? He steals it all. Consequently, in denying him his share of the grapevines I am simply recouping that which was stolen from me by this tenant farmer.

¹⁷¹ They said to him: That is the meaning of the folk saying: One who steals from a thief has a taste of theft. Despite the fact that the property was stolen to begin with, one nevertheless engages in theft. Although he did not violate a prohibition per se, it is still a form of theft, and one who is held to a higher standard than others will be punished for it. He said to them: I accept upon myself to give my tenant farmer his portion in the future. Thereupon, as a result of Rav Huna's repentance, God restored his loss. Some say his vinegar turned back into wine, and some say that the price of vinegar rose and it was sold at the price of wine.

¹⁷² The Gemara returns to the topic of prayer. It was taught in a baraita that the tanna Abba Binyamin would say: All of my life I have taken great pains with regard to two things: That my prayer should be before my bed and that my bed should be placed north to south. Abba Binyamin's statement requires explanation. With regard to his statement: That my prayer should be before my bed, the Gemara asks, what does before my bed mean? If you say that it literally means that he would stand before his bed and pray, it is difficult, as Rav Yehuda said that Rav said, and some say that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: From where is it derived that one who prays should have nothing separating between him and the wall? As it is stated: "And Hezekiah turned to face the wall and prayed" (Isaiah 38:2), in order to facilitate his concentration during prayer. That being said, why would Abba Binyamin pray before his bed? Rather, do not say that before my bed refers to where he stood during prayer, but rather, say that he prayed adjacent to the time that he would retire to bed; he was careful to recite Shema and recite the evening prayer just before going to sleep (Rabbeinu Ḥananel).

¹⁷³ Abba Binyamin's statement: And my bed should be placed north to south was in deference to the Divine Presence, which rests between east and west, the direction of the Temple; as the Holy of Holies was to the west, while the main entrance was to the east. Therefore, the Sages were careful not to perform actions inconsistent with that sanctity while facing east to west; and, therefore, Abba Binyamin was careful not to sleep in a bed that faced east to west.

¹⁷⁴ In praise of that stringency, the Sages added that Rabbi Ḥama said that Rabbi Ḥanina said that Rabbi Yitzḥak said: One who places his bed facing north to south will be rewarded with male children, as it is stated: "And whose belly You fill with Your treasure [utzfunekha], who have sons in plenty and leave their abundance to their babies" (Psalms 17:14). This verse indicates that one who sets his bed facing north will be rewarded with sons in plenty, as north [tzafon] is etymologically similar to Your treasure [tzfunekha].

¹⁷⁵ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: Moreover, his wife will not miscarry. From where do we derive this? It is written here: "And whose belly You fill [temaleh] with Your treasure," and it is written there, concerning Rebecca's pregnancy: "And her time to give birth was fulfilled [vayimle'u] and there were twins in her belly" (Genesis 25:24), consequently: You fill with Your treasure refers to a pregnancy that proceeds without complication.

¹⁷⁶ Another of Abba Binyamin's statements with regard to the laws of prayer was taught in a baraita: Abba Binyamin says: If two people enter a synagogue outside of the city in order to pray, and one began praying before the other and did not wait for the other person to complete his prayer, and left him alone in the synagogue, his prayer is thrown back in his face. Because he left the other person alone and caused him to be distracted during his prayer, his own prayer is thrown back in his face, as it is stated: "You who throw your soul in your face, for your sake will the earth be forsaken? The Rock will be moved from its place" (Job 18:4). This verse indicates that one who left the other person alone effectively causes his soul, as prayer is the outpouring of the soul before God, to be thrown in his face. God says to that person: For your sake, do you think because you left, the earth will be forsaken, that God will leave the world and the prayer of the other person will go unheard?

¹⁷⁷ Not only that, but it causes the Divine Presence to remove itself from Israel, as it is stated in the continuation of the verse: "The Rock will be moved from its place." The rock, God, is forced to remove His presence. And Rock means nothing other than the Holy One, Blessed be He, as it is stated: "Of the Rock that gave birth to you, you have been unmindful, and you have forgotten God Who bore you" (Deuteronomy 32:18).

¹⁷⁸ And if he waits for him in the synagogue, what is his reward? Is his reward proportionate to the punishment received by one who failed to do so?

¹⁷⁹ In terms of this reward, Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina said: One who waits in the synagogue for the other to finish his prayer merits the following blessings, as it is stated: "If only you had listened to My mitzvot then your peace would be as a river, and your righteousness as the waves of the sea. Your seed would be as the sand, and the offspring of your body like the grains thereof; his name would be neither cut off nor destroyed from before Me" (Isaiah 48:18–19). The explanation of this passage is based on the etymological similarity between the word mitzva and the word tzevet, which means group. If he keeps the other person company and does not abandon him after his prayer, all of the blessings that appear later in the verse will be fulfilled in him (Talmidei Rabbeinu Yona).

¹⁸⁰ In another baraita it was taught that Abba Binyamin says: If the eye was given permission to see, no creature would be able to withstand the abundance and ubiquity of the demons and continue to live unaffected by them.

¹⁸¹ Similarly, Abaye said: They are more numerous than we are and they stand over us like mounds of earth surrounding a pit.

¹⁸² Rav Huna said: Each and every one of us has a thousand demons to his left and ten thousand to his right. God protects man from these demons, as it says in the verse: "A thousand may fall at your side, and ten thousand at your right hand; they will not approach you" (Psalms 91:7).

¹⁸³ Summarizing the effects of the demons, Rava said: The crowding at the kalla, the gatherings for Torah study during Elul and Adar, is from the demons; those knees that are fatigued even though one did not exert himself is from the demons; those clothes of the Sages that wear out, despite the fact that they do not engage in physical labor, is from friction with the demons; those feet that are in pain is from the demons.

¹⁸⁴ One who seeks to know that the demons exist should place fine ashes around his bed, and in the morning the demons' footprints appear like chickens' footprints, in the ash. One who seeks to see them should take the afterbirth of a firstborn female black cat, born to a firstborn female black cat,

burn it in the fire, grind it and place it in his eyes, and he will see them. He must then place the ashes in an iron tube sealed with an iron seal [gushpanka] lest the demons steal it from him, and then seal the opening so he will not be harmed. Rav Beivai bar Abaye performed this procedure, saw the demons, and was harmed. The Sages prayed for mercy on his behalf and he was healed.

¹⁸⁵ It was taught in a baraita that Abba Binyamin said: One's prayer is only fully heard in a synagogue, as it is stated with regard to King Solomon's prayer in the Temple: "Yet have You turned toward the prayer of Your servant and to his supplication, Lord my God, to listen to the song and the prayer which Your servant prays before You on this day" (I Kings 8:28). The following verse concludes: "To hear the prayer Your servant directs toward this place" (I Kings 8:29). We see that one's prayer is heard specifically in the Temple, of which the synagogue is a microcosm (Rav Yoshiyahu Pinto). It may be inferred that in a place of song, a synagogue where God's praises are sung, there prayer should be.

¹⁸⁶ In explaining Abba Binyamin's statement, Ravin bar Rav Adda said that Rabbi Yitzhak said: From where is it derived that the Holy One, Blessed be He, is located in a synagogue? As it is stated: "God stands in the congregation of God; in the midst of the judges He judges" (Psalms 82:1). The congregation of God is the place where people congregate to sing God's praises, and God is located among His congregation.

¹⁸⁷ And from where is it derived that ten people who pray, the Divine Presence is with them? As it is stated: "God stands in the congregation of God," and the minimum number of people that constitute a congregation is a quorum of ten.

¹⁸⁸ From where is it derived that three who sit in judgment, the Divine Presence is with them? It is derived from this same verse, as it is stated: "In the midst of the judges He judges," and the minimum number of judges that comprises a court is three.

¹⁸⁹ From where is it derived that two who sit and engage in Torah study, the Divine Presence is with them? As it is stated: "Then they that feared the Lord spoke one with the other, and the Lord listened, and heard, and a book of remembrance was written before Him, for them that fear the Lord, and that think upon His name" (Malachi 3:16). The Divine Presence listens to any two God-fearing individuals who speak with each other.

¹⁹⁰ With regard to this verse, the Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the phrase, "And that think upon His name"? Rav Ashi said: If a person intended to perform a mitzva, but due to circumstances beyond his control, he did not perform it, the verse ascribes him credit as if he performed the mitzva, as he is among those that think upon His name.

¹⁹¹ The Gemara returns to Ravin bar Rav Adda's statement: And from where is it derived that when even one who sits and engages in Torah study, the Divine Presence is with him? As it is stated: "In every place where I cause My Name to be mentioned, I will come to you and bless you" (Exodus 20:21); God blesses even a single person who mentions God's name, a reference to Torah study (Iyyun Ya'akov).

¹⁹² The Gemara asks: Since the Divine Presence rests even upon one who engages in Torah study, was it necessary to say that the Divine Presence rests upon two who study Torah together? The Gemara answers: There is a difference between them. Two people, their words of Torah are written in

the book of remembrance, as it is stated: “And a book of remembrance was written”; however a single individual’s words of Torah are not written in a book of remembrance.

¹⁹³ The Gemara continues: Since the Divine Presence rests even upon two who engage in Torah study, is it necessary to mention three? The Gemara answers: Here too, a special verse is necessary lest you say that judgment is merely to keep the peace among the citizenry, and the Divine Presence does not come and rest upon those who sit in judgment as they are not engaged in Torah study. Ravin bar Rav Adda teaches us that sitting in judgment is also Torah.

¹⁹⁴ The Gemara asks: Since the Divine Presence rests even upon three, is it necessary to mention ten? The Gemara answers: The Divine Presence arrives before a group of ten, as the verse: “God stands in the congregation of God,” indicates that when the ten individuals who comprise a congregation arrive, the Divine Presence is already there. For a group of three judges, however, the Divine Presence does not arrive until they sit and begin their deliberations, as in the midst of the judges He judges. God aids them in their judgment, but does not arrive before them.

¹⁹⁵ The Gemara cites another aggadic statement: Rabbi Avin bar Rav Adda said that Rabbi Yitzḥak said: From where is it derived that the Holy One, Blessed be He, wears phylacteries? As it is stated: “The Lord has sworn by His right hand, and by the arm of His strength” (Isaiah 62:8). Since it is customary to swear upon holy objects, it is understood that His right hand and the arm of His strength are the holy objects upon which God swore.

¹⁹⁶ Specifically, “His right hand” refers to the Torah, as it is stated in describing the giving of the Torah: “From His right hand, a fiery law for His people” (Deuteronomy 33:2). “The arm of His strength,” His left hand, refers to phylacteries, as it is stated: “The Lord gave strength to His nation” (Psalms 29:11), in the form of the mitzva of phylacteries.

¹⁹⁷ The Gemara asks: And from where is it derived that phylacteries provide strength for Israel? As it is written: “And all the nations of the land shall see that the name of the Lord is called upon you, and they will fear you” (Deuteronomy 28:10). It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Eliezer the Great says: This is a reference to the phylacteries of the head, upon which the name of God is written in fulfillment of the verse: “That the name of the Lord is called upon you.”

¹⁹⁸ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said to Rav Ḥiyya bar Avin: What is written in the phylacteries of the Master of the world? Rav Ḥiyya bar Avin replied: It is written: “Who is like Your people, Israel, one nation in the land?” (I Chronicles 17:21). God’s phylacteries serve to connect Him, in a sense, to the world, the essence of which is Israel.

¹⁹⁹ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak continues: Is the Holy One, Blessed be He, glorified through the glory of Israel? Rav Ḥiyya bar Avin answered: Yes, as indicated by the juxtaposition of two verses; as it is stated: “You have affirmed, this day, that the Lord is your God, and that you will walk in His ways and keep His laws and commandments, and listen to His voice.” And the subsequent verse states: “And the Lord has affirmed, this day, that you are His treasure, as He spoke to you, to keep His commandments” (Deuteronomy 26:17–18). From these two verses it is derived that the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Israel: You have made Me a single entity [ḥativa] in the world, as you singled Me out as separate and unique. And because of this, I will make you a single entity in the world, and you will be a treasured nation, chosen by God.

²⁰⁰ You have made Me a single entity in the world, as it is stated that Israel declares God's oneness by saying: "Hear, Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is One" (Deuteronomy 6:4). And because of this, I will make you a single entity in the world, unique and elevated with the utterance: "Who is like Your people, Israel, one nation in the land?" Consequently, the Holy One, Blessed be He, is glorified through the glory of Israel whose praises are written in God's phylacteries.

²⁰¹ Rav Aḥa, son of Rava said to Rav Ashi: It works out well with regard to the contents of one of the four compartments of God's phylacteries of the head. However, all four compartments of Israel's phylacteries of the head contain portions of the Torah that praise God. What portions in praise of Israel are written in the rest of the compartments of God's phylacteries of the head?

²⁰² Rav Ashi said to him: In those three compartments it is written: "For who is a great nation, to whom God is close, like the Lord our God whenever we call upon Him?" (Deuteronomy 4:7); "And who is a great nation, who has righteous statutes and laws, like this entire Torah which I set before you today?" (Deuteronomy 4:8); "Happy are you, Israel, who is like you? A people saved by the Lord, the shield of your help, and that is the sword of your excellence. And your enemies shall dwindle away before you, and you shall tread upon their high places" (Deuteronomy 33:29); "Or has God attempted to go and take for Himself a nation from the midst of another nation, by trials, by signs and by wonders" (Deuteronomy 4:34); "And to elevate you above all nations that He has made, in praise, in name and in glory; that you may be a holy people to the Lord, your God, as He has spoken" (Deuteronomy 26:19).

²⁰³ Rav Aḥa, son of Rava, raises an objection: If all of these verses are included in God's phylacteries of the head, there are too many compartments as more than four verses of praise were listed. Rather, the portions in God's phylacteries must be arranged as follows: The verses "For who is a great nation" and "And who is a great nation" are included in one compartment, as they are similar. "Happy are you, Israel" and "Who is like your people, Israel" are in one compartment. "Or has God attempted" is in one compartment and "And to elevate you" is in one compartment

²⁰⁴ in the phylacteries of the head, where there are four separate compartments. And all of the verses are written together on one parchment in the phylacteries of the arm, which has only one compartment.

²⁰⁵ Additionally, Ravin bar Rav Adda said that Rabbi Yitzḥak said: One who is accustomed to come to the synagogue and did not come one day, the Holy One, Blessed be He, asks about him, as it were, to determine what happened to him, as it is stated: "Who among you fears the Lord? Who hears the voice of His servant? Though he walks in darkness and has no light, let him trust in the name of the Lord, and rely upon his God" (Isaiah 50:10). In other words, God asks, who among you fears the Lord yet did not come to hear the voice of His servant the prayer leader, who engages in the service of God? He who went out before dawn and walks in darkness before prayer.

²⁰⁶ If it is for a matter involving a mitzva that he went and absented himself from prayer in the synagogue, then, despite the darkness, there is light for him, the aura of his mitzva will protect him. But if it is for an optional matter, some mundane purpose, that he went and absented himself from prayer in the synagogue, then, even once the day begins, there is no light for him (Maharsha).

²⁰⁷ The verse continues: "Let him trust in the name of the Lord." The Gemara asks: What is the reason that God is so exacting with this person? The Gemara answers: Because he should have relied

on the name of the Lord, and trusted that he would not incur any loss if he postponed dealing with his mundane matters until after prayer in the synagogue, and he did not rely on God.

²⁰⁸ On this same topic, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: When the Holy One, Blessed be He, enters a synagogue and does not find ten people there, He immediately becomes angry, as it is stated: “Why, when I came, was there no one? When I called, there was no one to answer...Behold, with My rebuke I dry up the sea, I make the rivers a wilderness” (Isaiah 50:2).

²⁰⁹ Concerning another aspect of the constancy of prayer, Rabbi Ḥelbo said that Rav Huna said: One who sets a fixed place for his prayer, the God of Abraham assists him. Since prayer parallels the Temple service, it is a sign of respect to set a fixed place for this sacred rite (Rabbi Yoshiyahu Pinto). The God of Abraham assists him because this pious custom evokes Abraham’s conduct.

²¹⁰ When he dies, those who eulogize one who set a fixed place for his prayer say about him: “Where is the humble one, where is the pious one, of the disciples of our father Abraham?” Presumably, one who sets a fixed place for prayer is a disciple of Abraham in every respect, including humility and piety (Rabbi Yoshiyahu Pinto).

²¹¹ The Gemara asks: From where do we derive that Abraham our father set a fixed place for his prayer? The Gemara answers: As it is written: “And Abraham rose in the morning to the place where he had stood before God” (Genesis 19:27), and the verb “standing” means nothing other than prayer, as it is stated: “And Pinehas stood and prayed” (Psalms 106:30).

²¹² Rabbi Ḥelbo said that Rav Huna said: One who leaves the synagogue should not take large strides because it creates the impression that he is eager to leave. Abaye explained Rav Huna’s statement and said: This halakha was only said with regard to leaving the synagogue, where large strides seem particularly disrespectful. However, with regard to entering a synagogue, it is a mitzva to run and one is permitted to rush and take large strides (Rabbi Yoshiyahu Pinto). As it is said: “And let us know, eagerly strive to know the Lord” (Hosea 6:3). One who eagerly enters a synagogue displays his enthusiasm to follow the path of God.

²¹³ Rabbi Zeira said: Initially, when I saw the Sages running to the Rabbi’s lecture on Shabbat, I said: These Sages are desecrating Shabbat. One is prohibited from running on Shabbat in deference to the sanctity of the day. Once I heard that which Rabbi Tanḥum said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One should always run for a matter of halakha, even on Shabbat, as it is stated: “They shall walk after the Lord, who will roar like a lion” (Hosea 11:10). In other words, one should rush as though he were chased by a lion (Birkat Hashem), I too run.

²¹⁴ Rabbi Zeira said: The reward for attending the lecture is for running. Since most individuals attending the lecture did not fully understand the material taught, the primary reward for attendance was given for their intention to hear the Torah being taught, as evidenced by their rush to arrive.

²¹⁵ Similarly, Abaye said: The reward for attending the kalla is for the crowding. Due to the large crowd, study was difficult, so the primary reward was given for their effort to hear and understand some part of the lecture.

²¹⁶ Similarly, Rava said: The reward for learning the halakhic traditions of the amora’im is for the logical analysis, as the primary reward for studying Talmud was not given for knowing the halakhic conclusions, but for the logical reasoning that led to those conclusions.

²¹⁷ Rav Pappa said: The primary reward for attending a house of mourning [bei tammaya] is for the silence, which is the optimal manner for those consoling the mourners to express their empathy.

²¹⁸ Mar Zutra said: The primary reward for fasting is for the charity given to the poor on the fast day (see Isaiah 58).

²¹⁹ Rav Sheshet said: The primary reward for delivering a eulogy is for causing those in attendance to raise their voices and cry, as that increases the grief over the deceased.

²²⁰ Rav Ashi said: The primary reward for participating in a wedding is for the words, i.e., the good wishes with which the guests regale the bride and groom.

²²¹ Back to the topic of deference for a synagogue, the Gemara records that Rav Huna said: One who prays behind the synagogue is called wicked, as while the entire congregation is facing one direction to pray, he faces the opposite direction creating the impression that he is treating the synagogue and its congregation with contempt. As it is stated: “The wicked walk round about, when vileness is exalted among the sons of men” (Psalms 12:9). In other words, only the wicked walk round about the synagogue in order to pray.

²²² Abaye said: This halakha was said only in a case where one does not turn his face toward the synagogue. But where he turns his face toward the synagogue and prays we have no prohibition in that case.

²²³ To reinforce the gravity of this prohibition, the Gemara relates: A certain individual prayed behind the synagogue and did not turn to face the synagogue. Elijah the Prophet passed by and he saw him. He appeared to him as an Arab [taya’a]. Elijah said: “This is how [kadu bar] you stand before your Master?” Elijah drew a sword and killed him.

²²⁴ Rav Huna already explained the beginning of the verse, “The wicked walk round about.” The Gemara explains the end of the verse: “When vileness is exalted among the sons of men.” One of the Sages said to Rav Beivai bar Abaye, and some say Rav Beivai said to Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak: What is the meaning of: “When vileness is exalted among the sons of men”?

²²⁵ He said to him: These are matters of utmost importance, exalted, i.e., mitzvot or prayer, which people nonetheless treat with contempt, vileness among the sons of men.

²²⁶ Rabbi Yoḥanan and his student, Rabbi Elazar, both said an alternative explanation of this verse: Once a person needs the help of others and loses dignity in their eyes, vileness among the sons of men, his face changes and becomes like a kerum, as it is stated: “When [kerum] vileness is exalted among the sons of men.”

²²⁷ What is kerum referred to by Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Elazar? When Rav Dimi came to Babylonia from Eretz Yisrael he said: There is a bird in the cities by the sea called kerum and when the sun rises, the bird changes several colors. Similarly, one who becomes dependent upon others blushes in embarrassment.

²²⁸ Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi both said: One who becomes dependent upon others, it is as if he was punished with two punishments: Fire and water. As it is stated: “You have caused men to ride over our heads; we have gone through fire and water” (Psalms 66:12).

²²⁹ And Rabbi Ḥelbo said that Rav Huna said: One must always be vigilant with regard to the afternoon prayer, as Elijah’s prayer was only answered in the afternoon prayer, as it is stated: “And it was at the time of the afternoon offering that Elijah the Prophet came near, and he said: Lord, God of

Abraham, Isaac and Israel, let it be known on this day that You are God in Israel, and that I am Your servant, and that I have done all these things at Your word. Answer me, Lord, answer me, that this people will know that You, Lord, are God” (I Kings 18:36–37). Because Elijah was answered in the afternoon prayer, it has particular significance.

²³⁰ In passing, the Gemara explains why it was necessary for Elijah to repeat, “answer me, Lord, answer me”: The first answer me was the request that fire descend from the heavens, while the second answer me was the request that Israel should accept complete faith in God and not say that the fire descending from the heavens was an act of sorcery.

²³¹ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One must be vigilant with regard to the evening prayer as well, as it is stated: “Let my prayer come forth as incense before You, the lifting of my hands as the evening offering” (Psalms 141:2). Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: One must be vigilant with regard to the morning prayer as well, as it is stated: “Lord, in the morning You shall hear my voice; in the morning I will order my prayer unto You and will look forward” (Psalms 5:4).

²³² And Rabbi Ḥelbo said that Rav Huna said: Anyone who benefits from the feast of a groom but does not cause him to rejoice violates the five voices mentioned in this verse, as it is stated: “The voice of joy and the voice of gladness, the voice of the groom and the voice of the bride, and the voice of those who say: Give thanks to the Lord of hosts, for the Lord is good, for His mercy lasts forever, even of those who bring a thanks-offering to the house of the Lord. For I will restore the captivity of the land as it was in the beginning, says the Lord” (Jeremiah 33:11). These five voices in the context of a bride and groom correspond to the five voices mentioned in the context of the revelation at Sinai, as in Song of Songs, the day of the revelation at Sinai is alluded to by the phrase: His wedding day (Rabbi Yoshiyahu Pinto, Maharsha).

²³³ What is his reward if he causes the groom to rejoice? Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: He is privileged to acquire the Torah, which was given with five voices, as it is stated: “And it was on the third day, when it was morning, there were sounds [kolot], and lightning and a thick cloud upon the mountain, and the voice of the shofar” (Exodus 19:16). The plural kolot indicates at least two sounds, while “the voice of the shofar” is one more. The passage continues: “And when the voice of the shofar grew louder and louder, Moses spoke and God answered him by a voice” (Exodus 19:19). Along with the three previous voices, the second shofar and the voice with which God answered Moses amount to a total of five voices at the revelation at Sinai.

²³⁴ The Gemara asks: Is this so? Isn’t it also written: “And the whole nation saw the voices and the torches and the sound of the shofar” (Exodus 20:15)? Clearly more than five voices are mentioned with regard to the revelation at Sinai.

²³⁵ The Gemara answers: Those voices were sounded prior to the giving of the Torah, so they are not included in this calculation of voices.

²³⁶ Rabbi Abbahu said: The reward for causing a groom to rejoice is the same as if one had offered a thanks-offering in the Temple, for as it is stated later in the previously cited verse from Jeremiah: “Those who bring a thanks-offering to the house of the Lord.” And Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: The reward for causing a groom to rejoice is the same as if one rebuilt one of Jerusalem’s ruins, as it is stated later in the same verse: “For I will restore the captivity of the land as it was in the beginning.”

²³⁷ And Rabbi Ḥelbo said that Rav Huna said: Any person who has the fear of Heaven, his words are heeded, as it is stated: “The end of the matter, all having been heard: Fear God, and keep His commandments; for this is all of man” (Ecclesiastes 12:13). The Gemara explains: “The end of the matter, all having been heard,” refers to the words of one “who keeps His commandments; for this is all of man.”

²³⁸ With regard to the end of this verse, the Gemara asks: What is meant by, “for this is all of man”? Rabbi Elazar said: The Holy One, Blessed be He, said about him: The entire world was created only for this person. This is the ultimate person for which all of man was created.

²³⁹ Rabbi Abba bar Kahana said: The end of this verse teaches that this is equivalent to the entire world, all of man. Rabbi Shimon ben Azzai, and some say Rabbi Shimon ben Zoma, says: Not only is he the equivalent of the entire world, but the entire world was created to serve as companions for him, so that he would have a society in which to live and with which to interact.

²⁴⁰ And Rabbi Ḥelbo said that Rav Huna said: One who is aware that another person is accustomed to greet him is not only obligated to return his greeting, but he must greet him first, as it is stated: “Seek peace and pursue it” (Psalms 34:15). If the other person extended his greeting to him and he did not respond, he is called a robber, as it is stated: “It is you who have eaten up the vineyard, the spoils of the poor is in your houses” (Isaiah 3:14). The only way to steal from a pauper who owns nothing is to rob him of his dignity by refusing to return his greeting.

²⁴¹ Along the same lines, Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Yosei: From where is it derived that the Holy One, Blessed be He, prays? As it is stated: “I will bring them to My holy mountain, and make them joyful in the house of My prayer” (Isaiah 56:7). The verse does not say the house of their prayer, but rather, “the house of My prayer”; from here we see that the Holy One, Blessed be He, prays.

²⁴² The Gemara asks: What does God pray?

²⁴³ Rav Zutra bar Tovia said that Rav said: God says: May it be My will that My mercy will overcome My anger towards Israel for their transgressions, and may My mercy prevail over My other attributes through which Israel is punished, and may I conduct myself toward My children, Israel, with the attribute of mercy, and may I enter before them beyond the letter of the law.

²⁴⁴ Similarly, it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yishmael ben Elisha, the High Priest, said: Once, on Yom Kippur, I entered the innermost sanctum, the Holy of Holies, to offer incense, and in a vision I saw Akatriel Ya, the Lord of Hosts, one of the names of God expressing His ultimate authority, seated upon a high and exalted throne (see Isaiah 6). And He said to me: Yishmael, My son, bless Me. I said to Him the prayer that God prays: “May it be Your will that Your mercy overcome Your anger, and may Your mercy prevail over Your other attributes, and may You act toward Your children with the attribute of mercy, and may You enter before them beyond the letter of the law.” The Holy One, Blessed be He, nodded His head and accepted the blessing. This event teaches us that you should not take the blessing of an ordinary person lightly. If God asked for and accepted a man’s blessing, all the more so that a man must value the blessing of another man.

²⁴⁵ And Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Yosei: From where is it derived that one must not placate a person while he is in the throes of his anger, rather he should mollify him after he has calmed down? As it is written, when following the sin of the Golden Calf, Moses requested that the

Divine Presence rest upon Israel as it had previously, God said to him: “My face will go, and I will give you rest” (Exodus 33:14). Rabbi Yoḥanan explained: The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Moses: Wait until My face of wrath will pass and I will grant your request. One must wait for a person’s anger to pass as well.

²⁴⁶ The Gemara asks: And is there anger before the Holy One, Blessed be He? Can we speak of God using terms like anger?

²⁴⁷ The Gemara answers: Yes, as it was taught in a baraita, God becomes angry, as it is stated: “God vindicates the righteous, God is furious every day” (Psalms 7:12).

²⁴⁸ How much time does His anger last? God’s anger lasts a moment. And how long is a moment? One fifty-eight thousand, eight hundred and eighty-eighth of an hour, that is a moment. The Gemara adds: And no creature can precisely determine that moment when God becomes angry, except for Balaam the wicked, about whom it is written: “He who knows the knowledge of the Most High” (Numbers 24:16).

²⁴⁹ This should not be understood to mean that Balaam was a full-fledged prophet. Now, clearly, Balaam did not know the mind of his animal; and he did know the mind of the Most High? If he could not understand the rebuke of his donkey, he was certainly unable to understand the mind of the Most High.

²⁵⁰ Rather, this verse from Numbers teaches that Balaam was able to precisely determine the hour that the Holy One, Blessed be He, is angry. At that moment, Balaam would utter his curse and, through God’s anger, it would be fulfilled.

²⁵¹ And that is what the prophet said to Israel: “My nation, remember what Balak king of Moab advised, and how Balaam, son of Beor, responded; from Shittim to Gilgal, so that you may know the righteous acts of the Lord” (Micah 6:5). What is meant by the statement: “So that you may know the righteous acts of the Lord”?

²⁵² Rabbi Elazar said that the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Israel: Know how many acts of kindness I performed on your behalf, that I did not become angry during the days of Balaam the wicked, for had I become angry, there would have been no remnant or survivor remaining among the enemies of Israel, a euphemism for Israel itself. Instead, God restrained His anger and Balaam’s curse went unfulfilled.

²⁵³ And that is what Balaam said to Balak: “How can I curse whom God has not cursed? And how can I condemn whom God has not condemned?” (Numbers 23:8). This verse teaches that all those days, God was not angry.

²⁵⁴ And how long does His anger last? God’s anger lasts a moment. And how long is a moment? Rabbi Avin, and some say Rabbi Avina, said: A moment lasts as long as it takes to say it [rega].

²⁵⁵ From where do we derive that God is only angry for a moment? As it is stated: “His anger is but for a moment, His favor, for a lifetime” (Psalms 30:6). And if you wish, say instead, from here, as it is stated: “Hide yourself for a brief moment, until the anger passes” (Isaiah 26:20), meaning that God’s anger passes in a mere moment.

²⁵⁶ The Gemara asks: When is the Holy One, Blessed be He, angry? Abaye said: God’s anger is revealed through animals. During the first three hours of the day, when the sun whitens the crest of

the rooster and it stands on one leg. When it appears that its life has left him and he suddenly turns white, that is when God is angry.

²⁵⁷ The Gemara asks: The rooster also stands that way every hour. What kind of sign is this?

²⁵⁸ The Gemara answers: The difference is that every other hour when the rooster stands in that way, there are red streaks in his crest. But when God is angry, there are no red streaks in his crest.

²⁵⁹ The Gemara relates: A certain heretic who was in Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi's neighborhood would upset him by incessantly challenging the legitimacy of verses. One day, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi took a rooster and placed it between the legs of the bed upon which he sat and looked at it. He thought: When the moment of God's anger arrives, I will curse him and be rid of him. When the moment of God's anger arrived, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi slept. When he woke up, he said to himself: Conclude from the fact that I nodded off that it is not proper conduct to do so, to curse people, even if they are wicked. "His mercy is over all His creations" (Psalms 145:9) is written even with regard to sinners.

²⁶⁰ Moreover, it is inappropriate to cause the punishment of another, as it is written: "Punishment, even for the righteous, is not good" (Proverbs 17:26), even for a righteous person, it is improper to punish another.

²⁶¹ Explaining the cause of God's anger, it is taught in the name of Rabbi Meir: When the sun rises and the kings of the East and the West place their crowns on their heads and bow down to the sun, the Holy One, Blessed be He, immediately grows angry. Since this occurs in the early hours every day, God becomes angry at His world at that moment every day.

²⁶² And Rabbi Yohanan said in the name of Rabbi Yosei: A single regret or pang of guilt in one's heart is preferable to many lashes administered by others that cause only physical pain, as it is stated: "And she chases her lovers, but she does not overtake them; she seeks them, but she will not find them; and she will say 'I will go and return to my first husband; for it was better for me then than now'" (Hosea 2:9). Remorse is more effective than any externally imposed punishment listed in the verses that follow (Hosea 2:11–19). And Reish Lakish said that in the Bible, it seems that such remorse is preferable to one hundred lashes, as it is stated: "A rebuke enters deeper into a man of understanding than a hundred lashes to a fool" (Proverbs 17:10).

²⁶³ And Rabbi Yohanan said in the name of Rabbi Yosei regarding Moses' request that the Divine Presence rest upon Israel as it once had: Moses requested three things from the Holy One, Blessed be He, at that time, all of which were granted him. He requested that the Divine Presence rest upon Israel and not leave, and He granted it to him, as it is stated: "For how can it be known that I have found grace in Your sight, I and Your people? Is it not in that You go with us, so that we are distinguished, I and Your people, from all the people that are on the face of the earth?" (Exodus 33:16). The request: Is it not in that You go with us, refers to the resting of the Divine Presence upon Israel.

²⁶⁴ Moses requested that the Divine Presence not rest upon the nations of the world, and He granted it to him, as it is stated: "So that we are distinguished, I and Your people, from all the people on the face of the earth" (Exodus 33:16).

²⁶⁵ Lastly, Moses requested that the ways in which God conducts the world be revealed to him, and He granted it to him, as it is stated: "Show me Your ways and I will know You" (Exodus 33:13).

Moses said before God: Master of the Universe. Why is it that the righteous prosper, the righteous suffer, the wicked prosper, the wicked suffer? God said to him: Moses, the righteous person who prospers is a righteous person, the son of a righteous person, who is rewarded for the actions of his ancestors. The righteous person who suffers is a righteous person, the son of a wicked person, who is punished for the transgressions of his ancestors. The wicked person who prospers is a wicked person, the son of a righteous person, who is rewarded for the actions of his ancestors. The wicked person who suffers is a wicked person, the son of a wicked person, who is punished for the transgressions of his ancestors.

²⁶⁶ The Gemara expands upon these righteous and wicked individuals: The Master said: The righteous person who prospers is a righteous person, the son of a righteous person. The righteous person who suffers is a righteous person, the son of a wicked person. The Gemara asks: Is it so that one is always punished for his ancestors' transgressions? Isn't it written: "He visits iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and fourth generations" (Exodus 34:7). And it is written elsewhere: "Fathers shall not die for their children, and children shall not be put to death for the fathers; every man shall die for his own transgression" (Deuteronomy 24:16). And the Gemara raises a contradiction between the two verses.

²⁶⁷ The Gemara resolves the contradiction: This is not difficult. This verse from Exodus, which states that God punishes descendants for the transgressions of their ancestors, refers to a case where they adopt the actions of their ancestors as their own. While this verse from Deuteronomy, which states that descendants are not punished for the actions of their ancestors, refers to a case where they do not adopt the actions of their ancestors as their own, as it is stated: "I visit iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the third and fourth generations of my enemies" (Exodus 20:5).

²⁶⁸ A righteous person is clearly not punished for the transgressions of his ancestors. Rather, it must be that God said to Moses as follows: The righteous person who prospers is a completely righteous person whose actions are entirely good and whose reward is entirely good both in this world and in the World-to-Come. The righteous person who suffers is one who is not a completely righteous person. Because he does have some transgressions, he is punished in this world so that he will receive a complete reward in the World-to-Come. The wicked person who prospers is one who is not a completely wicked person. God rewards him in this world for the good deeds that he performed, so that he will receive a complete punishment in the World-to-Come. Finally, the wicked person who suffers is a completely wicked person. Since he performed absolutely no mitzvot and deserves no reward, he receives only punishment both in this world and in the World-to-Come (Maharsha).

²⁶⁹ Rabbi Yoḥanan's opinion, that God granted Moses all three of his requests, disagrees with that of Rabbi Meir, as Rabbi Meir said: Two of Moses' requests were granted to him, and one was not granted to him. God granted him that the Divine Presence would rest upon Israel and not leave, and that the Divine Presence would not rest upon the nations of the world, but God did not reveal to Moses the ways in which He conducts the world. As it is said: "And I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious" (Exodus 33:19); in His mercy, God bestows His grace upon every person, even though he is not worthy. Similarly, God says: "And I will have mercy upon whom I will have mercy," even though he is not worthy. According to Rabbi Meir, the way in which God conducts the world and bestows grace and mercy was not revealed even to Moses.

²⁷⁰ The Gemara continues to cite the Sages' explanation of verses that require clarification on the same topic. With regard to God's statement to Moses, "And He said: 'You cannot see My face, for man shall not see Me and live'" (Exodus 33:20), it was taught in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa that the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Moses as follows: When I wanted to show you My glory at the burning bush, you did not want to see it, as it is stated: "And Moses concealed his face, fearing to gaze upon God" (Exodus 3:6). But now that you want to see My glory, as you said: "Show me Your glory," I do not want to show it to you. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa interprets Moses' initial refusal to look upon God's glory negatively, as he rebuffed God's desire to be close to him.

²⁷¹ This disagrees with that which Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said, as Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: Specifically as a reward for three acts of humility in averting his glance at the burning bush, Moses was privileged to experience three great revelations:

²⁷² Because "Moses concealed his face, fearing to gaze upon God" (Exodus 3:6), he was privileged to have his countenance [kelaster] glow. Because he "feared," he was privileged that "they feared to approach him" (Exodus 34:30). Because he did not "gaze," he was privileged to "behold the likeness of the Lord" (Numbers 12:8).

²⁷³ What did Moses see? It is said: "And I will remove My hand, and you will see My back, but My face you will not see" (Exodus 33:23). Rav Ḥana bar Bizna said in the name of Rabbi Shimon Ḥasida, the expression: "And you will see My back," should be understood as follows: This teaches that the Holy One, Blessed be He, Who, as mentioned above, wears phylacteries, showed him the knot of the phylacteries of His head, which is worn on the back of the head.

²⁷⁴ On this subject, Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Yosei: Every statement to a person or to a nation that emerged from the mouth of the Holy One, Blessed be He, with a promise of good, even if it was conditional, He did not renege on it. Ultimately, every promise made by God will be fulfilled.

²⁷⁵ From where do we derive that all of God's promises are fulfilled? We know this from Moses our teacher, as God promised and said: "Leave Me alone; I will destroy them and blot out their name from under heaven; and I will make from you a nation mightier and greater than they" (Deuteronomy 9:14). Even though Moses prayed to have the decree repealed, and it was nullified, the promise was fulfilled and Moses' descendants became a nation mightier and greater than the 600,000 Israelites in the desert. As it is stated with regard to the Levites: "The sons of Moses: Gershon and Eliezer...and the sons of Eliezer were Reḥaviya the chief. And Eliezer had no other sons; and the sons of Reḥaviya were very many" (I Chronicles 23:15–17).

²⁷⁶ And Rav Yosef taught in a baraita: "Many" means more than 600,000. This is learned through a verbal analogy between the words many and many. It is written here with regard to Reḥaviya's sons: "Were very many." And it is written there with regard to the Israelites in Egypt: "And the children of Israel became numerous and multiplied and were very many, and waxed exceeding mighty; and the land was filled with them" (Exodus 1:7). Just as when the children of Israel were in Egypt, very many meant that there were 600,000 of them, so too the descendants of Reḥaviya were 600,000.

²⁷⁷ Until now, the Gemara has cited statements made by Rabbi Yoḥanan in the name of the tanna, Rabbi Yosei. Now, the Gemara begins to cite what Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: From the day that the Holy One, Blessed be He, created the world there was no person

who called him “Lord” until Abraham came and called him Lord. As it is stated: “And he said, ‘My Lord, God, by what shall I know that I will inherit it?’” (Genesis 15:8).

²⁷⁸ The Gemara cites another statement extolling that virtue of Abraham is mentioned, as Rav said: Even Daniel’s prayers were only answered on account of Abraham, as it is stated: “And now listen, God, to the prayer of Your servant and to his supplication; and cause Your face to shine upon Your desolate Temple, for the sake of the Lord” (Daniel 9:17). The verse should have said: And cause Your face to shine upon Your desolate Temple, for Your sake, as Daniel was addressing the Lord.

²⁷⁹ Rather, this verse contains an allusion that the prayer should be accepted for the sake of Abraham, who called You, Lord. Daniel utilized that name of God in order to evoke Abraham’s virtue and enhance his prayer.

²⁸⁰ And Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: From where is it derived that one must not placate a person while the person is in the throes of his anger? As it is stated: “My face will go, and I will give you rest” (Exodus 33:14).

²⁸¹ And Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: From the day the Holy One, Blessed be He, created the world, no one thanked the Holy One, Blessed be He, until Leah came and thanked Him, as it is stated: “And she became pregnant and gave birth to a son, and she said, ‘This time I will give thanks to God,’ and thus he was called Judah” (Genesis 29:35).

²⁸² Tangential to the mention of Leah’s son, Judah, and the reason for his name, the Gemara explains the sources for other names, including Reuben. Rabbi Elazar said: Reuben’s name should be considered a prophecy by Leah, as Leah said: See [re’u] the difference between my son [beni] and the son of my father-in-law, Esau, son of Isaac. Even though Esau knowingly sold his birthright to his brother Jacob, as it is written: “And he sold his birthright to Jacob” (Genesis 25:33), nonetheless, behold what is written about him: “And Esau hated Jacob” (Genesis 27:41).

²⁸³ Esau was not only angry over Isaac’s blessing, but he was angry about another matter as well, as it is written: “And he said, ‘Is he not rightly named Jacob, for he has supplanted me twice? He took my birthright, and behold, now he has taken my blessing’” (Genesis 27:36). Despite having sold his birthright, he refused to relinquish it.

²⁸⁴ While my son, Reuben, even though Joseph took his birthright from him by force, as it is written: “And the sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel, for he was the firstborn; but, since he defiled his father’s bed, his birthright was given to the sons of Joseph, son of Israel” (I Chronicles 5:1). Nevertheless, he was not jealous of him, as it is written when Joseph’s brothers sought to kill him: “And Reuben heard and he saved him from their hands, saying ‘Let us not take his life’” (Genesis 37:21).

²⁸⁵ Continuing on the topic of names, the Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the name Ruth? Rabbi Yoḥanan said: That she had the privilege that David, who inundated the Holy One, Blessed be He, with songs and praises, would descend from her. The name Ruth [Rut] is etymologically similar in Hebrew to the word inundate [riva].

²⁸⁶ Regarding the basic assumption that these homiletic interpretations of names are allusions to one’s future, the Gemara asks: From where do we derive that the name affects one’s life? Rabbi Eliezer said that the verse says: “Go, see the works of the Lord, who has made desolations [shamot]

upon the earth” (Psalms 46:9). Do not read the word as shamot, rather as shemot, names. The names given to people are, therefore, “the works of the Lord upon the earth.”

²⁸⁷ And Rabbi Yoḥanan said other aggadic statements in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: The existence of wayward children in a person’s home is more troublesome than the war of Gog and Magog, the ultimate war, the climax of the travails of Messianic times. As it is stated: “A Psalm of David, when he fled from his son, Absalom” (Psalms 3:1). And it is written thereafter: “Lord, how numerous are my enemies, many have risen against me” (Psalms 3:2). While concerning the war of Gog and Magog, which is alluded to in the second chapter of Psalms, it is written: “Why are the nations in an uproar? And why do the peoples speak for naught? The kings of the earth stand up and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against His anointed...He that sits in heaven laughs, the Lord mocks them” (Psalms 2:1–4). Yet in this chapter describing the war of Gog and Magog “how numerous are my enemies” is not written, as it is not as difficult as raising a wayward son like Absalom.

²⁸⁸ Regarding the opening phrase of the psalm, which serves as its title, the Gemara wonders: It is said: “A Psalm of David, when fleeing his son, Absalom.” A Psalm of David? It should have said: A lament of David.

²⁸⁹ Rabbi Shimon ben Avishalom said a parable: To what is this similar? It is similar to a person about whom a promissory note was issued stating that he must repay a debt to the lender. Before he repaid it, he was despondent, worried how he will manage to repay the debt. After he repaid it, he was glad.

²⁹⁰ So too was the case with David. When the Holy One, Blessed be He, told him, through Natan the prophet, after the incident with Bathsheba, “Behold, I will raise up evil against you from your house” (II Samuel 12:11), David was despondent. He said: Perhaps it will be a slave or a mamzer who will rise up in my house, a person of such lowly status, who will have no pity on me. But once David saw that Absalom was the one through whom the prophecy was to be fulfilled, he rejoiced, as he was certain that Absalom would show him mercy. That is why David said a psalm, not a lament, thanking God for punishing him in the least severe manner possible.

²⁹¹ And Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: One is permitted to provoke the wicked in this world. Though the ways of the wicked prosper, one is still permitted to provoke them and need not fear (Maharsha), as it is stated: “Those who abandon the Torah will praise wickedness, and the keepers of the Torah will fight them” (Proverbs 28:4).

²⁹² That statement was also taught in a baraita, as Rabbi Dostai, son of Rabbi Matun, says: One is permitted to provoke the wicked in this world, as it is stated: “Those who abandon the Torah will praise wickedness, and the keepers of the Torah will fight them.” And if someone whispered to you, saying, on the contrary, isn’t it also written: “Do not compete with evil-doers, and do not envy the unjust” (Psalms 37:1), meaning that one should avoid provoking the wicked, say to him: Only one whose heart strikes him with pangs of conscience over sins that he committed says this. Rather, the true meaning of the verse is: Do not compete with evil-doers, to be like the evil-doers, and do not envy the unjust to be like the unjust.

²⁹³ The Gemara cites proof from another verse. And it says: “One shall not envy the unjust, but be in fear of the Lord all the day” (Proverbs 23:17). In this context, to envy means to seek to emulate the unjust.

²⁹⁴ From these verses in Psalms and Proverbs, it would seem that one is encouraged to provoke the wicked. The Gemara asks: Is this so? Didn't Rabbi Yitzhak say: If you see a wicked person upon whom the hour is smiling, do not provoke him. As long as he is enjoying good fortune, there is no point in confronting him. As it is stated: "His ways prosper at all times; Your judgments are far beyond him; as for his adversaries, he snorts at them" (Psalms 10:5). The verse teaches us that the ways of the wicked will always succeed. And not only that, but he emerges victorious in judgment, as it is stated: "Your judgments are far beyond him," meaning that even when he is brought to justice, it does not affect him. And not only that, but he witnesses his enemies' downfall, as it is stated: "As for all his adversaries, he snorts at them."

²⁹⁵ To resolve this contradiction with regard to whether or not one may provoke the wicked, the Gemara offers several explanations: This is not difficult, as it can be understood that this, which says that one may not provoke the wicked, is referring to his personal matters, while that, which says that it is a mitzva to confront them, is referring to matters of Heaven.

²⁹⁶ And if you wish, say instead that this, which says not to confront the wicked and that, which says to confront the wicked, are both referring to matters of Heaven, and, nevertheless, it is not difficult. This, which says that one may not provoke the wicked, is referring to a wicked person upon whom the hour is smiling, who is enjoying good fortune. While that, which says that it is a mitzva to confront them, is referring to a wicked person upon whom the hour is not smiling.

²⁹⁷ And if you wish, say instead that this, which says not to confront and that, which says to confront, are both referring to a wicked person upon whom the hour is smiling, but the question of whether one is permitted to confront him depends on who is confronting him. And nevertheless, this is not difficult. This, which says that it is a mitzva to confront them, is referring to a completely righteous person, while this, which says that one may not confront the wicked, is referring to one who is not completely righteous, as Rav Huna said: What is the meaning of that which is written: "Why do You look on those who deal treacherously and hold Your peace? When the wicked swallows the man more righteous than he?" (Habakkuk 1:13). This verse is difficult to understand. Do the wicked swallow the righteous? Isn't it written: "The wicked looks to the righteous and seeks to kill him; the Lord will not leave him in his hand, nor allow him to be condemned when he is judged" (Psalms 37:32-33), and it is written: "No mischief shall befall the righteous" (Proverbs 12:21)? Rather, in light of these verses, the verse: "The wicked swallows the man more righteous than he" means: The man who is more righteous than he, but not completely righteous, he swallows. The completely righteous he does not swallow.

²⁹⁸ And if you wish, say: In general, the wicked cannot swallow the righteous, but when the hour is smiling upon him, it is different. When the wicked are enjoying good fortune, even the righteous can be harmed (Birkat Hashem).

²⁹⁹ And Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: Setting a fixed place for prayer is so important that one who sets a fixed place for his prayer, his enemies fall beneath him, as it is said: "And I will appoint a place for My nation, Israel, and I will plant them, that they may dwell in their own place." Through setting aside a place for prayer, they will merit to "be disturbed no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them anymore, as in the beginning" (II Samuel 7:10).

³⁰⁰ This verse, cited by the Gemara, leads to an additional point. Rav Huna raised a contradiction: In the book of Samuel, in this verse it is written: “To afflict them,” while in the parallel verse in I Chronicles (17:9) it is written: “To destroy them.”

³⁰¹ The Gemara resolves this contradiction: The enemies of Israel intend first to afflict them, and, ultimately, to destroy them entirely.

³⁰² And Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: Service of Torah is greater than its study, i.e., serving a Torah scholar and spending time in his company is greater than learning Torah from him. Torah study is one component of a Torah life, but one who serves a Torah scholar learns about every aspect of life from his actions. This is derived from the verse that speaks in praise of Elisha, as it is stated: “Here is Elisha son of Shafat, who poured water over Elijah’s hands” (II Kings 3:11). The verse does not say that he learned from Elijah, rather that he poured water, which teaches that the service of Torah represented by Elisha pouring water over Elijah’s hands is greater than its study.

³⁰³ As a prelude to another of the statements by Rabbi Yoḥanan in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai, the Gemara relates the following incident. Rabbi Yitzḥak said to Rav Naḥman: Why did the Master not come to the synagogue to pray? Rav Naḥman said to him: I was weak and unable to come. Rabbi Yitzḥak said to him: Let the Master gather ten individuals, a prayer quorum, at your home and pray. Rav Naḥman said to him: It is difficult for me to impose upon the members of the community to come to my home to pray with me (Sefer Mitzvot Gadol). Rabbi Yitzḥak suggested another option: The Master should tell the congregation to send a messenger when the congregation is praying to come and inform the Master so you may pray at the same time.

³⁰⁴ Rav Naḥman saw that Rabbi Yitzḥak was struggling to find a way for him to engage in communal prayer. He asked: What is the reason for all this fuss? Rabbi Yitzḥak said to him: As Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai:

³⁰⁵ What is the meaning of that which is written: “But as for me, let my prayer be unto You, Lord, in a time of favor; O God, in the abundance of Your mercy, answer me with the truth of Your salvation” (Psalms 69:14)? It appears that the individual is praying that his prayers will coincide with a special time of Divine favor. When is a time of favor? It is at the time when the congregation is praying. It is beneficial to pray together with the congregation, for God does not fail to respond to the entreaties of the congregation.

³⁰⁶ Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said that the unique quality of communal prayer is derived from here: “Thus said the Lord, in a time of acceptance I have answered you and on a day of salvation I have aided you” (Isaiah 49:8).

³⁰⁷ Rabbi Aḥa, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said that it is derived from here: “Behold, God is mighty, He despises no one” (Job 36:5). He adopts an alternative reading of the verse: “Behold, God will not despise” the prayer of “the mighty,” i.e., the community. And it is written: “He has redeemed my soul in peace so that none came upon me; for there were many with me. God shall hear and answer them...” (Psalms 55:19–20). This verse teaches that the prayer was answered because there were many with me when it was offered.

³⁰⁸ That last proof was also taught in a baraita. Rabbi Natan says: From where do we know that the Holy One, Blessed be He, does not despise the prayer of the masses? As it is stated: “Behold, God

does not despise the mighty,” and it is written: “He has redeemed my soul in peace so that none came upon me; for there were many with me.” Rabbi Natan interprets this not as David speaking about himself, but as God speaking to Israel. The Holy One, Blessed be He, says: Anyone who engages in Torah study, which is called peace in the verse: “All its ways are peace” (Proverbs 3:17); and in acts of kindness, and prays with the congregation, I ascribe to him credit as if he redeemed Me and My children from among the nations of the world.

³⁰⁹ Continuing to extol communal prayer, Reish Lakish said: One who has a synagogue nearby in his city but does not enter to pray there is called an evil neighbor, as it is stated: “Thus said the Lord: As for all My evil neighbors who touch My inheritance which I have caused My people Israel to inherit, behold, I will pluck them up from off their land, and will pluck the house of Judah up from among them” (Jeremiah 12:14). One who only touches, but does not enter the place of prayer, My inheritance, is considered an evil neighbor. And furthermore, he is punished in that he causes himself and his children to go into exile, as it is stated: “Behold, I will pluck them up from off their land, and will pluck the house of Judah up from among them.”

³¹⁰ The Gemara relates that when the Sages told Rabbi Yoḥanan that there are elders in Babylonia, he was confounded and said: It is written: “So that your days will be lengthened and the days of your children upon the land the Lord swore to your forefathers to give to them like the days of heaven on the earth” (Deuteronomy 11:21); lengthened in Eretz Yisrael but not outside of the Land. Why then, do the residents of Babylonia live long lives? When they told him that the people in Babylonia go early in the morning and go late in the evening to the synagogue, he said: That is what was effective for them in extending their lives.

³¹¹ As Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said to his sons: Go early and go late and enter the synagogue, so that your lives will be extended. And Rabbi Aḥa, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: Upon what verse is this based? As it is stated: “Happy is the man who listens to Me, watching daily at My gates, guarding at My door posts” (Proverbs 8:34). And the reward for doing so is written thereafter: “For whoso finds Me finds life and obtains the favor of the Lord” (Proverbs 8:35).

³¹² Based on this verse, Rav Ḥisda said: A person should always enter two doorways into the synagogue. This statement is unclear. Immediately, the Gemara asks: Does it enter your mind that Rav Ḥisda meant that one should enter two doorways literally? What if a synagogue only has a single doorway? Rather, emend his statement and say that Rav Ḥisda meant that one should enter a distance of two doorways into the synagogue and then pray. In entering a distance of two doorways, one fulfills the verse: Guarding at My door posts, in the plural.

³¹³ Having mentioned the verse, “For whoso finds Me finds life,” the Gemara seeks to clarify its meaning. It is said, “For this, let every pious man pray to You in the time of finding, that the overflowing waters may not reach him” (Psalms 32:6). With regard to the phrase, the time of finding, Rabbi Ḥanina said: The time of finding refers to the time one must find a wife, that one should pray to find a suitable woman to marry. As it is said: “He who finds [matza] a wife finds [matza] good and obtains favor from the Lord” (Proverbs 18:22).

³¹⁴ In Eretz Yisrael, the custom was that when a man married a woman, they would ask him: Matza or motzeh? In other words, they would ask the groom whether the appropriate passage for his wife is the above verse from Proverbs that begins with the word matza, as it is written: “He who finds a wife finds good and obtains favor from the Lord” or whether the more appropriate verse is the one

beginning with the word *motzeh*, as it is written: “And I find [*motzeh*] the woman more bitter than death” (Ecclesiastes 7:26).

³¹⁵ Rabbi Natan says: The time of finding refers to the time of finding Torah, as it is stated in a verse referring to Torah: “He who finds Me finds life.” The Torah is the object most sought.

³¹⁶ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: The time of finding refers to death. One should pray that when death comes, he will leave the world peacefully, as it is stated: “Issues [*totzaot*] of death” (Psalms 68:21). Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak’s statement is based on the etymological similarity between *totzaot* and *matza*, finding.

³¹⁷ It was also taught in a baraita: Nine hundred and three types of death were created in the world, as it is stated: “Issues [*totzaot*] of death,” and that, 903, is the numerical value [*gimatriya*] of *totzaot*. The Gemara explains that the most difficult of all these types of death is croup [*askara*], while the easiest is the kiss of death. Croup is like a thorn entangled in a wool fleece, which, when pulled out backwards, tears the wool. Some say that croup is like ropes at the entrance to the esophagus, which would be nearly impossible to insert and excruciating to remove. The kiss of death is like drawing a hair from milk. One should pray that he does not die a painful death.

³¹⁸ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The time of finding refers to a respectful burial, for which one should pray. Supporting Rabbi Yoḥanan’s interpretation, Rabbi Ḥanina said: What is the verse that teaches that the time of finding refers to burial? “Who rejoice in exultation and are glad when they can find a grave” (Job 3:22), as there are situations in which one is relieved when his body finds a grave in which to rest. Rabba bar Rav Sheila said, that is the meaning of the folk saying: A person should even pray for mercy until the final shovelful of dirt is thrown upon his grave.

³¹⁹ Mar Zutra said: The time of finding refers to finding a lavatory. As most places did not have a sewage system, one was forced to relieve himself outside the city. Because of this unpleasantness, finding a suitable location was called by Mar Zutra, the time of finding. In the West, Eretz Yisrael, they say: This explanation of Mar Zutra is preferable to all of them, as the term *motza* is explicitly associated in the Bible (see II Kings 10:27) with the lavatory (Rabbi Abraham Moshe Horovitz).

³²⁰ Returning to the tractate’s central topic, Rava said to Rafram bar Pappa: Let the Master say to us some of those outstanding statements that you said in the name of Rav Ḥisda with regard to matters of the synagogue.

³²¹ Rafram said to him, Rav Ḥisda said as follows: What is the meaning of the verse: “The Lord loves the gates of Zion [*Tziyyon*] more than all the dwellings of Jacob” (Psalms 87:2)? This means that the Lord loves the gates distinguished [*metzuyanim*] through the study of *halakha* as they are the gates of Zion, the outstanding gates, more than the synagogues and study halls. Although those places are the most outstanding of the dwellings of Jacob, they are not engaged in the study of *halakha*.

³²² And this concept, that *halakha* is the most sublime pursuit, is expressed in that which Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Ami said in the name of Ulla: Since the day the Temple, where the Divine Presence rested in this world, was destroyed, the Holy One, Blessed be He, has only one place in His world where he reveals His presence exclusively; only the four cubits where the study of *halakha* is undertaken.

³²³ This statement has practical ramifications. Abaye said: At first I studied in the house and prayed in the synagogue. Once I heard what Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Ami said in the name of Ulla: Since the day

the Temple was destroyed, the Holy One, Blessed be He, has only one place in His world, only the four cubits of halakha alone, from which I understood the significance of the four cubits of halakha, and I pray only where I study.

³²⁴ Similarly, the Gemara relates that Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi, despite the fact that they had thirteen synagogues in Tiberias, they would only pray between the pillars where they studied.

³²⁵ And Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Ami said in the name of Ulla: One who benefits from his hard labor is greater than a God-fearing person, i.e., one who is so enthralled by his fear of God that he sits idly by and does not work. As with regard to a God-fearing person, it is written: “Happy is the man who fears the Lord, who greatly desires His mitzvot” (Psalms 112:1), while with regard to one who benefits from his hard work, it is written: “By the labor of your hands you will live; you are happy and it is good for you” (Psalms 128:2). The Gemara explains this verse to mean that you are happy in this world, and it is good for you in the World-to-Come. And regarding a God-fearing person, happy is the man, is written about him but and it is good for you, is not written about him.

³²⁶ And Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Ami said in the name of Ulla: One should always live in the place where his teacher lives; thereby he will avoid sin. For as long as Shimi ben Gera, who according to tradition was a great Torah scholar and teacher of Solomon (see Gittin 59a), was alive, Solomon did not marry Pharaoh’s daughter. Immediately after the Bible relates the death of Shimi (I Kings, end of ch. 2), Solomon’s marriage to Pharaoh’s daughter is recorded (beginning of ch. 3).

³²⁷ The Gemara raises an objection: Wasn’t it taught in a baraita that one should not live where his teacher lives?

³²⁸ The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This, which says that one should live where his teacher lives, is referring to a case where he is acquiescent to his teacher and will heed his teaching and instruction. While this baraita, which says that one should not live where his teacher lives, is referring to a case where he is not acquiescent to him and that will lead them to quarrel.

³²⁹ The Gemara again returns to the topic of the synagogue. Rav Huna bar Yehuda said that Rabbi Menahem said that Rabbi Ami said: What is the practical halakhic meaning of that which is written: “They who forsake the Lord will perish” (Isaiah 1:28)? This verse refers to one who abandons the Torah scroll when it was taken out to be read and leaves the synagogue, as it appears that he is fleeing from God.

³³⁰ Practically speaking, the Gemara relates that Rabbi Abbahu would go out between one person who read the Torah and the next person who did so. Since the scroll was closed between readers, it was not considered to be a show of contempt.

³³¹ Rav Pappa raised a dilemma: What is the ruling with regard to leaving between one verse and the next verse? Is one permitted to leave during a break in the Torah reading while the verse was translated into Aramaic?

³³² An answer to this question was not found, so the dilemma stands unresolved.

³³³ The Gemara relates that Rav Sheshet would turn his face away from the Torah while it was being read and study. Explaining this practice, he said: We are engaged in ours, the study of the Oral Torah and they are engaged in theirs, listening to the Written Torah. Since Rav Sheshet was engaged in Torah study, he is not considered one who forsakes the Lord.

³³⁴ Rav Huna bar Yehuda said that Rabbi Ami said: A person should always complete his Torah portions with the congregation. The congregation reads a particular Torah portion every Shabbat, and during the week prior to each Shabbat, one is required to read the Bible text of the weekly portion twice and the translation once.

³³⁵ This applies to every verse, even a verse like: “Atarot and Divon and Yazer and Nimra and Heshbon and Elaleh and Sevam and Nevo and Beon” (Numbers 32:3). While that verse is comprised entirely of names of places that are identical in Hebrew and Aramaic, one is nevertheless required to read the verse twice and its translation once, as one who completes his Torah portions with the congregation is rewarded that his days and years are extended.

³³⁶ Rav Beivai bar Abaye thought to finish all the Torah portions of the entire year, which he had been unable to complete at their appointed time, on the eve of Yom Kippur when he would have time to do so. But H̥iyya bar Rav of Difti taught him: It is written with regard to Yom Kippur: “And you shall afflict your souls on the ninth day of the month in the evening, from evening to evening you shall keep your Sabbath” (Leviticus 23:32).

³³⁷ The Gemara wonders: And does one fast on the ninth of Tishrei? Doesn’t one fast on the tenth of Tishrei, as the Torah says at the beginning of that portion: “However, on the tenth day of this seventh month is the Day of Atonement; there shall be a holy convocation for you, and you shall afflict your souls” (Leviticus 23:27)? Rather, this verse comes to tell you: One who eats and drinks on the ninth day of Tishrei in preparation for the fast the next day, the verse ascribes him credit as if he fasted on both the ninth and the tenth of Tishrei. H̥iyya bar Rav of Difti cited this verse to Rav Beivai bar Abaye to teach him that Yom Kippur eve is dedicated to eating and drinking, not to completing the Torah portions one may have missed throughout the year.

³³⁸ When Rav Beivai heard this, he thought to read the Torah portions earlier, before they were to be read by the community. A certain unnamed elder told him, we learned: As long as one does not read the Torah portions earlier or later than the congregation. One must read them together with the congregation.

³³⁹ As Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi told his sons: Complete your portions with the congregation, the Bible text twice and the translation once.

³⁴⁰ He also advised them: Be careful with the jugular veins, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as we learned in a mishna with regard to the laws of ritual slaughter: Rabbi Yehuda said: Cutting the trachea and esophagus in the ritual slaughter of a bird does not render the bird kosher until he slaughters the jugular veins as well. While this is not halakhically required, it is appropriate to do so to prevent significant amounts of blood from remaining in the bird.

³⁴¹ Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi further advised: And be careful to continue to respect an elder who has forgotten his Torah knowledge due to circumstances beyond his control. Even though he is no longer a Torah scholar, he must still be respected for the Torah that he once possessed. As we say: Both the tablets of the Covenant and the broken tablets are placed in the Ark of the Covenant in the Temple. Even though the first tablets were broken, their sanctity obligates one not to treat them with contempt. An elder who forgot the Torah knowledge he once possessed is likened to these broken tablets.

³⁴² Rava said to his sons three bits of advice: When you cut meat, do not cut it on your hand. The Gemara offers two explanations for this. Some say: Due to the danger that one might accidentally cut his hand, and some say: Due to the fact that it could ruin the meal, as even if one only cut himself slightly, that small amount of blood could still spoil the meat and render it repulsive to eat.

³⁴³ And Rava also advised: Do not sit on the bed of an Aramean woman, and do not pass by a synagogue when the community is praying. The Gemara explains: Some say: Do not sit on the bed of an Aramean woman means one should not go to sleep without reciting Shema, as by doing so, it is tantamount to sleeping in the bed of a non-Jew, as his conduct is unbecoming a Jew. Others say: This means that one should not marry a woman who converted, and it is better to marry a woman who was born Jewish. And some say: It literally means that one should not sit on the bed of an Aramean, i.e., a non-Jewish woman.

³⁴⁴ This bit of advice was due to an incident involving Rav Pappa. Rav Pappa went to visit an Aramean woman. She took out a bed and she said to him: Sit. He said to her: I will not sit until you lift the sheets covering the bed. She did so and they found a dead baby there. Had Rav Pappa sat upon the bed, he would have been blamed for killing the baby. From that incident, the Sages said: One is prohibited from sitting on the bed of an Aramean woman.

³⁴⁵ And Rava's third bit of advice was, do not pass behind a synagogue while the congregation is praying. This statement supports the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, as Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One is prohibited from passing behind a synagogue while the congregation is praying because they will suspect that he does not want to pray, and it is a show of contempt for the synagogue.

³⁴⁶ Abaye introduced several caveats to Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi's statement and said: We only said this prohibition if there is no other entrance to the synagogue, but if there is another entrance, since it is possible that he will simply use the second entrance, they will not suspect him, and the prohibition does not apply. And we only said this prohibition if there is no other synagogue in the city, but if there is another synagogue, the prohibition does not apply. And we only said this prohibition when he is not carrying a burden, and not running, and not wearing phylacteries. But if one of those factors applies, the prohibition does not apply. If he is carrying a burden or running, clearly he is occupied with his work. If he is wearing phylacteries, it is evident that he is a God-fearing individual and they will not suspect him.

³⁴⁷ The Gemara cites a statement from a baraita, along the lines of Rava's advice to refrain from cutting meat on one's hands: Rabbi Akiva said: In three aspects of their conduct, I like the Medes, and we should learn from their practices. When they cut meat, they cut it only on the table and not on their hands; when they kiss, either as a show of affection or honor, they kiss only the back of the hand and do not give the person being kissed an unpleasant feeling; and when they hold counsel, they only hold counsel in the field so others will not hear their secrets.

³⁴⁸ Rav Adda bar Ahava said: From what verse is this derived? From the verse, "And Jacob sent and he called Rachel and Leah to the field to his flock" (Genesis 31:4); it was only there in the field that he held counsel with them.

³⁴⁹ It was taught in a baraita, Rabban Gamliel said: In three aspects of their conduct, I like the Persians: They are a modest people; they are modest in their eating, they are modest in the lavatory, and they are modest in another matter, i.e., sexual relations.

³⁵⁰ While they have been praised here regarding certain specific aspects of their conduct, the Gemara proceeds to offer another perspective on the Persians based on a verse describing the destruction of Babylonia at the hands of the Persian and Median armies: “I have commanded My consecrated ones; I have also called My mighty ones for My anger, even My proudly exulting ones” (Isaiah 13:3). Rav Yosef taught a baraita: These are the Persians who are consecrated and designated for Gehenna, for they have been sent by God to carry out his mission of anger, and they will be sent to Gehenna.

³⁵¹ The Gemara returns to explain the mishna, in which we learned that Rabban Gamliel says: One may recite Shema until dawn. Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Gamliel.

³⁵² It was taught in a baraita: Based on Rabban Gamliel’s ruling, Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai said: At times, one recites Shema twice at night, once just before dawn and once just after dawn, and he thereby fulfills his obligation to recite Shema, one of the day and one of the night. According to Rabban Gamliel, the Shema that he recited before dawn fulfills his evening obligation and the Shema that he recited after dawn fulfills his morning obligation.

³⁵³ This Tosefta is self-contradictory. Initially, you said: At times one recites Shema twice at night. Apparently, the time just after dawn is still night. And then you taught: He thereby fulfills his obligation to recite Shema one of the day and one of the night. Apparently, the time in question is considered day, as otherwise, he would not have fulfilled his obligation to recite Shema during the day. There is an internal contradiction with regard to the status of the time just after dawn. Is it considered day or night?

³⁵⁴ The Gemara answers: No, there is no contradiction. Actually, the time just after dawn, when it is still dark, is considered night and the fact that it is referred to here as day is because there are people who rise from their sleep at that time and, if the need arises, it can be characterized as bekumekha, when you rise, despite the fact that it is still night.

³⁵⁵ Rav Aḥa bar Ḥanina said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai.

³⁵⁶ Some teach this statement of Rav Aḥa bar Ḥanina, in which he ruled that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai, with regard to this halakha, which is stylistically similar to the previous halakha. As it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai said in the name of Rabbi Akiva: At times, one recites Shema twice during the day, once just before sunrise and once just after sunrise, and he thereby fulfills his dual obligation to recite Shema: One, that he recites after sunrise, Shema of the day, and one, that he recites before sunrise, Shema of the night.

³⁵⁷ This baraita is self-contradictory. Initially, you said: “At times one recites Shema twice during the day.” Apparently, the time just before sunrise is considered day. And then you taught: “He thereby fulfills his dual obligation to recite Shema, one of the day and one of the night.” Apparently, the time in question is considered night, as otherwise, he could not thereby fulfill his obligation to recite Shema during the night.

³⁵⁸ The Gemara answers: No, there is no contradiction. Actually, the time just before sunrise is considered day and the fact that it is referred to here as night is because there are people who are still

asleep at that time and, if the need arises, it can be characterized as beshokhbekha [when you lie down] despite the fact that it is already day.

³⁵⁹ Rabbi Aḥa, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon who said it in the name of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Zeira said: As long as he will not recite: Help us lie down [hashkivenu] as well, after reciting the evening Shema before sunrise, as the blessing: Help us lie down, is a prayer that we sleep in peace, which is inappropriate in the morning.

³⁶⁰ That is how the halakha was taught in the study hall. However, when Rav Yitzḥak bar Yosef came to Babylonia from Eretz Yisrael, where Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi lived, he said that this ruling that Rabbi Aḥa, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said, was not said explicitly by Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. Rather, it was stated that he held that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon who said it in the name of Rabbi Akiva based on inference.

³⁶¹ The incident was as follows: This pair of Sages got drunk at the wedding of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi's son and fell asleep before reciting the evening Shema. By the time they awoke, dawn had already passed. They came before Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi and asked him if they could still recite the evening Shema. He said to them: Rabbi Shimon is worthy to rely upon in exigent circumstances. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi did not rule in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, and, in a case where there are no exigent circumstances, one may not rely on this ruling.

³⁶² The mishna relates that there was an incident where Rabban Gamliel's sons returned very late from a wedding hall and they asked their father if they were permitted to recite Shema after midnight.

³⁶³ The Gemara asks: And until now, had they not heard this halakha of Rabban Gamliel? Were they unaware that he held that one is permitted to recite the evening Shema after midnight?

³⁶⁴ The Gemara answers that Rabban Gamliel's sons did not ask him his opinion. Rather, they said to him as follows: Do the Rabbis fundamentally disagree with you concerning this halakha, holding that Shema may be recited only until midnight? If so, when there is a disagreement between an individual Sage and many Sages, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of the many, in which case we must, in practice, follow the opinion of the Rabbis. Or perhaps, do the Rabbis hold in accordance with your opinion that the time of the evening Shema extends throughout the night, and that which they say that it may only be recited until midnight is in order to distance a person from transgression? If the latter is true, then, when there are extenuating circumstances, one may recite the evening Shema after midnight. Rabban Gamliel replied to his sons: The Rabbis agree with me and you are still obligated to recite Shema. The Rabbis say that Shema may only be recited until midnight in order to distance a person from transgression, but, after the fact, even the Rabbis permit recitation after midnight.

³⁶⁵ We learned in the mishna that Rabban Gamliel told his sons: And that is not only with regard to the halakha of the recitation of Shema, but, rather, wherever the Rabbis say until midnight, the mitzva may be performed until dawn.

³⁶⁶ The Gemara questions the formulation of the mishna: Does Rabban Gamliel say until midnight, that he teaches: And not only did they say? Rabban Gamliel does not restrict the time for the

recitation of Shema until midnight, so why does he say, and not only do they say, implying that he agrees with that stringency?

³⁶⁷ The Gemara explains that this is what Rabban Gamliel said to his sons: Even according to the Rabbis, who say that the mitzva may be performed only until midnight, the biblical obligation to perform the mitzva continues until dawn, and that which they say that it may only be recited until midnight is in order to distance a person from transgression.

³⁶⁸ In the mishna, Rabban Gamliel cites several cases where a mitzva may be performed until dawn; among them, the burning of fats and limbs on the altar.

³⁶⁹ The Gemara notes: In our mishna, the eating of the Paschal lamb was not taught among those mitzvot that may be performed until dawn, indicating that the mitzva of eating the Paschal lamb does not extend until dawn.

³⁷⁰ The Gemara raises a contradiction to this conclusion based on a baraita: The mitzvot of the recitation of the evening Shema, the recitation of hallel on the nights of Passover accompanying the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb, as well as eating the Paschal lamb, may all be performed until dawn.

³⁷¹ Rav Yosef said: This is not difficult as these two sources reflect two conflicting opinions. This, our mishna, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya. While this, the baraita, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva. As it was taught in a baraita with regard to the verse discussing the mitzva to eat the Paschal lamb: “And they shall eat of the meat on that night; roasted over fire and matzot with bitter herbs shall they eat it” (Exodus 12:8); Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya says: Here it is stated: “On that night,” from which we cannot determine when night ends. The same expression is encountered later in the same chapter: “And I will pass through the land of Egypt on that night and I will strike every firstborn in the land of Egypt, from person to animal” (Exodus 12:12). We know when the firstborns were struck down based on the verse “Thus said the Lord: At about midnight, I will go out into the midst of Egypt and every firstborn in Egypt shall die” (Exodus 11:4–5). Therefore, just as in the verse below, the striking of the firstborns took place until midnight, as stated explicitly in the verse, so too in the verse here, the mitzva to eat the Paschal lamb continues until midnight.

³⁷² Rabbi Akiva said to him: Was it not already said, “Thus you shall eat it, with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, your staffs in your hands and you will eat it in haste for it is the Paschal offering for the Lord” (Exodus 12:11)? Therefore the Paschal lamb may be eaten until the time of haste. Since the time of haste is when Israel left Egypt, and it is said, “You will not leave, every man from his house, until the morning,” then the Paschal lamb may be eaten until dawn. If that is so, why does the verse state: On that night?

³⁷³ The Gemara explains that the phrase on that night is necessary because without it I might have thought that the Paschal lamb is eaten during the day, like all other sacrifices, which must all be slaughtered and eaten during the day. Therefore, the verse states: On that night, to underscore that this particular sacrifice is eaten at night and not during the day. Essentially, the difference between these two opinions revolves around which word they deemed significant. Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya considered the word night as the key word, while Rabbi Akiva considered the word haste as the key word. The Gemara begins to analyze their statements.

³⁷⁴ Granted, according to Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, who has the tradition of a verbal analogy between the phrase, on that night, with regard to the eating of the Paschal lamb and the phrase, on that night, with regard to the striking of the firstborn in Egypt, it was necessary for the verse to write “that” in order to indicate that these times are parallel. However, according to Rabbi Akiva, who has no such tradition, what does he do with “that”? Why is it necessary to emphasize on that night?

³⁷⁵ The Gemara answers: On that night comes to exclude another night, as one might otherwise have concluded that the Paschal lamb may be eaten for two nights. It would have entered your mind to say: Since the Paschal lamb falls into the category of sacrifices of lesser sanctity, and peace-offerings are also sacrifices of lesser sanctity, just as peace-offerings may be eaten for two days and one night, i.e., the day that they are sacrificed through the following day, as we learned in the Torah, so too the Paschal lamb may be eaten for two nights instead of two days. In other words, one might otherwise mistakenly conclude from its parallel to peace-offerings, that the Paschal lamb is to be eaten for two nights and the day between them. Therefore, the verse teaches us specifically on that night, i.e., on that night it is eaten, and it is not eaten on another night.

³⁷⁶ The Gemara asks: If so, from where does Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya derive that the Paschal lamb cannot be eaten for two nights?

³⁷⁷ The Gemara answers: Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya derives this conclusion from the verse: “It should not remain until the morning” (Exodus 12:10). If one is prohibited from leaving over any part of the sacrifice until the morning, he is certainly prohibited from leaving it over until the following night. Therefore, it is unnecessary to cite an additional source to teach that the Paschal lamb may only be eaten on the first night.

³⁷⁸ And why does Rabbi Akiva require “that” to derive that the Paschal lamb may not be eaten on the second night? According to Rabbi Akiva, if it was derived from the verse: “It should not remain until the morning,” I would have said: What is the meaning of morning? It means the second morning, as the Torah does not specify until which morning the Paschal lamb may not be left; until the first morning or the second morning. Therefore, the Torah needed to write on that night and no other.

³⁷⁹ And what would Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya respond? He could have said to you: If it is not otherwise noted, every unmodified mention of the word morning in the Bible refers to the first, i.e., the next, morning. If that were not the case, no biblical text could have any definite meaning.

³⁸⁰ Concerning the tannaitic dispute between Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya regarding until when the Paschal lamb may be eaten, the Gemara remarks: The dispute between these tanna'im is parallel to the dispute between those tanna'im, who disagree over the same issue. As it was taught in a baraita with regard to the verse: “There you will offer the Paschal lamb, in the evening when the sun sets at the time when you left the land of Egypt” (Deuteronomy 16:6). Upon closer examination, it seems that this verse mentions three distinct times: In the evening, refers to the afternoon until sunset; when the sun sets, refers to the time of sunset itself; and the time when you left the land of Egypt refers to, as explained in Exodus, the early hours of the morning. Therefore it seems that these times parallel the different stages of the mitzva of the Paschal lamb, and it is regarding these details that the tanna'im disagree.

³⁸¹ Rabbi Eliezer says: In the evening, the afternoon, you slaughter the sacrifice, from when the sun sets until midnight you eat it, and at the time when you left the land of Egypt you burn what remains from the sacrifice, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya. Rabbi Yehoshua says:

In the evening, the afternoon, you slaughter the sacrifice, from when the sun sets, you eat it. And until when do you continue eating? Until the time when you left the land of Egypt, meaning until morning, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva.

³⁸² The Gemara cites an alternative explanation of the dispute between Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya and Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Abba said: Everyone agrees that when the children of Israel were redeemed from Egypt were given permission to leave, they were redeemed only in the evening, as it is stated: “In the spring the Lord, your God, took you out from Egypt at night” (Deuteronomy 16:1). And when they actually left, they left only during the day, as it is stated: “On the fifteenth of the first month, on the day after the offering of the Paschal lamb, the children of Israel went out with a high hand before the eyes of Egypt” (Numbers 33:3), indicating that they actually went out during the day.

³⁸³ However, with regard to what did they disagree? They disagreed with regard to the time of haste, as it is written: “You will eat it in haste for it is the Paschal offering for the Lord” (Exodus 12:11). Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya held: What is the meaning of haste? It is the haste of the Egyptians at midnight, as they hurried to the houses of the people of Israel to send them away, in fear of the plague of the firstborn.

³⁸⁴ And Rabbi Akiva held: What is the meaning of haste? It is the haste of Israel in the morning, as they rushed to leave Egypt.

³⁸⁵ Similar to Rabbi Abba’s statement, it was also taught in a baraita, regarding the verse: “The Lord, your God, took you out from Egypt at night,” the question arises: Did they leave at night? Didn’t they leave during the day, as it is stated: “On the day after the offering of the Paschal lamb, the children of Israel went out with a high hand”? Rather, this teaches that the redemption began for them in the evening.

³⁸⁶ Since the last topic discussed in the Gemara revolved around the exodus from Egypt, the Gemara cites additional aggadic midrash on that subject. With regard to the verse: “Speak, please [na] in the ears of the people, and they should borrow, every man from his fellow and every woman from her fellow, silver and gold vessels” (Exodus 11:2), the word please [na] is unclear. The students of the school of Rabbi Yannai said: Please [na] is nothing more than an expression of supplication. Why would God employ an expression of supplication in approaching Israel? The Gemara explains that the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Moses: I beseech you, go and tell Israel: I beseech you; borrow vessels of silver and vessels of gold from the Egyptians in order to fulfill the promise I made to Abraham in the “Covenant between the Pieces,” so that

³⁸⁷ that righteous person, Abraham, will not say: God fulfilled His pronouncement: “And they will be enslaved and afflicted,” but God did not fulfill His pronouncement: “And afterward, they will leave with great possessions.” As God said to Abraham: “Surely you shall know that your descendants will be foreigners in a land that is not theirs, and they will be enslaved and afflicted for four hundred years. And also that nation who enslaves them will I judge. And afterward, they will leave with great possessions” (Genesis 15:13–14).

³⁸⁸ The school of Rabbi Yannai continues: Israel said to Moses: If only we could get out ourselves. The Gemara offers a parable to one who was incarcerated in prison, and people would say to him: We promise, we will release you tomorrow and give you much money. He says to them: I beseech you, release me today and I ask for nothing. So too, Israel preferred leaving immediately empty handed rather than leaving later with great riches.

³⁸⁹ With regard to the spoils taken from Egypt described in the verse: “And the Lord gave the nation grace in the eyes of Egypt, and they gave them what they requested and they emptied Egypt” (Exodus 12:36), Rabbi Ami said: This teaches that the Egyptians gave them what they requested against their will. There is a dispute with regard to the question: Against whose will? Some say it was given against the will of the Egyptians, and some say it was given against the will of Israel. The proponent of each position cites support for his opinion.

³⁹⁰ The one who said that it was given against the will of the Egyptians cites the verse describing Israel’s exit from Egypt, as it is written: “And she who tarries at home divides the spoils” (Psalms 68:13). That which the woman in the verse requested from her counterpart was actually spoils taken against the will of an enemy. The one who said that it was given against the will of Israel, claims that they did not want the vessels because of the burden of carrying a heavy load on a long journey.

³⁹¹ With regard to the continuation of the verse: And they emptied Egypt, Rabbi Ami said: This indicates that they made Egypt like a trap in which there is no grain that serves as bait to attract birds. Reish Lakish said: They made Egypt like an abyss in the sea without fish.

³⁹² The Gemara proceeds to discuss the promise of redemption from Egypt that God made to Moses at the burning bush. When Moses asked God what to say when Israel asks him God’s name, “and God said to Moses: ‘I will be that I will be,’ and He said: ‘Thus you will say unto the children of Israel: I will be has sent me to you’” (Exodus 3:14). The Holy One, Blessed be He, told Moses to go and tell Israel: I was with you in this enslavement, and in this redemption, and I will be with you in the enslavement of the kingdoms in the future.

³⁹³ Moses said before Him: Master of the Universe, it is enough for them to endure. Let the future suffering be endured at its appointed time. There is no need to mention their future enslavement. The Holy One, Blessed be He, agreed with Moses and said to him: Go and tell the children of Israel only that, “I will be has sent me to you.”

³⁹⁴ Having explained the use of the double language of “I will be that I will be,” the Gemara proceeds to explain the double language employed by Elijah on Mount Carmel: “Answer me, Lord, answer me, that this people will know that You are the Lord, God, and You have turned their hearts backward” (I Kings 18:37). Rabbi Abbahu said: Why did Elijah say answer me twice? This repetition teaches that Elijah said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, answer me that fire will descend from heaven and consume everything that is on the altar, and answer me that You will divert their mind from devising alternative explanations for what they witnessed so that they will not say that they were acts of sorcery. As it is stated that Elijah said: “And You have turned their hearts backward,” God can restore them to the proper path as well.

³⁹⁵ MISHNA: From when does one recite Shema in the morning? From when a person can distinguish between sky-blue [tekhelet] and white. Rabbi Eliezer says: From when one can distinguish between sky-blue and leek-green. And one must finish reciting Shema until the end of the period when you rise, i.e., sunrise, when the sun begins to shine. Rabbi Yehoshua says: One may recite the morning Shema until three hours of the day, which this is still considered when you rise, as that is the habit of kings to rise from their sleep at three hours of the day.

³⁹⁶ While there is a set time frame for the recitation of Shema, one who recites Shema from that time onward loses nothing. Although he does not fulfill the mitzva of reciting of Shema at its appointed time, he is nevertheless considered like one who reads the Torah, and is rewarded accordingly.

³⁹⁷ GEMARA: The mishna stated that the time for the recitation of the morning Shema begins when one can distinguish between sky-blue and white. The Gemara asks: To what is between sky-blue and white referring? If you say that it means distinguishing between a pile of white wool and a pile of sky-blue wool, wouldn't one know the difference at night, as well? Rather, it must be a reference to ritual fringes made with sky-blue strings (see Numbers 15:38) along with white strings, and one must be able to distinguish between the sky-blue strings in the ritual fringes and the white strings in the ritual fringes. With regard to the beginning of the time for the recitation of the morning Shema, a baraita cites additional opinions not cited in the mishna.

³⁹⁸ It was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Meir says that the day begins when one can distinguish between two similar animals, e.g., a wolf and a dog. Rabbi Akiva provides a different sign, and says that the day begins when there is sufficient light to distinguish between a donkey and a wild donkey. And Aḥerim say: When one can see another person, who is merely an acquaintance (Jerusalem Talmud) from a distance of four cubits and recognize him.

³⁹⁹ Rav Huna said: The halakha is in accordance with Aḥerim. Abaye said: Regarding the time from which one may don phylacteries, a mitzva incumbent only by day, the halakha is in accordance with Aḥerim. But with regard to the recitation of Shema, one should conduct himself in accordance with the custom of the vatikin, pious individuals who were scrupulous in their performance of mitzvot. As Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The vatikin would conclude the recitation of Shema with sunrise, and one should act accordingly.

⁴⁰⁰ It was also taught in a baraita: The vatikin would conclude the recitation of Shema with sunrise in order to juxtapose the blessing of redemption, which immediately follows the recitation of Shema, with prayer, and pray during the day.

⁴⁰¹ Regarding this custom of the vatikin, Rabbi Zeira said: What verse is the source for this tradition? "They shall fear You with the sun, and before the moon for all generations" (Psalms 72:5). This verse indicates that one should express one's awe of Heaven, they shall fear You, immediately before sunrise, with the sun.

⁴⁰² Rabbi Yosei ben Elyakim testified in the name of the holy community in Jerusalem, a title accorded a particular group of Sages who lived there, that one who juxtaposes redemption and prayer at sunrise will incur no harm for the entire day.

⁴⁰³ Rabbi Zeira said: Is that so? Didn't I juxtapose redemption and prayer and nevertheless I was harmed? Rabbi Yosei ben Elyakim asked Rabbi Zeira: How were you harmed? That you brought a myrtle branch to the king's palace? The Gemara refers to Rabbi Zeira's responsibility as one of the respected members of the community to participate in a delegation that brought a crown of myrtle as a gift to the king, a dubious honor in which Rabbi Zeira had no interest. However, there, too, you had to pay a price in order to see the face of the king, as Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One should always strive to run to greet the kings of Israel to witness them in their glory. And not only must one run to greet the kings of Israel, but even to greet the kings of the nations of the world, so that if he will be privileged to witness the redemption of Israel, he will distinguish between the kings of Israel and the kings of the nations of the world, to see how much greater the Jewish king will be and how his rule will be manifest. Therefore, it was a privilege for Rabbi Zeira that he was allowed to see the face of the king.

⁴⁰⁴ Rabbi El'a said to Ulla before Ulla left for Babylonia: When you go to Babylonia, ask after my brother, Rav Beruna, in the presence of the entire group, as he is a great man who rejoices in mitzvot,

and it is only fitting that he should be accorded respect. The Gemara provides proof that he was indeed a great man who rejoiced in mitzvot: Once, Rav Beruna juxtaposed redemption and prayer at sunrise, as per the custom of the vatikin (Tosafot), and laughter and joy did not cease from his mouth for the entire day.

⁴⁰⁵ In practice, the Gemara asks: How is one able to juxtapose redemption and prayer? Didn't Rabbi Yoḥanan say: At the beginning of prayer, one says: "Lord, open my lips, that my mouth may declare Your glory" (Psalms 51:17), and at the end of prayer one says: "May the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable before You, Lord, my Rock, and my Redeemer" (Psalms 19:15). If so, the first verse is an interruption between redemption and prayer.

⁴⁰⁶ Rabbi Elazar said: Let this verse, "Lord, open my lips," be recited only in the evening prayer but not in the morning prayer.

⁴⁰⁷ The Gemara asks: Didn't Rabbi Yoḥanan say: Who is worthy of a place in the World-to-Come? He who juxtaposes redemption of the evening prayer to the evening prayer. Therefore, this verse from Psalms should not be recited before the evening prayer either.

⁴⁰⁸ Rather, Rabbi Elazar said: Let this verse: "Lord, open my lips," be recited only before the afternoon prayer.

⁴⁰⁹ Rav Ashi said another explanation: Even if you say that Rabbi Yoḥanan holds that "Lord, open my lips" is recited before all prayers, including the morning and the evening prayers. Since the Sages instituted this verse, it is considered as an extended prayer; it is an inseparable part of the prayers, and if redemption is juxtaposed to this verse, it is no different than if redemption was juxtaposed to prayer directly.

⁴¹⁰ Rabbi Ashi supports his claim: As if you do not say so, how does one juxtapose redemption of the evening prayer to the evening prayer? Mustn't one recite: Help us lie down [hashkivenu] after redemption? Rather, since the Sages instituted the recitation of: Help us lie down, it is considered as an extended blessing of redemption. So, too, since the Sages instituted this verse in prayer, it is considered as an extended prayer.

⁴¹¹ With regard to the verse with which the prayer concludes, the Gemara deliberates: Now, since this verse: "May the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable before You," can connote the end of prayer, petitioning God that He accept the prayer that was just recited, and it can connote the beginning of the prayer that he wants to recite: May the words of my mouth which I am about to recite be acceptable before You. If so, the question arises: Why did the Sages institute that it is to be recited after the eighteen blessings that constitute the Amida? Let it be recited at the beginning of the prayer.

⁴¹² Rabbi Yehuda, son of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi, said: This verse is recited after the eighteen blessings comprising the Amida because David only said this verse after eighteen chapters of Psalms (end of ch. 19). Therefore, the Sages instituted to recite it after the eighteen blessings of the Amida.

⁴¹³ The Gemara asks: Are these eighteen psalms? They are nineteen chapters that precede that verse.

⁴¹⁴ The Gemara answers: "Happy is the man," the first chapter of Psalms, and "Why are the nations in an uproar," the second chapter, constitute a single chapter, so the nineteen chapters are actually eighteen.

⁴¹⁵ The Gemara cites proof that the first two chapters are in fact a single chapter. As Rabbi Yehuda, son of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi, said: David said one hundred and three chapters, and he did not say Halleluya in any of them until he saw the downfall of the wicked. Only then could David say Halleluya wholeheartedly. As it is stated: “Let sinners cease from the earth, and let the wicked be no more. Bless the Lord, my soul, Halleluya” (Psalms 104:35).

⁴¹⁶ Here too, the Gemara notes that the calculation appears inaccurate: Are these one hundred and three psalms? They are one hundred and four. Rather, conclude from this that “Happy is the man” and “Why are the nations in uproar” constitute a single portion.

⁴¹⁷ Additional proof that these two chapters comprise a single portion is cited from what Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said:

⁴¹⁸ Every chapter that was dear to David, he began with “happy is” and concluded with “happy is.” He opened with “happy is,” as it is written: “Happy is the man who has not walked in the counsel of the wicked or stood in the way of sinners or sat in the dwelling place of the scornful” (Psalms 1:1). And he concluded with “happy,” as it is written at the end of the chapter: “Pay homage in purity, lest He be angry, and you perish on the way when His anger is kindled suddenly. Happy are those who take refuge in Him” (Psalms 2:12). We see that these two chapters actually constitute a single chapter.

⁴¹⁹ With regard to the statement of Rabbi Yehuda, son of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi, that David did not say Halleluya until he saw the downfall of the wicked, the Gemara relates: There were these hooligans in Rabbi Meir’s neighborhood who caused him a great deal of anguish. Rabbi Meir prayed for God to have mercy on them, that they should die. Rabbi Meir’s wife, Berurya, said to him: What is your thinking? On what basis do you pray for the death of these hooligans? Do you base yourself on the verse, as it is written: “Let sins cease from the land” (Psalms 104:35), which you interpret to mean that the world would be better if the wicked were destroyed? But is it written, let sinners cease?” Let sins cease, is written. One should pray for an end to their transgressions, not for the demise of the transgressors themselves.

⁴²⁰ Moreover, go to the end of the verse, where it says: “And the wicked will be no more.” If, as you suggest, transgressions shall cease refers to the demise of the evildoers, how is it possible that the wicked will be no more, i.e., that they will no longer be evil? Rather, pray for God to have mercy on them, that they should repent, as if they repent, then the wicked will be no more, as they will have repented.

⁴²¹ Rabbi Meir saw that Berurya was correct and he prayed for God to have mercy on them, and they repented.

⁴²² The Gemara relates an additional example of Berurya’s incisive insight: A certain heretic said to Berurya: It is written: “Sing, barren woman who has not given birth, open forth in song and cry, you did not travail, for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, said the Lord” (Isaiah 54:1). Because she has not given birth, she should sing and rejoice?

⁴²³ Berurya responded to this heretic’s mockery and said: Fool! Go to the end of the verse, where it is written: “For the children of the desolate shall be more numerous than the children of the married wife, said the Lord.”

⁴²⁴ Rather, what is the meaning of: “Sing, barren woman who has not given birth”? It means: Sing congregation of Israel, which is like a barren woman who did not give birth to children who are destined for Gehenna like you.

⁴²⁵ In explaining passages from Psalms, the Gemara relates another instance of a response to the question of a heretic: A certain heretic said to Rabbi Abbahu, it is written: “A Psalm of David, when he fled from his son, Absalom” (Psalms 3:1), and similarly it is said: “To the chief musician, al tashḥet, a mikhtam of David when fleeing from Saul into the cave” (Psalms 57:1). Which event was first? Since the event with Saul was first, it would have been appropriate to write it first.

⁴²⁶ Rabbi Abbahu said to him: For you, who do not employ the homiletic method of juxtaposition of verses, it is difficult. But for us, who employ the homiletic method of juxtaposition of verses, it is not difficult, as the Sages commonly homiletically infer laws and moral lessons from the juxtaposition of two verses.

⁴²⁷ Regarding the juxtaposition of verses, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: From where in the Bible is it derived that one may draw homiletical inferences from the juxtaposition of verses? As it is said: “The works of His hands in truth and justice, all His commandments are sure. Adjoined forever and ever, made in truth and uprightness” (Psalms 111:7–8). Conclude from here that it is appropriate to draw inferences from the juxtaposition of God’s commandments. Accordingly, David’s fleeing from Absalom is situated where it is in order to juxtapose it to the next chapter, which mentions the war of Gog and Magog; the second chapter of Psalms opens: “Why are the nations in an uproar?”

⁴²⁸ Why was the chapter of Absalom juxtaposed with the chapter of Gog and Magog? They are juxtaposed so that if a person should say to you, expressing doubt with regard to the prophecy of the war of Gog and Magog “against the Lord and against His anointed”: Is there a slave who rebels against his master? Is there someone capable of rebelling against God? You too say to him: Is there a son who rebels against his father and severs the relationship with the one who brought him into the world and raised him? Yet, nevertheless, there was such a son, Absalom, and so too there can be a situation where people will seek to rebel against God.

⁴²⁹ Rabbi Yoḥanan said explanations of other verses in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: What is the meaning of that which is written: “She opens her mouth with wisdom, and the teaching of loving-kindness is on her tongue” (Proverbs 31:26)? The Sages explain that this chapter discusses the wisdom of Torah and those who engage in its study, so with reference to whom did Solomon say this verse? He said this verse about none other than his father, David, who was the clearest example of one who opens his mouth in wisdom, and who resided in five worlds or stages of life and his soul said a song of praise corresponding to each of them. Five times David said: “Bless the Lord, O my soul,” each corresponding to a different stage of life.

⁴³⁰ He resided in his mother’s womb, his first world, and said a song of praise of the pregnancy, as it is stated: “Of David. Bless the Lord, O my soul and all that is within me bless His holy name” (Psalms 103:1), in which he thanks God for creating all that is within his mother, i.e., her womb.

⁴³¹ He emerged into the atmosphere of the world, his second world, looked upon the stars and constellations and said a song of praise of God for the entirety of creation, as it is stated: “Bless the Lord, His angels, mighty in strength, that fulfill His word, listening to the voice of His word. Bless the Lord, all His hosts, His servants, that do His will. Bless the Lord, all His works, in all places of

His kingship, bless my soul, Lord” (Psalms 103:20–23). David saw the grandeur of all creation and recognized that they are mere servants, carrying out the will of their Creator (Ma’ayan HaBerakhot).

⁴³² He nursed from his mother’s breast, his third world, and he looked upon her bosom and said a song of praise, as it is stated: “Bless the Lord, O my soul, and do not forget all His benefits [gemulav]” (Psalms 103:2). The etymological association is between gemulav and gemulei mehalav, which means weaned from milk (Isaiah 28:9).

⁴³³ We still must understand, however, what is meant by all His benefits? What in particular is praiseworthy in what God provided, beyond merely providing for the infant? Rabbi Abbahu said: In contrast with most other animals, God placed her breasts near her heart, the place that is the source of understanding.

⁴³⁴ What is the reason that God did this? Rav Yehuda said: So that the nursing child would not look upon the place of his mother’s nakedness. Rav Mattana said: So that the child would not nurse from a place of uncleanness.

⁴³⁵ He witnessed in both vision and reality the downfall of the wicked and he said a song of praise, as it is stated: “Let sinners cease from the earth, and let the wicked be no more. Bless the Lord, O my soul, Halleluya” (Psalms 104:35).

⁴³⁶ The fifth world was when David looked upon the day of death and said a song of praise, as it is stated: “Bless the Lord, O my soul. Lord my God, You are very great; You are clothed in glory and majesty” (Psalms 104:1); for even death is a time of transcendence for the righteous.

⁴³⁷ The connection between this final praise and the day of death is unclear. The Gemara asks: From where is it inferred that this verse was stated with regard to the day of death? Rabba bar Rav Sheila says: We can derive this from the verses at the end of the matter, where it is written: “You hide Your face, they vanish; You gather Your breath, they perish and return to the dust” (Psalms 104:29).

⁴³⁸ Other interpretations of this verse exist. The Gemara relates how Rav Shimi bar Ukva, and some say Mar Ukva, would regularly study before Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi, who was well versed in aggada and would arrange the aggada before Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. Once, Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi said to him: What is the meaning of that which is written: “Bless the Lord, my soul, and all that is within me bless His Holy name”? Rav Shimi bar Ukva said to Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi: Come and see that the attribute of the Holy One, Blessed be He, is not like the attribute of flesh and blood, as this verse praises the formation of man in his mother’s womb. The attribute of flesh and blood is such that he shapes a form on the wall for all to see, yet he cannot instill it with a spirit and soul, bowels and intestines. While the Holy One, Blessed be He, is not so, as God shapes one form within another form, a child in its mother’s womb, and instills it with spirit and soul, bowels and intestines. And this is the explanation of what Hannah said with regard to the birth of Samuel: “There is none holy like the Lord, for there is none like You, and there is no Rock like our God” (I Samuel 2:2).

⁴³⁹ What is the meaning of there is no rock [tzur] like our God? There is no artist [tzayyar] like our God.

⁴⁴⁰ The Gemara continues to interpret the rest of that verse homiletically: What is the meaning of “there is none like You”? Rabbi Yehuda ben Menasya said: Do not read the verse to mean “there is none like You [biltekha]”; rather, read it to mean “none can outlast You [levalotkha],” as the attribute

of the Holy One, Blessed be He, is not like the attribute of flesh and blood: The attribute of flesh and blood is such that his creations outlast him, but the Holy One, Blessed be He, outlasts His actions.

⁴⁴¹ This did not satisfy Rav Shimi bar Ukva, who said to Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi: I meant to say to you as follows: Corresponding to whom did David say these five instance of “Bless the Lord, O my soul”? He answered him: He said them about none other than the Holy One, Blessed be He, and corresponding to the soul, as the verse refers to the relationship between man’s soul and God. The five instances of “Bless the Lord, O my soul” correspond to the five parallels between the soul in man’s body and God’s power in His world.

⁴⁴² Just as the Holy One, Blessed be He, fills the entire world, so too the soul fills the entire body. Just as the Holy One, Blessed be He, sees but is not seen, so too does the soul see, but is not seen. Just as the Holy One, Blessed be He, sustains the entire world, so too the soul sustains the entire body. Just as the Holy One, Blessed be He, is pure, so too is the soul pure. Just as the Holy One, Blessed be He, resides in a chamber within a chamber, in His inner sanctum, so too the soul resides in a chamber within a chamber, in the innermost recesses of the body. Therefore, that which has these five characteristics, the soul, should come and praise He Who has these five characteristics.

⁴⁴³ With regard to redemption and prayer, the Gemara tells the story of Hezekiah’s illness, his prayer to God, and subsequent recuperation. Rav Hamnuna said: What is the meaning of that which is written praising the Holy One, Blessed be He: “Who is like the wise man, and who knows the interpretation [peshar] of the matter” (Ecclesiastes 8:1)? This verse means: Who is like the Holy One, Blessed be He, Who knows how to effect compromise [peshara] between two righteous individuals, between Hezekiah, the king of Judea, and Isaiah the prophet. They disagreed over which of them should visit the other. Hezekiah said: Let Isaiah come to me, as that is what we find with regard to Elijah the prophet, who went to Ahab, the king of Israel, as it is stated: “And Elijah went to appear to Ahab” (I Kings 18:2). This proves that it is the prophet who must seek out the king. And Isaiah said: Let Hezekiah come to me, as that is what we find with regard to Yehoram ben Ahab, king of Israel, who went to Elisha the prophet, as it is stated: “So the king of Israel, Jehosaphat and the king of Edom went down to him” (II Kings 3:12).

⁴⁴⁴ What did the Holy One, Blessed be He, do to effect compromise between Hezekiah and Isaiah? He brought the suffering of illness upon Hezekiah and told Isaiah: Go and visit the sick. Isaiah did as God instructed, as it is stated: “In those days Hezekiah became deathly ill, and Isaiah ben Amoz the prophet came and said to him: Thus says the Lord of Hosts: Set your house in order, for you will die and you will not live” (Isaiah 38:1). This seems redundant; what is the meaning of you will die and you will not live? This repetition means: You will die in this world, and you will not live, you will have no share, in the World-to-Come.

⁴⁴⁵ Hezekiah said to him: What is all of this? For what transgression am I being punished? Isaiah said to him: Because you did not marry and engage in procreation. Hezekiah apologized and said: I had no children because I envisaged through divine inspiration that the children that emerge from me will not be virtuous. Hezekiah meant that he had seen that his children were destined to be evil. In fact, his son Menashe sinned extensively, and he thought it preferable to have no children at all.

⁴⁴⁶ Isaiah said to him: Why do you involve yourself with the secrets of the Holy One, Blessed be He? That which you have been commanded, the mitzva of procreation, you are required to perform,

and that which is acceptable in the eyes of the Holy One, Blessed be He, let Him perform, as He has so decided.

⁴⁴⁷ Hezekiah said to Isaiah: Now give me your daughter as my wife; perhaps my merit and your merit will cause virtuous children to emerge from me. Isaiah said to him: The decree has already been decreed against you and this judgment cannot be changed. Hezekiah said to him: Son of Amoz, cease your prophecy and leave. As long as the prophet spoke as God's emissary, Hezekiah was obligated to listen to him. He was not, however, obligated to accept Isaiah's personal opinion that there was no possibility for mercy and healing.

⁴⁴⁸ Hezekiah continued: I have received a tradition from the house of my father's father, from King David, the founding father of the dynasty of kings of Judea: Even if a sharp sword rests upon a person's neck, he should not prevent himself from praying for mercy. One may still hold out hope that his prayers will be answered, as was David himself when he saw the Angel of Destruction, but nonetheless prayed for mercy and his prayers were answered.

⁴⁴⁹ With regard to the fact that one should not despair of God's mercy, the Gemara cites that it was also said that Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Eliezer both said: Even if a sharp sword is resting upon a person's neck, he should not prevent himself from praying for mercy, as it is stated in the words of Job: "Though He slay me, I will trust in Him" (Job 13:15). Even though God is about to take his life, he still prays for God's mercy.

⁴⁵⁰ Similarly, Rabbi Ḥanan said: Even if the master of dreams, in a true dream, an angel (Ma'ayan HaBerakhot) tells a person that tomorrow he will die, he should not prevent himself from praying for mercy, as it is stated: "For in the multitude of dreams and vanities there are many words; but fear God" (Ecclesiastes 5:6). Although the dream may seem real to him, that is not necessarily the case, and one must place his trust in God.

⁴⁵¹ Having heard Isaiah's harsh prophecy, immediately "Hezekiah turned his face toward the wall and prayed to the Lord" (Isaiah 38:2).

⁴⁵² The Gemara asks: What is meant by the word "wall [kir]" in this context? Why did Hezekiah turn his face to a wall? Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: This symbolically alludes to the fact that Hezekiah prayed to God from the chambers [kirot] of his heart, as it is stated elsewhere: "My anguish, my anguish, I am in pain. The chambers of my heart. My heart moans within me" (Jeremiah 4:19).

⁴⁵³ Rabbi Levi said: Hezekiah intended to evoke matters relating to a wall, and he said before God: Master of the Universe, and if the woman from Shunem, who made only a single small wall on the roof for the prophet Elisha, and you revived her son, all the more so should you bring life to the descendant of my father's father, King Solomon, who covered the entire Temple Sanctuary with silver and gold. In his prayer, Hezekiah said: "Please, Lord, please remember that I walked before You in truth, and with a complete heart, and what was good in Your eyes I did. And Hezekiah wept sore" (Isaiah 38:3).

⁴⁵⁴ The Gemara asks: To what specific action was he referring when he said: "And what was good in your sight I did"? Various opinions are offered: Mentioning Hezekiah's merits, Rav Yehuda said in the name of Rav that he juxtaposed redemption and prayer at sunrise instead of sleeping late, as was the custom of most kings (Iyyun Ya'akov). Rabbi Levi said: He suppressed the Book of Remedies upon which everyone relied.

⁴⁵⁵ The Sages taught: King Hezekiah performed six innovative actions. With regard to three the Sages agreed with him, and with regard to three they did not agree with him.

⁴⁵⁶ With regard to three actions the Sages agreed with him: He suppressed the Book of Remedies, and they agreed with him. He ground the copper snake through which miracles were performed for Israel (Numbers 21:9), destroying it because it had been used in idol worship (II Kings 18:4), and they agreed with him. He dragged the bones of his evil father, King Ahaz, on a bed of ropes; meaning he did not accord his father a funeral fit for a king (II Chronicles 28:27), and they agreed with him.

⁴⁵⁷ Yet, with regard to three other innovations, the Sages of his generation did not agree with him: He stopped up the waters of the Gihon, the Pool of Siloam, diverting its water into the city by means of a tunnel (II Chronicles 32:30), and they did not agree with him. He cut off the doors of the Sanctuary and sent them to the king of Assyria (II Kings 18:16), and they did not agree with him. He intercalated Nisan in Nisan, creating a leap year by adding an extra month during the month of Nisan. That intercalation must be performed before the end of Adar (II Chronicles 30:2).

⁴⁵⁸ With regard to his intercalation of Nisan, the Gemara asks: Did Hezekiah not accept the halakha: “This month will be for you the first of the months; it shall be the first for you of the months of the year” (Exodus 12:2)? By inference, this first month is Nisan, and no other month is Nisan. How could Hezekiah add an additional Nisan in violation of Torah law?

⁴⁵⁹ The Gemara answers that the scenario was different. Rather, Hezekiah erred with regard to the halakhic opinion ascribed in later generations to Shmuel, as Shmuel said: One may not intercalate the year on the thirtieth day of Adar, since it is fit to establish it as the New Moon of Nisan. On the thirtieth day of each month, those who witnessed the new moon would come and testify before the court, which, based on their testimony, would declare that day the first day of the next month. Therefore, one may not declare a leap year on the thirtieth day of Adar, as it could potentially become the first of Nisan. Therefore, the Sages of Hezekiah’s generation did not agree with his decision to intercalate the year on the thirtieth of Adar. Hezekiah held that we do not say: Since that day is fit to establish it as the New Moon is reason enough to refrain from intercalation of the year.

⁴⁶⁰ Stemming from the analysis of Hezekiah’s prayer, Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Yosei ben Zimra: Anyone who bases his prayer or request upon his own merit, when God answers his prayer, it is based upon the merit of others. And anyone who modestly bases his prayer or request upon the merit of others, when God answers his prayer, it is based upon his own merit.

⁴⁶¹ The Gemara cites proof from Moses. When he prayed to God for forgiveness after the incident of the Golden Calf, he based his request upon the merit of others, as it is stated: “Remember Abraham, Isaac and Israel your servants, to whom You swore upon Yourself, and told them: I will increase your descendants like the stars of the heavens, and all of this land of which I have spoken, I will give to your descendants and they will inherit it forever” (Exodus 32:13). Yet when this story is related, God’s forgiveness of Israel is based upon Moses’ own merit, as it is stated: “And He said He would destroy them, had Moses, His chosen, not stood before Him in the breach to turn back His destructive fury, lest He should destroy them” (Psalms 106:23).

⁴⁶² Hezekiah, however, based his request upon his own merit, as it is written: “Please, remember that I walked before You” (Isaiah 38:3). When God answered his prayers, it was based upon the merit of others with no mention made of Hezekiah’s own merit, as it is stated: “And I will protect this city to save it, for My sake and for the sake of David, My servant” (II Kings 19:34). And that is what Rabbi

Yehoshua ben Levi said. As Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “Behold, for my peace I had great bitterness; but You have, in love to my soul, delivered it from the pit of corruption; for You have thrown all my sins behind Your back” (Isaiah 38:17)? This verse teaches that even when the Holy One, Blessed be He, sent him peace and told him that he would recover from his illness, it was bitter for him, because God did not take his merit into consideration.

⁴⁶³ Having mentioned the chamber on the roof built for Elisha by the woman from Shunem, the Gemara now describes the entire event. The woman from Shunem suggested to her husband: “Let us make, I pray thee, a small chamber on the roof, and let us place a bed, table, stool and candlestick for him there, and it will be, when he comes to us, that he will turn in there” (II Kings 4:10).

⁴⁶⁴ Rav and Shmuel argued over the meaning of small chamber. One of them said: They had an uncovered second story on their roof, over which they built a ceiling; and one of them said: There was an enclosed veranda [akhsadra] and they divided it in half.

⁴⁶⁵ The Gemara comments: Granted, according to the one who said that it was an enclosed veranda which they divided in two, it makes sense that the term wall [kir] was written. However, according to the one who said that they had an open second story, what is the meaning of wall?

⁴⁶⁶ The Gemara responds: The one who said that they had an uncovered second story interprets kir not as wall but as ceiling meaning that they built a ceiling [kirui] over it.

⁴⁶⁷ On the other hand, granted, according to the one who said that they had an uncovered second story, it makes sense that the term second story [aliyat] was written. But according to the one who said that it was an enclosed veranda, what is the meaning of the term second story?

⁴⁶⁸ The Gemara responds: The one who said that it was an enclosed veranda interprets aliya not as second story, but as the most outstanding [me’ula] of the rooms.

⁴⁶⁹ Incidental to this discussion, the Gemara analyzes the statement made by the woman from Shunem to her husband with regard to the provisions that they would place in the room for Elisha: “And let us place a bed, table, stool and candlestick for him there.”

⁴⁷⁰ Abaye, and some say Rabbi Yitzḥak, said: A great man who seeks to enjoy the contributions of those who seek to honor him may enjoy those gifts, as Elisha enjoyed gifts given him by the woman from Shunem, among others. And one who does not seek to enjoy these gifts should not enjoy them, as was the practice of the prophet Samuel from Rama, who would not accept gifts from anyone at all. From where do we know that this was Samuel’s custom? As it is stated: “And he returned to Rama, for there was his house, and there he judged Israel, and he built an altar to the Lord” (I Samuel 7:17). And similarly, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Every place where Samuel went, his house was with him, so he would have everything that he needed and not be forced to benefit from public contributions. One may opt to conduct himself in accordance with either of these paths.

⁴⁷¹ Regarding the woman from Shunem: “And she said to her husband: Behold now, I perceive that he is a holy man of God who passes by us continually” (II Kings 4:9). Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: From here, where the woman from Shunem perceived the prophet’s greatness before her husband did, derive that a woman recognizes the character of her guests more than a man does.

⁴⁷² The Gemara notes that the woman from Shunem said that “he is holy.” The Gemara asks: From where did she know that he was holy? Rav and Shmuel disagreed over this. One of them said: She

never saw a fly pass over his table; and the other said: She spread a white linen sheet on his bed, and despite that even the smallest stain is visible on white linen, and nocturnal seminal emissions are not uncommon, she never saw the residue of a seminal emission on it.

⁴⁷³ With regard to the verse: “He is holy,” Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: The woman from Shunem intimated that: He is holy, but his attendant, Geihazi, is not holy, as she saw no indication of holiness in him (Iyyun Ya’akov). Here too, she correctly perceived the character of her guest, as it is later stated: “And Geihazi approached her to push her away [lehodfa]” (II Kings 4:27). And Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: He grabbed her by the majesty of her beauty [hod yofya], meaning that when he pushed her he grabbed her breasts in a licentious manner.

⁴⁷⁴ With regard to the phrasing of the verse: “He is a holy man of God who passes by us continually,” Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said in the name of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov: From this verse we derive that one who hosts a Torah scholar in his home and lets him enjoy his possessions, the verse ascribes to him credit as if he is sacrificing the daily [tamid] offering, as the verse states: “Passes by us continually [tamid].”

⁴⁷⁵ With regard to the halakhot of prayer, Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said in the name of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov: A person should not stand in a high place and pray; rather, he should stand in a low place and pray, as it is stated: “I called to You, Lord, from the depths” (Psalms 130:1).

⁴⁷⁶ That was also taught in a baraita: One should neither stand upon a chair nor upon a stool, nor in a high place and pray. Rather, one should stand in a low place and pray, for there is no haughtiness before God. As it is stated: “I called to You, Lord, from the depths” and it is written: “A prayer for the impoverished, when he is faint and pours out his complaint before God” (Psalms 102:1). It is appropriate to feel impoverished when praying and make one’s requests humbly.

⁴⁷⁷ And Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said in the name of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov: When praying, one should align his feet next to each other, as a single foot, in order to model oneself after the angels, with regard to whom it is stated: “And their feet were a straight foot” (Ezekiel 1:7).

⁴⁷⁸ Rabbi Yitzḥak said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said and Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said in the name of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov: What is the meaning of that which is written: “You shall not eat with the blood” (Leviticus 19:26)? You may not eat before you pray for your blood. One may not eat before he prays.

⁴⁷⁹ Others say that Rabbi Yitzḥak said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said that Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said in the name of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov: One who eats and drinks and later prays, about him the verse states the rebuke of the prophet in the name of God: “And Me you have cast behind your back” (I Kings 14:9). One who sees to his own bodily needs by eating and drinking before prayer casts God aside, according to his arrogance and ego priority over God (Maharsha). Indeed, do not read your back [gavekha]; rather, your pride [ge’ekha]. The Holy One, Blessed be He, said: After this one has become arrogant and engaged in satisfying his own needs, he only then accepted upon himself the kingdom of Heaven.

⁴⁸⁰ We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehoshua says: One may recite the morning Shema until three hours of the day. Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua.

⁴⁸¹ We also learned in the mishna that one who recites Shema from that time onward loses nothing; although he does not fulfill the mitzva of reciting of Shema at its appointed time, he is nevertheless considered like one who reads the Torah, and is rewarded accordingly.

⁴⁸² With regard to this ruling, Rav H̥isda said that Mar Ukva said: This only applies provided one does not recite: Who forms light [yotzer or], or the rest of the blessings recited along with Shema, as they pertain only to the fulfillment of the mitzva of reciting of the morning Shema; after the third hour, they are inappropriate.

⁴⁸³ The Gemara raises an objection to Rav H̥isda's statement from a baraita: One who recites Shema from that time onward loses nothing, and is considered like one who reads Torah, but he recites two blessings beforehand and one blessing thereafter. This directly contradicts Rav H̥isda's statement, and the Gemara notes: Indeed, the refutation of the statement of Rav H̥isda is a conclusive refutation, and Rav H̥isda's opinion is rejected in favor of that of the baraita.

⁴⁸⁴ Some say that Rav H̥isda said that Mar Ukva said the opposite: What is the meaning of: Loses nothing, in the mishna? This means that one who recites Shema after the third hour does not lose the opportunity to recite the blessings and is permitted to recite them although the time for the recitation of Shema has passed. That was also taught in a baraita: One who recites Shema after this time loses nothing, and is considered like one who reads the Torah, but he recites two blessings beforehand and one thereafter.

⁴⁸⁵ With regard to our mishna, Rabbi Mani said: Greater is one who recites Shema at its appropriate time than one who engages in Torah study. A proof is cited based on what was taught in the mishna: One who recites Shema after this time loses nothing and is considered like one who reads the Torah. This is proven by inference, since one who recites Shema at its appointed time is greater than one who does not, and one who does not is equal to one who reads the Torah, when one recites Shema at its appointed time he fulfills two mitzvot, that of Torah study and that of the recitation of Shema.

⁴⁸⁶ MISHNA: Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel disputed the proper way to recite Shema. Beit Shammai say: One should recite Shema in the manner indicated in the text of Shema itself. Therefore, in the evening every person must recline on his side and recite Shema, in fulfillment of the verse: "When you lie down," and in the morning he must stand and recite Shema, in fulfillment of the verse: When you rise, as it is stated: "When you lie down, and when you rise."

⁴⁸⁷ And Beit Hillel say: Every person recites Shema as he is, and he may do so in whatever position is most comfortable for him, both day and night, as it is stated: "And when you walk along the way," when one is neither standing nor reclining (Me'iri).

⁴⁸⁸ If so, according to Beit Hillel, why was it stated: "When you lie down, and when you rise"? This is merely to denote time; at the time when people lie down and the time when people rise.

⁴⁸⁹ With regard to this halakha, Rabbi Tarfon said: Once, I was coming on the road when I stopped and reclined to recite Shema in accordance with the statement of Beit Shammai. Although Rabbi Tarfon was a disciple of Beit Hillel, he thought that fulfilling the mitzva in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai would be a more meticulous fulfillment of the mitzva, acceptable to all opinions. Yet in so doing, I endangered myself due to the highwaymen [listim] who accost travelers.

⁴⁹⁰ The Sages said to him: You deserved to be in a position where you were liable to pay with your life, as you transgressed the statement of Beit Hillel. This statement will be explained in the Gemara.

⁴⁹¹ GEMARA: The Gemara begins by clarifying the rationale for Beit Shammai's opinion. Granted, Beit Hillel explain the rationale for their opinion and the rationale for Beit Shammai's opinion. Beit Hillel explain both the verse that ostensibly supports Beit Shammai's opinion: When you lie down, at the time when people lie down, etc., and the verse that proves that their own explanation is more reasonable: "And when you walk along the way." However, what is the reason that Beit Shammai do not state their opinion in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel?

⁴⁹² The Gemara answers, Beit Shammai could have said to you: If so that the verse means only to denote the time for the recitation of Shema, as claimed by Beit Hillel, then let the verse say: "In the morning and in the evening." What is the meaning of the ambiguous formulation: "When you lie down, and when you rise"? It must mean that at the time of lying down one must recite Shema while actually lying down, and at the time of arising one must recite Shema while actually risen.

⁴⁹³ The Gemara continues, asking: And what do Beit Shammai do with this verse: "And when you walk along the way," which Beit Hillel use to prove that every person recites Shema as he is?

⁴⁹⁴ The Gemara answers: Beit Shammai need this verse in order to derive other halakhot, as it was taught in a baraita which interpreted this verse that the obligation to recite Shema applies when you sit in your home, to the exclusion of one who is engaged in performance of a mitzva, who is exempt from the recitation of Shema; and when you walk along the way, to the exclusion of a groom, who is also exempt from the recitation of Shema. The baraita adds that from here, from this interpretation of the verses, they said: One who marries a virgin is exempt from the recitation of Shema on his wedding night, but one who marries a widow is obligated.

⁴⁹⁵ The Gemara clarifies the meaning of this baraita, and asks: From where may it be inferred that the verse, when you walk along the way, exempts a groom from the obligation to recite Shema?

⁴⁹⁶ Rav Pappa said that we learn: Like the way; just as the journey along a specific way described in the verse is voluntary and involves no mitzva, so too all of those who are obligated to recite Shema are engaged in voluntary activities. However, one engaged in the performance of a mitzva, like a groom, is exempt from the obligation to recite Shema.

⁴⁹⁷ The Gemara asks: Are we not dealing with a case where one walks along the way to perform a mitzva? The Torah did not designate the objective of his walk and, nevertheless, the Torah said to recite Shema, indicating that one is obligated even if he set out to perform a mitzva. Rather, the proof is from the formulation of the verse. If so, that the intention was to obligate in all cases, let the Torah write: When sitting and when walking. What is the meaning of: When you sit and when you walk? Certainly these additions come to emphasize in your sitting down and in your walking, meaning that when one does this for his own purposes and of his own volition, he is obligated to recite Shema, but when he does with the objective of performing a mitzva, he is exempt from reciting Shema, as in that case he is sitting or walking at God's behest.

⁴⁹⁸ The conclusion is that anyone engaged in the performance of a mitzva is exempt from the recitation of Shema. If so, even one who marries a widow should be exempt, for he, too, is engaged in performance of a mitzva. That, however, contradicts the baraita.

⁴⁹⁹ The Gemara responds that there is nevertheless a distinction between one marrying a virgin and one marrying a widow. One who marries a virgin is preoccupied by his concern lest he discover that

his bride is not a virgin, while one who marries a widow is not preoccupied. The conclusion is that the groom is exempt from reciting Shema because he is preoccupied.

⁵⁰⁰ The Gemara asks: If the exemption is due to preoccupation, then even one who is preoccupied because his ship sank at sea should also be exempt. The Gemara reinforces its question: And if you say that in this case as well, when one's ship sank at sea, one is exempt, why then did Rabbi Abba bar Zavda say that Rav said: A mourner is obligated in all the mitzvot mentioned in the Torah except for the mitzva to don phylacteries, from which a mourner is exempt, as the term splendor is stated with regard to phylacteries, as it is stated: "Make no mourning for the dead, bind your splendor upon yourself" (Ezekiel 24:17). It is inappropriate for a mourner to wrap himself in phylacteries, with regard to which, the term splendor was employed (Tosafot). If a mourner, who is clearly pained and preoccupied, is obligated to recite Shema, then certainly all others who are preoccupied, even one whose ship sank at sea, whose loss was merely monetary (Birkat Hashem), should be obligated. Why, then, is a groom exempted because of his preoccupation and one who lost his property is not?

⁵⁰¹ The Gemara answers: Nevertheless, there is a distinction between the cases. For there, in the case of a groom, he is preoccupied with the preoccupation of a mitzva that he must perform; here, in the case of a ship lost at sea, he is preoccupied with the preoccupation of a voluntary act that he chooses to perform.

⁵⁰² Here, the Gemara returns to its initial question: And how do Beit Shammai explain the passage: "When you walk along the way" (Rashash)?

⁵⁰³ The Gemara answers: Beit Shammai need this passage in order to exclude one who is on the path to perform a mitzva from the obligation to recite Shema.

⁵⁰⁴ Beit Hillel also agree that one engaged in the performance of a mitzva is exempt from reciting Shema? If so, the halakha that they derived from: When you walk along the way lacks a source and is therefore unfounded. And Beit Hillel say: Derive from this halakha itself that one who is not an agent in the performance of a mitzva recites Shema even along the way.

⁵⁰⁵ The Sages taught in a baraita that Beit Hillel say: One may recite Shema in any situation: Standing and reciting, sitting and reciting, reclining and reciting, walking and reciting and even working and reciting. And in the Tosefta an incident is related where two tanna'im, Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, who were both disciples of Beit Hillel, were reclining at a meal in one place together with their students, and Rabbi Yishmael was reclined as was the customary dining position, and Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya was upright. When the time to recite the evening Shema arrived, Rabbi Elazar reclined to recite Shema in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai, while Rabbi Yishmael sat upright to recite Shema. Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya appeared to take offense, and said to Rabbi Yishmael: Yishmael, my brother, I will tell you a parable to which this is similar. It is comparable to a situation where one to whom people say as a compliment: Your beard is full and suits you. That man says to them: May it be against those who shave and destroy their beards, i.e., the only reason I grow my beard is to irritate those who cut their own (Rashba). You are the same. As long as I am upright, you are reclined, and now when I reclined lauding your conduct and emulating you, you sat upright as if to demonstrate that whatever I do, you do the opposite.

⁵⁰⁶ Rabbi Yishmael said to him: I acted in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, according to whom one may recite Shema in any position, while you acted in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai. I am the one who acted in accordance with the halakha. And furthermore, I was concerned

lest the students see your conduct and establish the halakha for generations accordingly. It was therefore necessary for me to demonstrate that there is no obligation to do so.

⁵⁰⁷ The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of: And furthermore? Why was it necessary for Rabbi Yishmael to add additional justification for his actions when the reason that he acted in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel was sufficient?

⁵⁰⁸ The Gemara answers: It was necessary for him to add this reason, as if you say: Beit Hillel also hold that one is permitted to recite Shema while reclining and Rabbi Yishmael could have remained reclining even in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, but this only applies when one had already been reclining originally, in which case it is like any other position. However, here, since until now he had been upright, and now he is reclined, the students will say: Conclude from this, that they hold in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai. Due to the concern that the students might see and establish the halakha for generations in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai, it was necessary for Rabbi Yishmael to sit upright.

⁵⁰⁹ Rav Yehezkel taught: One who acted in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai has acted appropriately and is not in violation of the halakha. One who acted in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel acted appropriately as well. According to this opinion, Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai agree that one who acted in accordance with the opinion of the other fulfilled his obligation. Although the halakha was ruled in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, Beit Hillel would agree that one who acted in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai fulfilled his obligation.

⁵¹⁰ However, Rav Yosef said: One who acts in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai has done nothing and must repeat Shema in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, as we learned in the mishna with regard to the halakhot of a sukka: One who had his head and most of his body in the sukka, and his table upon which he was eating inside the house, Beit Shammai invalidate his action, as he is liable to be drawn after the table and end up eating outside the sukka. And Beit Hillel validate his action, since his head and most of his body remain inside the sukka.

⁵¹¹ Beit Hillel said to Beit Shammai as a proof: There was an incident where the elders of Beit Shammai and the elders of Beit Hillel went on Sukkot to visit Rabbi Yoḥanan ben HaḤōranit. They found him with his head and most of his body in the sukka and his table inside the house and they said nothing to him. In other words, even Beit Shammai did not object.

⁵¹² Beit Shammai said to them: And is there proof from there? That is not what happened, rather they said to him explicitly: If you have been accustomed to act in this manner, you have never in your life fulfilled the mitzva of sukka. We see that Beit Shammai held that anyone who did not act in accordance with their opinion, did not fulfill his obligation at all. Similarly, since Beit Hillel's opinion was accepted as halakha, anyone who acts in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai fails to fulfill his obligation.

⁵¹³ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak stated an even more extreme opinion: One who acted in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai has acted so egregiously that he is liable to receive the death penalty, as we learned in our mishna that Rabbi Tarfon said to his colleagues: Once, I was coming on the road when I stopped and reclined to recite Shema in accordance with the statement of Beit Shammai. Yet in so doing, I endangered myself due to the highwaymen who accost travelers. The Sages said to him: You deserved to be in a position where you were liable to pay with your life, as you transgressed the statement of Beit Hillel.

⁵¹⁴ MISHNA: From the laws of the recitation of Shema itself, the mishna proceeds to discuss the blessings recited in conjunction with Shema. Here, the order is established: In the morning when reciting Shema, one recites two blessings beforehand, the first on the radiant lights and the second the blessing on the love of Torah, and one thereafter, which begins with: True and Firm [emet veyatziv]. And in the evening one recites two blessings beforehand, on the radiant lights and on the love of God, and two thereafter, the blessing of redemption: True and Faithful [emet ve'emuna], and the blessing: Help us lie down. With regard to the blessing: True and Faithful, whether one recites it in its long formula and whether one recites it in its short formula, he fulfills his obligation (Tosafot).

⁵¹⁵ However, the general principle is: Where the Sages said to recite a long blessing, one may not shorten it, and so too, wherever they said to recite a short blessing, one may not lengthen it. Where the Sages said that a blessing must conclude with a second blessing at the end, he may not fail to conclude with that blessing. Similarly, if the Sages said that a blessing must not conclude with a second blessing, one may not conclude with a blessing.

⁵¹⁶ GEMARA: The Gemara begins by determining the formula of the two blessings preceding the morning Shema. The Gemara asks: What blessing does one recite?

⁵¹⁷ Rabbi Ya'akov said in the name of Rabbi Oshaya: The blessing focuses on the verse:

⁵¹⁸ "Who forms light and creates darkness, Who makes peace and creates evil, I am the Lord Who does all these things" (Isaiah 45:7).

⁵¹⁹ With regard to this formula of the blessing, the Gemara asks: Let him say the following formula instead: Who forms light and creates brightness, so as not to mention darkness, which has negative connotations.

⁵²⁰ The Gemara answers: We say the blessing as the verse is written in the Bible and do not alter the formula that appears in the verse.

⁵²¹ The Gemara strongly objects: But if so, what about the continuation of the verse: "Who makes peace and creates evil"? Do we say this blessing as it is written in the Bible? Rather, it is written evil and we euphemistically recite the blessing all things to avoid mention of evil. Here, too, let us euphemistically say brightness instead of darkness.

⁵²² Rather, Rava said: The reason we recite: "Who creates darkness" is in order to mention the attribute of day at night and the attribute of night during the day, and thereby unify day and night as different parts of a single entity.

⁵²³ The Gemara continues and asks: Granted, the attribute of night is mentioned during the day, as we say: Who forms light and creates darkness, but where do you find the attribute of day mentioned at night? In the blessing over the radiant lights recited at night there is no mention of "Who forms light."

⁵²⁴ Abaye said: Nevertheless, the attribute of day is mentioned at night in the words: Rolling away light before the darkness and darkness before the light.

⁵²⁵ The Gemara asks: And what is the formula of the other blessing recited before Shema? Rav Yehuda said in the name of Shmuel: An abounding love [ahava rabba]. And Rabbi Elazar instructed his son, Rabbi Pedat, to also say: An abounding love.

⁵²⁶ That was also taught in a baraita: One does not recite: An eternal love [ahavat olam]; rather, one recites: An abounding love. And the Rabbis say that one recites: An eternal love, and so it says: “And an eternal love I have loved you, therefore I have drawn you with kindness” (Jeremiah 31:3).

⁵²⁷ The blessing: An abounding love, is about God’s love for us and includes praise for His giving us the Torah. Therefore, Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: One who arose to study, until he recites Shema he must recite a special blessing over the Torah. If he already recited Shema he need not recite that blessing, as he has exempted himself by reciting the blessing of: An abounding love, which includes the components of the blessing over the Torah.

⁵²⁸ Having mentioned the blessing recited over Torah, the Gemara focuses on a dispute over what constitutes Torah in terms of requiring a blessing. Rav Huna said: For the study of Bible, one must recite a blessing, as it is the word of God, and for halakhic midrash, the derivation of halakhot from verses, one need not recite a blessing.

⁵²⁹ And Rabbi Elazar said: For Bible and midrash, which includes halakhot derived from verses themselves, one must recite a blessing; for Mishna, which is only comprised of halakhic rulings issued by the Sages, one need not recite a blessing.

⁵³⁰ And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even for Mishna, which includes final, binding halakhic rulings, one must recite a blessing as well, but for Talmud, which comprises a study of the Mishna and the rationales for its rulings, one need not recite a blessing.

⁵³¹ And Rava said: Even for Talmud, which is the means to analyze the significance of the halakhot, and is the only form of Torah study that leads one to its true meaning, one must recite a blessing.

⁵³² This statement is supported by the practical halakha derived from observation of Rav’s practice. His student, Rav Ḥiyya bar Ashi, said: Many times I stood before Rav to study our chapter in the Sifra, also known as Torat Kohanim, the halakhic midrash on Leviticus, of the school of Rav, and I saw that Rav would first wash his hands, then recite a blessing, and only then he would teach us our chapter. This demonstrates that even before their study of Torat Kohanim, which, due to Rav’s explanation of the reasons behind the halakhot, was the equivalent of studying Talmud, one must recite a blessing.

⁵³³ The Gemara clarifies: What formula of blessings does he recite? There is a dispute over the formula of the blessings as well. Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: The formula of this blessing is like the standard formula for blessings recited over other mitzvot: Blessed are You, Lord our God, King of the universe, Who sanctified us with his mitzvot and commanded us to engage in matters of Torah.

⁵³⁴ And Rabbi Yoḥanan concludes the blessing by adding the following: Lord our God, make the words of Your Torah sweet in our mouths and in the mouths of Your people, the house of Israel, so that we and our descendants and the descendants of Your people, the house of Israel, may be those who know Your name and engage in Your Torah. Blessed are You, Lord, Who teaches Torah to His people Israel.

⁵³⁵ And Rav Hamnuna said an additional formula: Who has chosen us from all the peoples and given us His Torah. Blessed are You, Lord, Giver of the Torah. With regard to this formula, Rav Hamnuna said: This concise blessing is the most outstanding of all the blessings over the Torah, as it combines thanks to God for giving us the Torah as well as acclaim for the Torah and for Israel.

⁵³⁶ Since several formulas for the blessing over Torah were suggested, each with its own distinct advantage, the Gemara concludes: Therefore, let us recite them all as blessings over the Torah.

⁵³⁷ The Gemara returns to dealing with the blessings that accompany Shema, and describes the practice in the Temple. We learned there, in a mishna in tractate Tamid: In the morning the deputy High Priest appointed to oversee activity in the Temple, said to the priests who were members of the priestly watch [mishmar] on duty that week: Recite a single blessing. The members of the priestly watch recited a blessing, and read the Ten Commandments, Shema, VeHaya im Shamo'a and VaYomer, the standard recitation of Shema. Additionally, they blessed the people with three blessings. These blessings were: True and Firm, the blessing of redemption recited after Shema; Avoda, service, the special blessing recited over God's acceptance of the sacrifices with favor, similar to the blessing of Temple Service recited in the Amida prayer; and the priestly benediction, recited in the form of a prayer without the outstretched hands that usually accompany that blessing (Tosafot). And on Shabbat one blessing is added to bless the outgoing priestly watch, as the watch serving in the Temple was replaced on Shabbat.

⁵³⁸ Certain details in this mishna are not sufficiently clear. First, what is the single blessing that the deputy High Priest instructed the guards to recite? The Gemara relates: It is like the incident where Rabbi Abba and Rabbi Yosei bar Abba happened to visit a certain unnamed place, and the people there asked them: What is the single blessing mentioned in the mishna? They did not have an answer readily available. So they came and asked Rav Mattana, and he too did not have an answer readily available. They came and asked Rav Yehuda, and he told them: Shmuel said as follows: An abounding love is the single blessing recited by the priestly watch.

⁵³⁹ Rabbi Zerika said that Rabbi Ami said that Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said a different answer: This single blessing is: Who creates light. That was how Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish's statement was received in Babylonia, yet when Rav Yitzhak bar Yosef came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that this halakha was not a direct quote of a statement by Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish. That which Rabbi Zerika said was not stated explicitly by Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish, but rather it was inferred from another statement. As Rabbi Zerika said that Rabbi Ami said that Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: From the expression: Recite a single blessing, in the mishna in tractate Tamid, it follows that failure to recite one of the blessings recited before Shema does not prevent one from reciting the other. This means that if only one of the blessings was recited, the obligation to recite that blessing was fulfilled, as the two blessings are not mutually dependent.

⁵⁴⁰ The conclusion was drawn from Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish's statement that he held that the single blessing recited was: Who creates light. The considerations that led the Sages to that conclusion were: Granted, if you say that they would recite: Who creates light, then the conclusion of Reish Lakish, that failure to recite one of the blessings recited before Shema does not prevent one from reciting the other, is understandable, as they recited: Who creates light, and did not recite: An abounding love, and they nonetheless fulfilled their obligation.

⁵⁴¹ However, if you say that they would omit: Who creates light, and would recite: An abounding love, on what basis would you conclude that failure to recite one of the blessings recited before Shema does not prevent one from reciting the other? In that case, one could offer another reason why only a single blessing is recited. Perhaps the fact that they did not recite: Who creates light was because the time for the recitation of: Who creates light, had not yet arrived, as the sun had yet to

rise. The blessings of the priestly watch are recited in the early morning hours, long before sunrise. However, afterward, when the time to recite: Who creates light arrived, they would recite it. From the conclusion drawn by Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish, that failure to recite one of the blessings recited before Shema does not prevent one from reciting the other, it is clear that the blessing recited by the members of the priestly watch was: Who creates light.

⁵⁴² As this deductive reasoning seems coherent and convincing, the Gemara asks: And if this halakha is based on inference, and not on an explicit statement, what of it? There seems to be no other way to interpret Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish's statement.

⁵⁴³ The Gemara answers: If this conclusion were based on an inference, one could say that actually they recited: An abounding love, and when the time to recite: Who creates light arrived, they would recite it. In that case, what is the meaning of: Failure to recite one of the blessings recited before Shema does not prevent one from reciting the other? Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish meant that failure to recite the correct order of the blessings does not prevent one from fulfilling his obligation. Even if one recites: An abounding love before: Who creates light, he fulfills his obligation. Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish did not refer to a case where only one of the blessings was recited. Consequently, one cannot infer from his statement his opinion regarding the identity of the single blessing.

⁵⁴⁴ The Gemara related above that the priests in the Temple read the Ten Commandments, along with the sections of Shema, VeHaya im Shamo'a, VaYomer, True and Firm, Avoda, and the priestly benediction.

⁵⁴⁵ Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: Even in the outlying areas, outside the Temple, they sought to recite the Ten Commandments in this manner every day, as they are the basis of the Torah (Rambam), but they had already abolished recitation of the Ten Commandments due to the grievance of the heretics, who argued that the entire Torah, with the exception of the Ten Commandments, did not emanate from God (Jerusalem Talmud). If the Ten Commandments were recited daily, that would lend credence to their claim, so their recitation was expunged from the daily prayers.

⁵⁴⁶ That was also taught in a baraita that Rabbi Natan says: In the outlying areas, they sought to recite the Ten Commandments in this manner, but they had already abolished their recitation due to the grievance of the heretics.

⁵⁴⁷ The Gemara relates that several Sages sought to reinstitute recitation of the Ten Commandments, as Rabba bar bar Hana thought to institute this in the city of Sura, but Rav Hisha said to him: They already abolished them due to the grievance of the heretics.

⁵⁴⁸ So too, Ameimar thought to institute this in the city of Neharde'a. Rav Ashi, the most prominent of the Sages in that generation, said to him: They already abolished them due to the grievance of the heretics.

⁵⁴⁹ We learned in a mishna in tractate Tamid that on Shabbat a single blessing is added to bless the outgoing priestly watch. The Gemara asks: What is that single blessing? Rabbi Hila said: As they finished their service, the outgoing priestly watch would say to the incoming priestly watch: May He who caused His Name to dwell in this house cause love and brotherhood, peace and camaraderie to dwell among you.

⁵⁵⁰ We learned in the mishna: Where the Sages said to recite a long blessing, one may not shorten it, and vice-versa. The Gemara proceeds to address a particular problem arising from conclusions drawn

from this mishna. Before addressing the primary problem, however, a simpler, secondary issue is raised: Obviously, in a case where one took a cup of wine in his hand and thought it was beer, and began reciting the blessing thinking it was beer, i.e., he intended to recite the appropriate blessing on beer: By Whose word all things came to be, and upon realizing that it was wine, he concluded the blessing with that which is recited over wine: Who creates the fruit of the vine, he fulfilled his obligation. In that case, even had he recited: By Whose word all things came to be, as he originally intended, he would have fulfilled his obligation, as we learned in a mishna: If one recited the general blessing: By Whose word all things came to be, over all food items, he fulfilled his obligation after the fact, even if ab initio another blessing was instituted to recite before eating that food. Therefore, if he reconsidered and concluded the blessing with the ending of the blessing over wine, he fulfilled his obligation.

⁵⁵¹ However in a case where one took a cup of beer in his hand and thought it was wine, and began reciting the blessing thinking it was wine, meaning he intended to recite: Who creates the fruit of the vine, and upon realizing that it was beer he concluded the blessing with that which is recited over beer: By Whose word all things came to be, what is the halakha?

⁵⁵² Ostensibly, this blessing is comprised of two sections. The first section, during which he intended to recite: Who creates the fruit of the vine, cannot fulfill his obligation as it is an inappropriate blessing to recite over beer. However, in the second section he recited: By Whose word all things came to be, the appropriate blessing. The dilemma, then, is: Do we follow the essence of the blessing, the first section, or do we follow the conclusion of the blessing?

⁵⁵³ Come and hear a proof from what was taught in a baraita with regard to a similar case: If, in the morning prayer, one began the blessings prior to the recitation of Shema appropriately with: Who creates light, and concluded with the formula of the evening prayer: Who brings on evenings, he did not fulfill his obligation. However, if one did the opposite, and commenced with: Who brings on evenings, and concluded with: Who creates light, he fulfilled his obligation.

⁵⁵⁴ Similarly, if, in the evening prayer, one commenced the recitation of Shema with: Who brings on evenings and concluded with: Who creates light, he did not fulfill his obligation. If one commenced with: Who creates light and concluded with: Who brings on evenings, he fulfilled his obligation.

⁵⁵⁵ The baraita summarizes that the general principle is: Everything follows the conclusion of the blessing. Based on this principle, the question with regard to a blessing recited over food and drink posed above can be resolved.

⁵⁵⁶ This proof is rejected: There, in the case of the blessing recited over the radiant lights, it is different, as one recites: Blessed...Who forms the radiant lights, and similarly, in the evening one recites: Blessed...Who brings on evenings. Since these are long blessings that conclude with a second blessing summarizing their content, one could assert that everything follows the conclusion. However, in the case of short blessings, such as: By Whose word all things came to be, or: Who creates the fruit of the vine, ostensibly, if there is a problem with the first part of the blessing, the entire blessing is nullified.

⁵⁵⁷ The distinction between the blessing recited over the radiant lights and the blessings recited over food and drink stems from the assumption that the conclusion: Blessed...Who fashions the radiant lights, is a complete, independent blessing. However, this is not necessarily so. This works out well according to Rav, who said: Any blessing that does not include mention of God's name is not

considered a blessing, and since: Who creates light, includes God's name, it constitutes a complete, independent blessing. That works out well. However, according to Rabbi Yoḥanan, who said: Any blessing that does not include mention of God's sovereignty, i.e., our God, King of the universe, is not considered a blessing, what can be said to distinguish between the conclusion of the blessings over food and drink and the blessing over the radiant lights? Since the conclusion: Who creates light, does not mention God's sovereignty, it does not constitute a complete, independent blessing.

⁵⁵⁸ The Gemara responds: Rather, Rabbi Yoḥanan also holds that the blessing over the radiant lights is a complete blessing. Since Rabba bar Ulla said: Who creates darkness, is mentioned during the day and: Rolling away the light before the darkness, is mentioned at night in order to mention the attribute of day at night and the attribute of night in the day, the beginning of the blessing in which God's sovereignty is mentioned day and night is appropriate to both day and night, and when one recites the blessing with God's name and mentions God's sovereignty at the beginning of the blessing, it refers to both day and night. Therefore, no proof can be cited from the blessing over the radiant lights to the blessings recited over food and drink.

⁵⁵⁹ The Gemara attempts to cite an additional proof: Come and hear another solution based on what we learned in the latter clause of the baraita cited above: The general principle is: Everything follows the conclusion of the blessing. What does the phrase: The general principle is, come to include beyond the detailed example cited in the baraita? Does it not come to include the case that we stated, that both in the case of a long blessing and the case of a short blessing, the conclusion of the blessing is the determining factor?

⁵⁶⁰ The Gemara rejects this: No, the principle is cited to include a case of bread and dates. The Gemara clarifies: What are the circumstances of the dilemma with regard to the blessings on these food items? If you say that it is a case where one ate bread and thought that he ate dates, and commenced reciting the blessing thinking it was dates; then, upon realizing that it was bread, he concluded the blessing with that which is recited over bread, isn't that our dilemma, as this case is identical to the one involving wine and beer?

⁵⁶¹ The Gemara answers: No; this general principle is only necessary to teach a special case, where one ate dates and thought that he ate bread, and commenced reciting the blessing thinking they were bread. Upon realizing that they were dates, he concluded the blessing with that which is recited over dates. In that case he fulfilled his obligation, as even had he concluded the blessing with that which is recited over bread, he would have fulfilled his obligation.

⁵⁶² What is the reason that had he concluded with the blessing recited over bread he would have fulfilled his obligation to recite a blessing over dates? This is because dates also provide a person sustenance. While ab initio one should not recite the blessing for bread over dates, after the fact, if one did so, he fulfilled his obligation. It is with regard to this particular situation that the baraita established the principle: Everything follows the conclusion of the blessing. Ultimately, the dilemma regarding a blessing with an inappropriate opening and an appropriate conclusion remains unresolved. The Gemara proceeds to discuss the formula for the blessings recited along with Shema.

⁵⁶³ Rabba bar Ḥinnana Sava said in the name of Rav: One who did not recite: True and Firm [emet veyatziv] at the beginning of the blessing of redemption that follows Shema in the morning prayer, and: True and Trustworthy [emet ve'emuna] in the evening prayer, he did not fulfill his obligation. An allusion to the difference in formulation between morning and evening is, as it is stated: "To

declare Your kindness in the morning and Your faith in the nights” (Psalms 92:3). In the morning, one must mention God’s loving-kindness, while in the evening one is required to emphasize the aspect of faith.

⁵⁶⁴ And Rabba bar Hinnana Sava said in the name of Rav: One who is praying, when he bows in the appropriate places, he bows when he says: Blessed, and when he subsequently stands upright, he stands upright when he says God’s name.

⁵⁶⁵ Shmuel, who was Rav’s colleague and significantly outlived him, said: What is Rav’s reason for saying that one should stand upright at the mention of God’s name? As it is written: “The Lord, who raises the bowed” (Psalms 146:8); one stands upright at the mention of God’s name to recall that it is God who raises the bowed.

⁵⁶⁶ The Gemara raises an objection based on what we learned in praise of a priest: “And he was afraid before My name” (Malachi 2:5), indicating that one must be humbled and not upright before God’s name.

⁵⁶⁷ The Gemara responds: Is it written: At My name? Before My name, is written, meaning that one is humbled and bows prior to the mention of God’s name, when he says: Blessed.

⁵⁶⁸ The Gemara relates: Shmuel said to Hiyya bar Rav: Son of Torah, come and I will tell you a great saying that your father said. Your father said the following: When one bows, he bows when he says: Blessed, and when he stands upright, he stands upright when he says God’s name.

⁵⁶⁹ With regard to bowing, the Gemara relates: When Rav Sheshet bowed he bowed all at once, like a cane, without delay. When he stood upright he stood upright like a snake, lifting himself slowly, demonstrating that the awe of God was upon him in the manner that he bowed and stood upright (HaBoneh).

⁵⁷⁰ And, with regard to the formulation of the blessings, Rabba bar Hinnana Sava said in the name of Rav: Throughout the year a person prays and concludes the third blessing of the Amida prayer with: The holy God, and concludes the blessing regarding the restoration of justice to Israel with: King who loves righteousness and justice, with the exception of the ten days between Rosh HaShana and Yom Kippur, the Ten Days of Atonement. These days are comprised of Rosh HaShana, Yom Kippur, and the seven days in between, when one emphasizes God’s sovereignty, and so when he prays he concludes these blessings with: The holy King and: The King of justice, i.e., the King who reveals Himself through justice.

⁵⁷¹ In contrast, Rabbi Elazar said that one need not be exacting, and even if he said: The holy God during those ten days, he fulfilled his obligation, as it is stated: “And the Lord of Hosts is exalted through justice, and the holy God is sanctified through righteousness” (Isaiah 5:16). The Gemara explains: When is it appropriate to describe God with terms like: And the Lord of Hosts is exalted through justice? It is appropriate when God reveals Himself through justice, during the ten days between Rosh HaShana and Yom Kippur, yet the verse says: The holy God. This appellation sufficiently underscores God’s transcendence, and there is no need to change the standard formula.

⁵⁷² The Gemara asks: What is the conclusion that was reached about this halakha?

⁵⁷³ Here, too, opinions differ: Rav Yosef said in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar: There is no need to change the standard formula: The holy God and: King Who loves righteousness and

justice. Rabba said in accordance with the opinion of Rav: The holy King and: The King of justice. The Gemara concludes: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabba.

⁵⁷⁴ And Rabba bar Ḥinnana Sava said in the name of Rav: Anyone who can ask for mercy on behalf of another, and does not ask is called a sinner, as it is stated following Samuel's rebuke of the people: "As for me, far be it from me that I should transgress against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you, but I will teach you the good and the right way" (I Samuel 12:23). Had Samuel refrained from prayer, he would have committed a sin.

⁵⁷⁵ Rava said: If the one in need of mercy is a Torah scholar, it is insufficient to merely pray on his behalf. Rather, one must make himself ill worrying about him.

⁵⁷⁶ The Gemara seeks to clarify the source of this halakha. What is the reason that one must make oneself ill over a Torah scholar in need of mercy? If you say that it is because of what Saul said to his men, as it is written: "And there is none of you that is ill over me or tells unto me" (I Samuel 22:8), meaning that because Saul was a Torah scholar, it would have been appropriate for people to make themselves ill worrying about him; this is not an absolute proof. Perhaps a king is different, and excessive worry is appropriate in that case. Rather, proof that one must make oneself ill over a Torah scholar in need for mercy is from here: When David speaks of his enemies, Doeg and Ahitophel, who were Torah scholars, he says: "But for me, when they were sick, my clothing was sackcloth, I afflicted my soul with fasting" (Psalms 35:13). One must be concerned to the extent that he dresses in sackcloth and fasts for the recovery of a Torah scholar.

⁵⁷⁷ And Rabba bar Ḥinnana Sava said in the name of Rav: One who commits an act of transgression and is ashamed of it, all of his transgressions are forgiven. Shame is a sign that one truly despises his transgressions and that shame has the power to atone for his actions (Rabbi Yoshiyahu Pinto), as it is stated: "In order that you remember, and be embarrassed, and never open your mouth anymore, because of your shame, when I have forgiven you for all that you have done, said the Lord, God" (Ezekiel 16:63).

⁵⁷⁸ However this proof is rejected: Perhaps a community is different, as a community is forgiven more easily than an individual. Rather, proof that an individual ashamed of his actions is forgiven for his transgressions is cited from here, when King Saul consulted Samuel by means of a necromancer before his final war with the Philistines: "And Samuel said to Saul, why have you angered me to bring me up? And Saul said, I am very pained, and the Philistines are waging war against me, and God has removed Himself from me and answers me no more, neither by the hands of the prophets nor by dreams. And I call to you to tell me what to do" (I Samuel 28:15). Saul says that he consulted prophets and dreams, but he did not say that he consulted the Urim VeTummim.

⁵⁷⁹ The reason for this is because he killed all the residents of Nov, the city of priests, and because of this transgression Saul was ashamed to consult the Urim VeTummim, which was accomplished by means of a priest.

⁵⁸⁰ The Gemara concludes: And from where is it derived that Saul was pardoned by God in the heavens for his transgressions? As it is stated: "And Samuel said to Saul: Tomorrow you and your sons will be with me" (I Samuel 28:19). And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: With me does not only mean that they will die, but also means, in a statement that contains an aspect of consolation, that they will be in my company among the righteous in heaven, as Saul was pardoned for his transgressions.

⁵⁸¹ And the Rabbis say that proof that Saul was pardoned is derived from here, from what the Gibeonites said to David: “Let seven men of his sons be given to us and we will hang them up unto the Lord in the Giva of Saul, the chosen of the Lord” (II Samuel 21:6). Certainly the Gibeonites, who were furious at Saul, would not refer to him as the chosen of the Lord. Therefore, this phrase must be understood as having been spoken by a Divine Voice that emerged and said the chosen of the Lord, because Saul had been pardoned for his transgressions and included among the completely righteous. The Gemara returns to the primary focus of the chapter, the recitation of Shema.

⁵⁸² Rabbi Abbahu ben Zutarti said that Rabbi Yehuda bar Zevida said: The Sages sought to establish the blessings of Balaam that appear in the Torah portion of Balak, as part of the twice-daily recitation of Shema. And why did they not establish it there? Because extending Shema would place an encumbrance on the congregation, from which the Sages sought to refrain.

⁵⁸³ The Gemara seeks: Why did the Sages seek to add the blessings of Balaam in the first place? If you say that they did so because the exodus from Egypt is mentioned, as it is written therein: “God, who brought them forth out of Egypt, is like the horns of the wild ram” (Numbers 23:22), certainly mention of the Exodus is not unique to this Torah portion. Many other portions mention the exodus as well. Let us say the portion of usury (Leviticus 25:35–38) or the portion of weights (Leviticus 19:35–37), as the exodus from Egypt is written therein as well. In addition, they are brief and would not constitute an encumbrance on the congregation.

⁵⁸⁴ Rather, Rabbi Yosei bar Avin said: The reason the Sages sought to establish the portion of Balak as part of the recitation of Shema is because it is written therein: “He couched, He lay down like a lion and a lioness; who shall rouse Him? Those who bless You are blessed and those who curse You are cursed” (Numbers 24:9). This is reminiscent of what is said in Shema: When you lie down, and when you rise.

⁵⁸⁵ On this, the Gemara asks: And if it is important to include this as part of Shema because of this single verse, then let us say this verse and nothing more.

⁵⁸⁶ The Gemara rejects this: It is impossible to do this, as they learned through tradition that any portion that Moses, our teacher, divided, we too divide and read separately. However, a portion that Moses, our teacher, did not divide, we do not divide and read separately. And, as stated above, the Sages did not wish to institute the recitation of the entire portion of Balak to avoid placing an encumbrance on the congregation.

⁵⁸⁷ The Gemara continues: Why was the portion of ritual fringes established as part of the recitation of Shema when its content is unrelated to that of the preceding portions?

⁵⁸⁸ Rabbi Yehuda bar Ḥaviva said: The portion of ritual fringes was added because it includes five elements including the primary reason for its inclusion, the exodus from Egypt (Melo HaRo'im): The mitzva of ritual fringes, mention of the exodus from Egypt, the acceptance of the yoke of mitzvot, admonition against the opinions of the heretics, admonition against thoughts of the transgressions of licentiousness, and admonition against thoughts of idolatry.

⁵⁸⁹ The Gemara clarifies: Granted, these three are mentioned explicitly: The yoke of mitzvot is mentioned in the portion of ritual fringes, as it is written: “And you shall look upon them and remember all the mitzvot of the Lord and you shall do them” (Numbers 15:39). Ritual fringes are mentioned explicitly, as it is written: “And they will make for themselves ritual fringes” (Numbers

15:38). The exodus from Egypt is also mentioned explicitly, as it is written: “I am the Lord, your God, who took you out from the Land of Egypt” (Numbers 15:41). But where do we derive the other elements mentioned above: Admonition against the opinions of the heretics, admonition against thoughts of transgressions of licentiousness, and admonition against thoughts of idolatry?

⁵⁹⁰ In response, the Gemara cites a baraita where these elements were derived from allusions in the verse, “You shall stray neither after your hearts nor after your eyes, after which you would lust” (Numbers 15:39). As it was taught: “After your hearts” refers to following opinions of heresy that may arise in one’s heart. The Gemara offers a proof, as it is stated: “The fool said in his heart: ‘There is no God’; they have been corrupt, they have acted abominably; there is none who does good” (Psalms 14:1). The phrase: “After your eyes,” in this verse refers to following thoughts of transgressions of licentiousness, that a person might see and desire, as it is stated: “And Samson said to his father, ‘That one take for me, for she is upright in my eyes’” (Judges 14:3). The passage: “You shall stray after” refers to promiscuity, which in the parlance of the prophets is a metaphor for idol worship, as it is stated: “The children of Israel again went astray after the Be’alim” (Judges 8:33).

⁵⁹¹ MISHNA: It is a mitzva by Torah law to mention the exodus from Egypt at night, but some held that this mitzva was, like phylacteries or ritual fringes, fulfilled only during the day and not at night. For this reason it was decided: The exodus from Egypt is mentioned at night, adjacent to the recitation of Shema. Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya said: I am approximately seventy years old, and although I have long held this opinion, I was never privileged to prevail (Me’iri) and prove that there is a biblical obligation to fulfill the accepted custom (Ra’avad) and have the exodus from Egypt mentioned at night, until Ben Zoma interpreted it homiletically and proved it obligatory.

⁵⁹² Ben Zoma derived it as it is stated: “That you may remember the day you went out of the land of Egypt all the days of your life” (Deuteronomy 16:3). The days of your life, refers to daytime alone; however, the addition of the word all, as it is stated: All the days of your life, comes to add nights as well.

⁵⁹³ And the Rabbis, who posit that there is no biblical obligation to mention the exodus from Egypt at night, explain the word, all, differently and say: The days of your life, refers to the days in this world, all is added to include the days of the Messiah.

⁵⁹⁴ GEMARA: The fundamental dispute between Ben Zoma and the Sages appears in the mishna, and the baraita cites its continuation. Disputing the position of the Sages that: All the days of your life, refers to both this world and the days of the Messiah, it was taught in a baraita that Ben Zoma said to the Sages: And is the exodus from Egypt mentioned in the days of the Messiah? Was it not already said that Jeremiah prophesied that in the days of the Messiah: “Behold, days are coming, says the Lord, that they will no longer say: The Lord lives Who brought up the children of Israel out of the Land of Egypt. Rather: As the Lord lives, that brought up and led the seed of the house of Israel up out of the north country and from all the countries where I had driven them” (Jeremiah 23:7–8).

⁵⁹⁵ The Sages rejected this claim and they said to him that these verses do not mean that in the future the exodus from Egypt will be uprooted from its place and will be mentioned no more. Rather, redemption from the subjugation of the kingdoms will be primary and the exodus from Egypt will be secondary.

⁵⁹⁶ On a similar note, you say: The meaning of the expressions: It will not say, and they will no longer mention, are not absolute, as in the verse: “Your name shall no longer be called Jacob; rather, Israel will be your name” (Genesis 35:10). There, too, the meaning is

⁵⁹⁷ not that the name Jacob will be entirely uprooted from its place, but that the name Israel will be the primary name to which the name Jacob will be secondary, as the Torah continues to refer to him as Jacob after this event. And it also says that the ultimate redemption will overshadow the previous redemption in the verse: “Do not remember the former events, and do not ponder things of old” (Isaiah 43:18), and the Gemara explains: “Do not remember the former events,” that is the subjugation to the kingdoms, and “do not ponder things of old,” that is the exodus from Egypt, which occurred before the subjugation to the nations.

⁵⁹⁸ With regard to the following verse: “Behold, I will do new things, now it will spring forth” (Isaiah 43:19), Rav Yosef taught a baraita: This refers to the future war of Gog and Magog, which will cause all earlier events to be forgotten.

⁵⁹⁹ The Gemara cites a parable: To what is this comparable? To a person who was walking along the way and a wolf accosted him and he survived it, and he continued to relate the story of the wolf. A lion accosted him and he survived it, and he continued to relate the story of the lion. A snake accosted him and he survived it, he forgot both the lion and the wolf, and he continued to relate the story of the snake. Each encounter was more dangerous and each escape more miraculous than the last, so he would continue to relate the most recent story. So too with Israel; more recent troubles cause the earlier troubles to be forgotten.

⁶⁰⁰ Having mentioned the changing of Jacob’s name, the Gemara addresses the changing of the names of Abraham and Sarah. What is the meaning of changing Abram’s name to Abraham? As it is stated: “Abram is Abraham” (I Chronicles 1:27).

⁶⁰¹ The Gemara explains: Initially he became a father, a minister, and prominent person, only to Aram, so he was called Abram, father [av] of Aram, and ultimately with God’s blessing he became the father of the entire world, so he was called Abraham, father of the masses [av hamon], as it is stated: “I have made you the father of a multitude of nations” (Genesis 17:5).

⁶⁰² Similarly, what is the meaning of changing Sarai’s name to Sarah? The same concept applies to Sarai as to Abram: Sarai is Sarah.”

⁶⁰³ The Gemara explains: Initially she was a princess only to her nation: My princess [Sarai], but ultimately she became Sarah, a general term indicating that she was princess for the entire world.

⁶⁰⁴ Also, with regard to Abraham’s name, bar Kappara taught: Anyone who calls Abraham Abram transgresses a positive mitzva, as it is stated: “And your name will be Abraham” (Genesis 17:5). This is a positive mitzva to refer to him as Abraham. Rabbi Eliezer says: One who calls Abraham Abram transgresses a negative mitzva, as it is stated: “And your name shall no longer be called Abram, and your name will be Abraham, for I have made you the father of a multitude of nations” (Genesis 17:5).

⁶⁰⁵ The Gemara asks: But if we consider these obligatory statements, then from here we must infer that one who calls Sarah Sarai also transgresses a positive or negative mitzva.

⁶⁰⁶ The Gemara answers: There in the case of Sarah, it is not a general mitzva, rather the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Abraham alone: “And God said to Abraham, your wife Sarai, you shall not

call her name Sarai; rather, Sarah is her name” (Genesis 17:15). In contrast, this is stated regarding Abraham in general terms: “Your name shall no longer be called Abram.”

⁶⁰⁷ Again, the Gemara asks: But if that is so, one who calls Jacob Jacob, about whom it is written: “Your name shall no longer be Jacob, but Israel” (Genesis 32:29), also transgresses a mitzva.

⁶⁰⁸ The Gemara answers: It is different there, as the verse reverts back and God Himself refers to Jacob as Jacob, as it is written before his descent to Egypt: “And God said to Israel in the visions of the night, and said, Jacob, Jacob, and he said, ‘Here I am’” (Genesis 46:2).

⁶⁰⁹ Rabbi Yosei bar Avin, and some say Rabbi Yosei bar Zevida, raised an objection to the statements of bar Kappara and Rabbi Eliezer based on what is said in the recounting of the history of the Jewish people: “You are the Lord, God, Who chose Abram and took him out of Ur Kasdim and made his name Abraham” (Nehemiah 9:7). Here the Bible refers to him as Abram.

⁶¹⁰ The Gemara responds: There, the prophet is recounting God’s praises, including that which was the situation originally, before his name was changed to Abraham. Indeed, the verse continues: “You took him out of Ur Kasdim and made his name Abraham, and found his heart faithful before You and made a covenant with him to give him the land of Canaan...to give to his descendants, and You fulfilled Your words for You are righteous” (Nehemiah 9:7–8).

Chapter 2

¹ MISHNA: The first question discussed in the mishna is the question of intent. One who was reading the sections of the Torah which comprise Shema, and the time for the recitation of the morning or evening Shema arrived, if he focused his heart, he fulfilled his obligation and need not repeat Shema in order to fulfill his obligation. This is true even if he failed to recite the requisite blessings (Rabbeinu Hānanel).

² Ab initio, one may not interrupt the recitation of Shema. The tanna’im, however, disagree over how strict one must be in this regard. They distinguish between interruptions between paragraphs and interruptions within each paragraph. At the breaks between paragraphs, one may greet an individual due to the respect that he is obligated to show him, and one may respond to another’s greeting due to respect. And in the middle of each paragraph one may greet an individual due to the fear that the individual may harm him if he fails do so (Me’iri) and one may respond to another’s greeting due to fear. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir.

³ Rabbi Yehuda says: There is a distinction between greeting someone and responding to his greeting. In the middle of each paragraph, one may greet another due to fear and respond due to respect. In the breaks between paragraphs, one may greet another due to respect and respond with a greeting to any person who greets him, whether or not he is obligated to show him respect.

⁴ As for what constitutes a paragraph, these are the breaks between the paragraphs: Between the first blessing and the second, between the second and Shema, between Shema and the second paragraph: If you indeed heed My commandments [VeHaya im Shamoā], between VeHaya im Shamoā and the third paragraph: And the Lord spoke [VaYomer] and between VaYomer and True and Firm [emet veyatziv], the blessing that follows Shema.

⁵ The Rabbis held that each blessing and each paragraph of Shema constitutes its own entity, and treat interruptions between them as between the paragraphs. Rabbi Yehuda, however, says: Between VaYomer and emet veyatziv, which begins the blessing that follows Shema, one may not interrupt at all. According to Rabbi Yehuda, these must be recited consecutively.

⁶ Since the paragraphs of Shema are not adjacent to one another in the Torah, and they are not recited in the order in which they appear, the mishna explains their placement. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa said: Why, in the mitzva of the recitation of Shema, did the portion of Shema precede that of VeHaya im Shamo? This is so that one will first accept upon himself the yoke of the kingdom of Heaven, the awareness of God and God's unity, and only then accept upon himself the yoke of the mitzvot, which appears in the paragraph of VeHaya im Shamo. Why did VeHaya im Shamo precede VaYomer? Because the paragraph of VeHaya im Shamo is practiced both by day and by night, while VaYomer, which discusses the mitzva of ritual fringes, is only practiced during the day.

⁷ GEMARA: We learned in the mishna that one must focus his heart while reading the portion of Shema in the Torah in order to fulfill his obligation. From here, the Gemara seeks to conclude: Learn from this that mitzvot require intent, when one performs a mitzva, he must intend to fulfill his obligation. If he lacks that intention, he does not fulfill his obligation. With that statement, this Gemara hopes to resolve an issue that is raised several times throughout the Talmud.

⁸ The Gemara rejects this conclusion: What is the meaning of: If one focused his heart? It means that one had the intention to read. The Gemara attacks this explanation: How can you say that it means that one must have intention to read? Isn't he already reading? The case in the mishna refers to a person who is reading from the Torah. Therefore, focused his heart must refer to intention to perform a mitzva.

⁹ The Gemara rejects this: Perhaps the mishna speaks of one who is reading the Torah not for the purpose of reciting the words, but in order to emend mistakes in the text. Therefore, if he focused his heart and intended to read the words and not merely emend the text, he fulfills his obligation. He need not have the intention to fulfill his obligation.

¹⁰ The Sages taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and the Rabbis disagreed with regard to the language in which Shema must be recited. This dispute serves as an introduction to a broader analysis of the question of intent: Shema must be recited as it is written, in Hebrew, this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. And the Rabbis say: Shema may be recited in any language.

¹¹ The Gemara seeks to clarify: What is the reason for Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's opinion? The Gemara answers: The source for his halakha lies in the emphasis on the word: "And these words, which I command you this day, will be upon your heart" (Deuteronomy 6:6). "Will be" means as they are, so shall they be; they should remain unchanged, in their original language.

¹² The Gemara seeks to clarify further: And what is the reason for the Rabbis' opinion? The Gemara answers: The source upon which the Rabbis base their opinion is, as it is stated: "Hear, Israel" (Deuteronomy 6:4), which they understand to mean that Shema must be understood. Therefore, one may recite Shema in any language that you can hear and understand.

¹³ The Gemara explains how Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and the Rabbis each contend with the source cited by the other. And according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, isn't it also stated: "Hear, Israel"? How does he explain this verse? The Gemara responds: He requires this verse in order to derive a different

halakha: Make your ears hear what your mouth utters, i.e., one must recite Shema audibly so he hears it while reciting it.

¹⁴ And from where do the Rabbis derive that one must recite Shema audibly? The Rabbis do not accept the literal interpretation of the word Shema; rather, they hold in accordance with the one who said: One who recited Shema in a manner inaudible to his own ears, fulfilled his obligation.

¹⁵ The Gemara asks: And according to the Rabbis, isn't it also written: "And they will be"? How do the Sages explain that emphasis in the verse? The Gemara answers: They, too, require this expression to derive that one may not recite Shema out of order. One may not begin reciting Shema from the end, but only in the order in which it is written.

¹⁶ And from where does Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi derive the halakha that one may not recite Shema out of order? The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi derives it from an additional emphasis in the verse: "And the words [hadevarim], which I command you this day, will be upon your heart." The verse could have conveyed the same idea had it written: Words [devarim], without the definite article. However, it says the words [hadevarim], employing the definite article, emphasizing that it must be recited in the specific order in which it is written. The Rabbis, however, do not derive anything from the fact that the words, with the definite article, was written in place of words, without the definite article.

¹⁷ The Gemara seeks to link this debate to another: Is that to say that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi holds that the entire Torah, i.e., any portion of the Torah which must be read publicly (Tosafot), or if one studies or reads the Torah in general (Me'iri), may be recited in any language? As if it should enter your mind to say that the entire Torah may only be recited in the holy tongue and not in any other, then why do I need that which the Torah wrote: "And they will be"? Prohibiting recitation of Shema in a language other than Hebrew is superfluous, if indeed one is prohibited from reciting any portion of the Torah in a language other than Hebrew. Since the Torah saw the need to specifically require Shema to be recited in Hebrew, it must be because the rest of the Torah may be recited in any language.

¹⁸ The Gemara rejects this: This is not necessarily so, as the phrase: And they will be is necessary in this case because Shema, hear, is also written. Had it not been for the phrase: And they will be, I would have understood hear, to allow Shema to be recited in any language, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. Therefore, and they will be, was necessary.

¹⁹ The Gemara attempts to clarify: Is that to say that the Rabbis hold that the entire Torah may only be recited in the holy tongue and not in any other? As if it should enter your mind to say that the Torah may be recited in any language, then why do I require that which the Torah wrote: Shema, hear? One is permitted to recite the entire Torah in any language, rendering a specific requirement regarding Shema superfluous.

²⁰ The Gemara rejects this: Shema is necessary in any case, because and they will be, is also written. Had it not been for Shema, I would have understood this in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, that one is prohibited from reciting Shema in any other language. Therefore, Shema, is necessary.

²¹ The interpretation of these verses is the source of a fundamental dispute concerning the obligation to recite Shema and the required intent during its recitation. The Rabbis taught: From: And they will

be, it is derived that one may not recite Shema out of order. From: These words...upon your heart, it is derived that they must be recited with intent. I might have thought that the entire paragraph requires intent? Therefore the verse teaches: These, to indicate that to this point, one must have intent, but from here on one need not have intent, and even if he recites the rest of Shema without intent he fulfills his obligation. This is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer.

²² Rabbi Akiva said to him: But the verse states:

²³ “Which I command you this day, will be upon your heart.” Surely the word these, does not come to limit the mitzva of intent. On the contrary, from here you derive that the entire portion requires intent.

²⁴ Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva; the entire portion requires intent.

²⁵ Some teach this halakha stated by Rabbi Yoḥanan with regard to that which was taught in a Tosefta, where there is a tannaitic dispute. The first tanna holds: One who recites Shema must focus his heart for the entire Shema. Rabbi Aḥa says in the name of Rabbi Yehuda: Once he focused his heart for the first paragraph alone, he no longer requires intent. With regard to this Tosefta, Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The halakha is in accordance with Rabbi Aḥa who said in the name of Rabbi Yehuda. While this differs from the previous version in form, it arrives at the same conclusion.

²⁶ It was taught in another baraita on this subject, which cited different opinions. From: And they will be, recited in Shema, it is derived that it may not be recited out of order. From: Upon your heart, Rav Zutra says: To this point, there is the mitzva of intent; from here on, beginning with the second paragraph, there is only the mitzva of recitation. Rabbi Yoshiya says that it means the opposite: To this point, there is the mitzva of recitation; from here on there is only the mitzva of intent.

²⁷ At first the Gemara understands that Rav Zutra required recitation only in the second paragraph, while in the first paragraph only intent was required. Therefore, the Gemara asks: What is different, that from here on, beginning with the second paragraph, there is the mitzva of recitation? Is it because it is written: “And you shall teach them to your children, to speak of them” (Deuteronomy 11:19)? This is no proof, as here too, in the first paragraph it is written: “And you shall speak of them.” The mitzva of recitation applies to the first paragraph as well.

²⁸ Rather, he is saying as follows: To this point there is the mitzva of both intent and recitation, but from here on, there is only the mitzva of recitation without intent.

²⁹ Again the Gemara asks: According to Rav Zutra, what is different, that to this point, in the first paragraph, there is the mitzva of both intent and recitation because there are two requirements in the first paragraph, as it is written: “Upon your heart...and you shall speak of them”? There, too, in the second paragraph it is also written: “And you shall place these words upon your heart...to speak of them,” indicating that intent is also required in that paragraph.

³⁰ The Gemara responds: That verse is necessary to derive that which was taught by Rabbi Yitzḥak, who said: “And you shall place these words” refers literally to the paragraphs of Shema found in the phylacteries. The verse teaches that the placement of the phylacteries of the arm must be opposite the heart.

³¹ The Gemara now attempts to clarify the second opinion in the baraita. The Master said, Rabbi Yoshiya says: To this point at the end of the first paragraph, there is the mitzva of recitation; from here on there is the mitzva of intent. The Gemara asks: What is different, that from here on, beginning with the second paragraph, there is the mitzva of intent? Is it because it is written in the second paragraph: “And you shall place these words upon your heart”? That is no proof, as here too, in the first paragraph it is written: “Upon your heart.”

³² The Gemara responds that he is saying as follows: To this point, there is the mitzva of both recitation and intent, but from here on, there is only the mitzva of intent without recitation.

³³ The Gemara continues: And what is different, that to this point, in the first paragraph, there is the mitzva of recitation and intent because there are two requirements, as it is written: Upon your heart as well as: And you shall speak of them? There, too, with regard to the second paragraph isn't it written: And you shall place these words upon your heart...and you shall teach them to your children, to speak of them?

³⁴ Rabbi Yoshiya responded: That verse refers to Torah study in general, not to the recitation of Shema in particular. And the Torah says the following: Teach your children Torah, that they will be well-versed in them.

³⁵ The Sages taught in another baraita with regard to one who recites Shema and utters the verse, “Hear, Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is One.” Intent of the heart is only required to this point. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rava said: In this matter, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir.

³⁶ It was taught in a baraita, Sumakhos says: One who extends his intonation of the word One [eḥad] while reciting Shema, is rewarded that his days and years are extended. Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: This is only true if he extends the letter dalet, so the word eḥad is sounded in its entirety. Rav Ashi said: This is only so long as one does not pronounce the letter ḥet hurriedly.

³⁷ The Gemara relates that Rabbi Yirmeya was seated before Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba. He saw that he was greatly extending his pronunciation of eḥad. He said to him: Once you have crowned Him in your thoughts over everything above, in Heaven, below, on earth, and in the four corners of the heavens, you need not extend any further.

³⁸ Rav Natan bar Mar Ukva said that Rav Yehuda said: One must recite upon your heart, while standing in one place. The Gemara is perplexed: Does it enter your mind that upon your heart alone must be recited while standing in one place? What distinguishes that phrase from the rest of Shema? Rather, say: One must recite until upon your heart while standing in one place. From here on, one need not stand in one place. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One must recite the entire first portion while standing in one place.

³⁹ The Gemara notes: Rabbi Yoḥanan is consistent and follows his reasoning expressed elsewhere, as Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Aḥa who said in the name of Rabbi Yehuda; one is required to recite the entire first paragraph of Shema with intent.

⁴⁰ The Sages taught in a baraita: The single verse, “Hear, Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is One”; this is Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's recitation of Shema. The Gemara relates: Rav said to his uncle, Rabbi Ḥiyya: I did not see Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi accept the kingship of Heaven upon himself,

meaning that he did not see him recite Shema. Rabbi Ḥiyya said to him: Son of noblemen [bar paḥtei], when Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi passed his hands over his face in the study hall in the middle of his lesson, he accepted the yoke of the kingdom of Heaven upon himself, as his Shema was comprised of a single verse.

⁴¹ Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's students and members of his household disputed: Does he complete Shema later or does he not complete it later? Bar Kappara says: He does not complete it later. Rabbi Shimon, son of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, says: He completes it later. Bar Kappara said to Rabbi Shimon, son of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi: Granted, according to my position, that I say that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi does not complete Shema later, that is why when he taught, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi would specifically seek a topic that included the exodus from Egypt, as by so doing he fulfills the mitzva to remember the Exodus; a mitzva that others fulfill in their recitation of the last paragraph of Shema. But according to you, who says that he completes his recitation of Shema later, why, when he teaches, would he specifically seek a topic that included the exodus from Egypt?

⁴² Rabbi Shimon responded: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi did so in order to mention the exodus from Egypt at its appointed time, during the time of the recitation of Shema.

⁴³ Based on this halakha, Rabbi Ila, son of Rav Shmuel bar Marta, said in the name of Rav: One who recited the verse, "Hear, Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is One," and was immediately overcome by sleep, fulfilled his obligation to recite Shema. Similarly, Rav Naḥman said to his slave, Daru: If you see that I have fallen asleep, bother me to recite the first verse, do not bother me to recite any more than that. Similarly, Rav Yosef said to Rav Yosef, son of Rabba: What would your father do? Rav Yosef, son of Rabba, said to him: He would exert himself not to fall asleep in order to recite the first verse, he would not exert himself to recite any more than that.

⁴⁴ Rav Yosef said: One who is lying [perakdan] on his back may not recite Shema, for lying that way is unbecoming. The Gemara asks: Is that to say that one may not recite Shema in this position, but to sleep lying in that position is permissible? Didn't Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi curse one who sleeps lying on his back?

⁴⁵ The Gemara answers: If one lies on his back while leaning slightly to the side, it is permissible. Nonetheless, to recite Shema in this position, even though he is leaning, is prohibited.

⁴⁶ The Gemara asks: Wouldn't Rabbi Yoḥanan lie on his back, lean slightly and recite Shema?

⁴⁷ The Gemara responds: The case of Rabbi Yoḥanan is different, because he was corpulent and it was difficult for him to read any other way.

⁴⁸ The mishna cited Rabbi Meir's statement: At the breaks between paragraphs, one may greet an individual due to the respect that he is obligated to show him, and may respond. And in the middle of each paragraph, one may greet an individual due to the fear that the individual may harm him if he fails to do so, and may respond.

⁴⁹ About this, the Gemara asks: He may respond due to what circumstance? If you say that one may respond due to respect; now that we learned that one may greet another due to respect, is it necessary to say that one may respond due to respect? Rather, it must be explained as follows: One may greet due to respect and respond with a greeting to any person. But if that is the case, say the latter clause of the mishna: In the middle of each paragraph one may greet due to fear and return another's greeting due to fear.

⁵⁰ Here too, it must be clarified: He may respond due to what circumstance? If you say that one may respond due to fear; now that we have learned that one may greet another due to fear, is it necessary to say that one may respond due to fear? Rather, it must mean that one may respond to another's greeting even due to honor. If so, that is identical to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as we learned in the mishna: In the middle of each paragraph, one may greet another due to fear and respond due to respect. At the breaks between paragraphs, one may greet another due to respect and respond with a greeting to any person. If so, what is the dispute between them?

⁵¹ The Gemara says: The mishna is incomplete; it is missing an important element, and it teaches the following: At the breaks between the paragraphs, one may greet due to respect, and, needless to say, he may respond due to respect. In the middle of each paragraph one may greet due to fear, and, needless to say, he may respond due to fear. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says: In the middle of each paragraph one may greet due to fear and respond due to respect.

⁵² And at the breaks between the paragraphs one may greet due to respect and respond with a greeting to any person. And if that is the case, the mishna is no longer difficult.

⁵³ The Gemara remarks: This version of the dispute was also taught in a baraita: One who is reciting Shema and happens upon his teacher or one who is greater than he, at the breaks between the paragraphs he may greet him due to respect and, needless to say, he may respond. And in the middle of each paragraph, he may greet another due to fear and, needless to say, he may respond. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says: In the middle of each paragraph one may greet due to fear and respond due to respect. And in the breaks between the paragraphs one may greet due to respect and respond with a greeting to any person. The proposed additions to the mishna appear in the version of the dispute cited in the baraita.

⁵⁴ Aḥai, the tanna who recited mishnayot in the school of Rabbi Ḥiyya, raised a dilemma before Rabbi Ḥiyya: May one interrupt during the recitation of hallel and the reading of the Megilla, Esther, to greet someone? Do we say that it is an a fortiori inference; if in the middle of Shema, which is a biblical obligation, one may interrupt in order to greet someone, all the more so, in the middle of hallel, which is a rabbinic obligation, one may interrupt? Or, perhaps, publicizing the miracle is more significant, so one may not interrupt hallel or the Megilla at all.

⁵⁵ Rabbi Ḥiyya said to him: One interrupts and it is of no concern. Rabba said: On days when the individual completes the entire hallel, i.e., the days on which there is a rabbinic obligation to recite hallel, an individual may interrupt between one paragraph and another; however, one may not interrupt in the middle of the paragraph. On days where the individual does not complete the entire hallel, i.e., days on which the recitation of hallel is merely a custom, not a rabbinic obligation, one may interrupt even in the middle of the paragraph.

⁵⁶ The Gemara questions this: It that so? Didn't Rav bar Shaba once happen to come before Ravina on one of the days when the individual does not complete the entire hallel, and Ravina did not interrupt his recitation of hallel to greet him?

⁵⁷ The Gemara responds: The case of Rav bar Shaba is different, as Rav bar Shaba was not considered important to Ravina. That is the reason that he did not interrupt his recitation of hallel to greet him.

⁵⁸ Having mentioned the dilemma raised by one of those who recite the mishnayot in the study hall, the Gemara cites that Ashyan, the tanna who recited mishnayot in the school of Rabbi Ami, raised a dilemma before Rabbi Ami: May one who is fasting taste the food that he is preparing to determine if it spiced properly? Did he accept upon himself to refrain from eating and drinking, and that is not eating and drinking; it is merely tasting? Or, perhaps, he accepted upon himself to refrain from deriving pleasure from food, and that is pleasure when he tastes.

⁵⁹ Rabbi Ami said to him: He tastes and it is of no concern. This was also taught in a baraita: Tasting a cooked dish does not require a blessing beforehand, and one who is fasting may taste and it is of no concern.

⁶⁰ The Gemara asks: How much may one who is fasting taste?

⁶¹ The Gemara responds: When Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi would fast, they would taste up to a quarter of a log.

⁶² Rav said: Anyone who greets another person in the morning before he prayed, it is as if he built an altar for idol worship, as it is stated: “Cease you from man, in whose nostrils there is breath, for how little is he to be accounted” (Isaiah 2:22). When one’s soul is breathed in through his nostrils in the morning (ge’onim) he should turn to no one other than God. And do not read it as it is written, bameh, how; but rather, read bama, altar.

⁶³ And Shmuel said: The word bameh should not be taken in anything other than its literal connotation. The verse must therefore be understood: How did you consider him so significant, that you gave him priority and not God? Certainly you should have honored God first.

⁶⁴ Rav Sheshet raises an objection: We learned in our mishna that in the breaks between the paragraphs one may greet an individual due to respect, and respond to another’s greeting due to respect, despite the fact that the recitation of Shema precedes the Amida prayer.

⁶⁵ Rabbi Abba explained this: The prohibition against greeting another in the morning refers specifically to when one sets out early to greet him at his door. If one simply happens to encounter another person, he is permitted to greet him.

⁶⁶ With regard to this same verse, Rabbi Yona said that Rabbi Zeira said: Anyone who tends to his own affairs before he prays, it is as though he built an altar. They said to Rabbi Yona: Did you say that it was as if one built an altar? Rabbi Yona responded to them: No; I said simply that it is prohibited.

⁶⁷ And as Rav Idi bar Avin said that Rav Yitzhak bar Ashyan said: A person is prohibited to attend to his own affairs before he prays, as it is stated: “Righteousness shall go before Him, and shall make His footsteps on a path” (Psalms 85:14). One should first pray and acknowledge the righteousness of his Creator, and only then should he set out on his way.

⁶⁸ And, Rav Idi bar Avin said that Rav Yitzhak bar Ashyan said: Anyone who first prays and only then sets out on his way, the Holy One, Blessed be He, tends to his affairs, as it is stated: “Righteousness shall go before Him, and shall make His footsteps on a path.” God will set righteousness before him and satisfy all his wishes, when he sets out on his way.

⁶⁹ Having mentioned his name, the Gemara tangentially cites what Rabbi Yona said that Rabbi Zeira said: One who goes seven nights without a dream, is called evil, as it is stated: “He who has it will abide satisfied [save’a], he will not be visited by evil” (Proverbs 19:23). Rabbi Yona reinterprets the

verse: Do not read save'a, satisfied, but sheva, seven. One who sleeps for seven nights without being visited by a dream, is called evil.

⁷⁰ Rav Aḥa, son of Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba, said to him: Rabbi Ḥiyya said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said as follows: Anyone who fills himself with matters of Torah and goes to sleep, they do not deliver evil tidings to him, as it is stated: "He who lies satisfied, will not be visited by evil."

⁷¹ We learned in the mishna: These are the breaks between the paragraphs at which one is permitted to interrupt under certain circumstances. According to the first tanna, one may interrupt between the last paragraph of Shema and the blessing that follows it, but Rabbi Yehuda prohibits this.

⁷² Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda who said that one may not interrupt between eloheikhem and emet veyatziv. Furthermore, Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: What is the reason for Rabbi Yehuda's opinion? This phrase evokes the verse as it is written:

⁷³ "And the Lord, God, is True" (Jeremiah 10:10).

⁷⁴ After the conclusion of the final paragraph of Shema along with the first word of the subsequent blessing, with the words: "The Lord, your God, is True [Hashem Eloheikhem emet]," the question is posed: Does one repeat emet when he begins the blessing of emet veyatziv, or does he not repeat emet?

⁷⁵ Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: He repeats emet. Rabba said: He does not repeat emet. The Gemara relates: This person who descended to lead the service before Rabba, Rabba heard that he said emet, emet twice. Rabba mocked him and said: Every emet, emet has caught this one; he must be passionate about the pursuit of truth.

⁷⁶ Rav Yosef said: How excellent is this tradition that I heard, as when Rav Shmuel bar Yehuda came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: In Eretz Yisrael, at the evening prayer they do not recite the entire third portion of Shema, which deals with ritual fringes, as there is no obligation to wear ritual fringes at night. Rather, they say a condensed version of that portion that includes an excerpt from the beginning and an excerpt from the end: "Speak to the children of Israel and say to them...I am the Lord, your God, True" (Numbers 15:38, Numbers 15:41).

⁷⁷ Abaye said to him: What is excellent about this tradition? Didn't Rav Kahana say that Rav said: One should not begin to recite the portion of ritual fringes at night, but if he does begin, he completes it? And if you say that: Speak to the children of Israel and say to them, is not considered the beginning of the portion of ritual fringes, didn't Rav Shmuel bar Yitzḥak say that Rav said: Speak to the children of Israel, is not considered a beginning of the portion of ritual fringes, as many passages in the Torah begin this way; and say to them, is considered a beginning.

⁷⁸ Rav Pappa said: In Eretz Yisrael, they hold that and say to them, is not considered a beginning, until he said: And make for them ritual fringes.

⁷⁹ Abaye said: Therefore, we begin to recite the portion of ritual fringes, since they begin to recite it in Eretz Yisrael. And once we begin to recite it, we complete it as well, as Rav Kahana said that Rav said: One should not begin to recite the portion of ritual fringes at night, but if he does begin, he completes it.

⁸⁰ Ḥiyya bar Rav said: If in the evening one recited the portion of ritual fringes concluding with: I am the Lord, your God, he must recite: True and Faithful [emet ve'emuna], and the entire blessing of

redemption. However, if he did not recite: I am the Lord, your God, he need not recite *emet ve'emuna*.

⁸¹ The Gemara asks: Isn't he required to mention the exodus from Egypt at night as well?

⁸² The Gemara responds: In place of reciting *emet ve'emuna* he said the following shorter passage: We give thanks to You, Lord, our God, Who took us out from Egypt and redeemed us from the house of bondage, and performed miracles and mighty deeds on our behalf on the sea, and we sang unto You, as this formula includes all of the content comprising *emet ve'emuna*.

⁸³ We learned in the mishna: Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa said: Why did the portion of Shema precede that of *VeHaya im Shamo'a*? So that one will first accept upon himself the yoke of the kingdom of Heaven and only then accept upon himself the yoke of the mitzvot.

⁸⁴ It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai offers a different explanation for the order of the portions of Shema. He says: By right, Shema should precede *VeHaya im Shamo'a* because the Shema includes the directive to learn, while *VeHaya im Shamo'a* includes the directive to teach. Similarly, *VeHaya im Shamo'a* should precede *VaYomer*, the final paragraph of Shema, because *VeHaya im Shamo'a* includes the directive to teach, while the portion of ritual fringes includes the directive to perform.

⁸⁵ The Gemara asks: Is that to say that the portion of Shema contains the directive to learn but it does not contain the directive to teach and perform? Isn't it written: "And you shall teach them to your children" (Deuteronomy 6:7), a directive to teach, as well as: "And you shall bind them as a sign upon your arm" (Deuteronomy 6:8) and: "And write them on your door posts of your house" (Deuteronomy 6:9), directives to perform? Furthermore, does *VeHaya im Shamo'a* contain the directive to teach but it does not contain the directive to perform? Isn't it written: "And you shall bind them as a sign upon your arm" (Deuteronomy 11:18), a directive to perform?

⁸⁶ Rather, Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai said as follows: By right, the portion of Shema should precede *VeHaya im Shamo'a* because the portion of Shema includes the directives to learn, to teach, and to perform, while *VeHaya im Shamo'a* includes the directives to teach and to perform. *VeHaya im Shamo'a* should precede *VaYomer* because *VeHaya im Shamo'a* includes the directives to teach and to perform, while *VaYomer* only includes the directive to perform.

⁸⁷ The Gemara asks: Let him derive this, that the portion of Shema is recited first, from the statement of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa. The Gemara responds: He stated one reason and another. Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai does not disagree with Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa; he simply suggested as additional explanation as follows: One reason the portion of Shema is recited first is so that one will first accept the yoke of the kingdom of Heaven upon himself and afterward the yoke of the mitzvot; and the second reason is because the portion of Shema contains these other elements as well.

⁸⁸ The Gemara relates: Rav washed his hands, recited Shema, donned phylacteries, and prayed in that order. The Gemara asks: How could he do that? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: One who digs a grave for the dead in the wall of the family burial cave is exempt from the recitation of Shema, from prayer, from phylacteries, and from all mitzvot mentioned in the Torah. When the appointed time for the recitation of Shema arrives, he emerges from the cave, washes his hands, dons phylacteries, recites Shema, and prays.

⁸⁹ Before clarifying the problem, the Gemara comments: This baraita itself is difficult; it appears to be contradictory. The first clause of the baraita stated that one digging a grave is exempt from the recitation of Shema, and the latter clause stated that he is obligated to emerge and recite Shema

⁹⁰ The Gemara responds: That is not difficult. The latter clause of the baraita refers to a case of two individuals digging the grave together; one pauses to recite Shema while the other continues digging. The first clause of the baraita refers to a case of one individual digging alone, who may not stop.

⁹¹ In any case, this baraita contradicts Rav in terms of the order in which the mitzvot are performed. The Gemara responds: Rav holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa, who said that the acceptance of the yoke of the kingdom of Heaven takes precedence and should come first, followed by the acceptance of the yoke of the mitzvot. Therefore, Rav first recited Shema, and only then donned phylacteries.

⁹² The Gemara challenges: Say that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa said to give precedence to recitation of the portion concerning the acceptance of the yoke of the kingdom of Heaven over recitation of other portions. But did you hear him say the halakha gives precedence to recitation over performance?

⁹³ And furthermore, does Rav really hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa? But didn't Rav Ḥiyya bar Ashi say: Many times I stood before Rav, and he first washed his hands, recited a blessing, taught us our lesson, donned phylacteries, and then recited Shema. And if you say: This was when the time for the recitation of Shema had not yet arrived and that is why he donned his phylacteries first, then what is the point of the testimony of Rav Ḥiyya bar Ashi?

⁹⁴ The Gemara responds: Rav Ḥiyya bar Ashi's story comes to exclude the opinion of the one who said that one need not recite the blessing on Torah study for the study of mishna. It teaches us that even for mishna, one must recite a blessing.

⁹⁵ In any case this baraita is difficult for Rav. The Gemara responds: The messenger was at fault and brought Rav his phylacteries late, so Rav recited Shema at its appropriate time and later donned phylacteries.

⁹⁶ With regard to the recitation of Shema without phylacteries, Ulla said: Anyone who recites Shema without phylacteries, it is as if he has borne false testimony against himself, as in Shema, he mentions his obligation to don phylacteries and in this case fails to don them himself (Talmidei Rabbeinu Yona). Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One who recites Shema without phylacteries, it is as if he has offered a burnt-offering without a meal-offering or a peace-offering without libations. Despite the fact that he fulfilled his obligation, his offering is incomplete.

⁹⁷ And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One who seeks to accept upon himself the complete yoke of the kingdom of Heaven

⁹⁸ should relieve himself, wash his hands, don phylacteries, recite Shema, and pray, and that is acceptance of the complete Kingdom of Heaven.

⁹⁹ On a similar note, Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Anyone who relieves himself, washes his hands, dons phylacteries, recites Shema, and prays, the verse ascribes credit to him as if he built an altar and offered a sacrifice upon it, as it is written: "I will wash in purity my hands, and I will encircle the altar of the Lord" (Psalms 26:6). Rava said to him: Do you not

maintain, Master, that one who does so, it is as if he immersed his entire body, as it is written: “I will wash in purity,” and it is not written: “I will wash my hands”?

¹⁰⁰ Ravina said to Rava: My Master, look at this Torah scholar [tzurva merabbanan] who came from Eretz Yisrael and said something astonishing: One who has no water with which to wash his hands, it is sufficient that he wipes his hands with earth, a rock, or a sliver of wood.

¹⁰¹ Rava replied to Ravina: He spoke well, as, is it written: I will wash with water? In purity, is written referring to anything that cleans, as Rav Ḥisda would curse one who went out of his way to seek water at the time of prayer.

¹⁰² With regard to seeking water, the Gemara comments: This applies only to the recitation of Shema, as the time for its recitation is limited, and if one goes seeking water he may run out of time. However, for prayer, which may be recited all day, one must go out of his way to seek water. And how far must one go out of his way to seek water? As far as a parasang [parsa]. And this, one parasang, applies only before him but behind him, he need not return even one mil. From this one may infer that he need not return one mil, but one must return less than one mil.

¹⁰³ MISHNA: One who recites Shema and did not recite in a manner audible to his own ear, either because he read inaudibly or because he is deaf, fulfilled his obligation. Rabbi Yosei says: He did not fulfill his obligation.

¹⁰⁴ One who recited Shema and was not sufficiently precise in his enunciation of its letters, Rabbi Yosei says: He fulfilled his obligation. Rabbi Yehuda says: He did not fulfill his obligation.

¹⁰⁵ One who recited Shema out of order, meaning he did not read the verses sequentially, he did not fulfill his obligation. One who recited and erred, should return to the place in Shema that he erred.

¹⁰⁶ GEMARA: The discussion in our mishna dealt with the question of whether or not one who recites Shema without hearing it fulfilled his obligation. The Gemara clarifies the opinions cited in the mishna: What is the reason for Rabbi Yosei’s opinion that one must recite Shema in a manner audible to his own ear? Because it is written: Shema, hear, and Rabbi Yosei holds that this is to be understood literally, meaning: Make your ears hear what your mouth utters. The first tanna, who holds that one fulfills his obligation even if he does not hear his recitation of Shema, holds that Shema, hear, comes to teach something else; one may recite Shema in any language that one can hear and understand, and there is no requirement to recite Shema specifically in Hebrew.

¹⁰⁷ And Rabbi Yosei agrees with the principle derived by the first tanna from the word Shema; however Rabbi Yosei holds: Derive two halakhot from the word Shema; first, one may recite Shema in any language, and second, one must recite it in a manner audible to his own ears.

¹⁰⁸ We learned there in a mishna regarding the laws of separating tithes: A deaf person who can speak but cannot hear may not separate teruma ab initio, because he must recite a blessing over the separation of teruma and he is unable to hear the blessing. But after the fact, if he did separate it, his teruma is valid teruma.

¹⁰⁹ The Gemara asks: Who is this tanna who holds that if a deaf person who can speak but cannot hear separates teruma, it is considered teruma after the fact, but ab initio he may not do so?

¹¹⁰ Rav Ḥisda said: It is Rabbi Yosei, as we learned in our mishna: One who recites Shema and did not recite it so it was audible to his own ear, he fulfilled his obligation. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Yosei says: He did not fulfill his obligation.

¹¹¹ Rav Ḥisda elaborates: Rabbi Yosei only stated that a deaf person did not fulfill his obligation even after the fact with regard to the recitation of Shema, which is a biblical obligation. But with regard to teruma, the concern is due to the blessing recited over its separation. And the blessing is by rabbinic law, and the separation of teruma itself is not contingent upon the blessing. The separation of teruma takes effect regardless of whether or not a blessing is recited, so in the case of a deaf person, he fulfilled his obligation after the fact.

¹¹² The Gemara challenges the assertion that this mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei: And from where do you infer that this is the opinion of Rabbi Yosei? Perhaps it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and he said that with regard to the recitation of Shema as well, if one did not recite it in a manner audible to his own ears, he has fulfilled his obligation after the fact, but ab initio he may not do so. This opinion is identical to that of the tanna in the case of teruma. Know that this is true because it was taught in the mishna: One who recites Shema without it being audible to his own ear. The tanna formulated the dispute in a case which was after the fact. If one already recited Shema in this manner, yes, he fulfilled his obligation. The tanna did not formulate the case in the mishna using ab initio language, i.e., one may recite Shema in a manner inaudible to his own ears because, ab initio, he may not do so according to Rabbi Yehuda.

¹¹³ The Gemara rejects this proof. In explanation, they say: The fact that the mishna taught the halakha utilizing the after the fact language: One who recited, does not prove that Rabbi Yehuda also holds that one may not ab initio recite Shema in a manner inaudible to his own ears. Rather, the mishna formulated the halakha in that manner is to convey the far-reaching nature of the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, who said that if one does so, even after the fact, he did not fulfill his obligation to recite Shema. As, if it sought to convey the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, then even ab initio he may fulfill his obligation without hearing the recitation.

¹¹⁴ The Gemara challenges this conclusion: How did you establish the reasoning of the mishna dealing with the laws of terumot? In accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, who holds that one who does not hear his recitation does not fulfill his obligation even after the fact. But what about that which was taught in a baraita: One may not recite the Grace after Meals, which like Shema and unlike the blessing on separating teruma is a Torah commandment, in his heart, inaudibly, and if he recited the blessing in that manner, he fulfilled his obligation?

¹¹⁵ In accordance with whose opinion is this baraita? It is in accordance neither with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei nor with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. As if you say that it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, didn't he say according to the way the Gemara explained his position that even ab initio he may fulfill his obligation in that manner, and he need not recite it audibly. In that case, why should one refrain from reciting the blessing in his heart? And if you say that it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei; he holds that even after the fact, he did not fulfill his obligation.

¹¹⁶ Rather, what must we say? We must revert to the explanation that it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda who holds that after the fact, yes, he fulfilled his obligation, but ab initio, no, one may not recite it in a manner inaudible to his own ears. Therefore the baraita concerning Grace after Meals is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda.

¹¹⁷ The Gemara questions this: But what about that baraita which was taught by Rabbi Yehuda, son of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi: A deaf person who speaks but does not hear may, *ab initio*, separate *teruma*. In accordance with whose opinion is that baraita?

¹¹⁸ According to what we have said, it is in accordance neither with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda nor with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei. As if you say that it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, didn't he say that after the fact, yes, he fulfilled his obligation, although it was inaudible to his own ears, but *ab initio*, no, he may not fulfill his obligation in that manner? And if you say that it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, didn't he say that if he does not hear himself, even after the fact he did not fulfill his obligation? If so, whose opinion is reflected in this baraita?

¹¹⁹ Rather, we must revert to the previous explanation but with a slight revision, and say that actually it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and even *ab initio*, a deaf person may also separate *teruma*. And this is not difficult and there is no contradiction between the mishna and the baraita, as this is his own opinion and that is his teacher's opinion. As it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda said in the name of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya: One who recites Shema must make it audible to his ears, as it is stated: "Hear, Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is One." This means that he must do so, but after the fact, if he failed to do so, he nevertheless fulfilled his obligation. The baraita continues: Rabbi Meir said to him: It says: "Which I command you this day, upon your heart;" which Rabbi Meir explains to mean that the significance of the words follows the intention of the heart and even *ab initio* one need not recite Shema audibly.

¹²⁰ The Gemara notes: Now that you have arrived at this point and the entire baraita has been cited, even if you say that Rabbi Yehuda holds in accordance with the opinion of his teacher, that only after the fact, does a deaf person fulfill his obligation, it is, nevertheless, not difficult and the different baraitot are not contradictory. As this baraita permitting a deaf person to separate *teruma ab initio* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, while this baraita that holds that he may not recite Grace after Meals *ab initio* but after the fact he fulfilled his obligation is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda.

¹²¹ The Gemara cites a similar discussion with regard to the reading of the Megilla: We learned in a mishna there in tractate Megilla: All are fit to read the Megilla except a deaf person, an imbecile, and a minor. And Rabbi Yehuda deems a minor fit.

¹²² The Gemara clarifies: Who is the *tanna* who holds that even after the fact, the reading of a deaf person is not valid? Rav Mattana said: It is Rabbi Yosei, as we learned in our mishna: One who recites Shema and did not recite it so it was audible to his own ear, fulfilled his obligation. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Yosei says: He did not fulfill his obligation.

¹²³ The Gemara asks: From where do you conclude that the mishna cited from tractate Megilla is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, and that after the fact his reading is also not valid?

¹²⁴ Perhaps it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and although *ab initio* a deaf-mute may not read, after the fact his reading is valid?

¹²⁵ The Gemara responds: This could not enter your mind, as it was taught: A deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor, in one phrase in our mishna; to teach that a deaf-mute is similar to an imbecile and a minor. Just as in the case of an imbecile and a minor, even after the fact, their reading is not valid, so too the reading of a deaf-mute, even after the fact, is not valid.

¹²⁶ The Gemara rejects this assertion based on their appearance in a common list: And perhaps this case is as it is and that case is as it is; although listed together, the circumstances of each case may be different, and no definite proof can be drawn from their juxtaposition.

¹²⁷ The Gemara objects from a different perspective: And can you really establish that the first clause in the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda? But from what was taught in the latter clause of the mishna: And Rabbi Yehuda deems a minor fit to read the Megilla, this proves by inference that the beginning of the mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda?

¹²⁸ The Gemara rejects this challenge as well: And perhaps the entire mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and there are two types of minors, and the mishna is incomplete and it teaches as follows: All are fit to read the Megilla except a deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor. In what case is this said? With regard to a minor who has not yet reached the age of training to fulfill the mitzvot. However in the case of a minor who has reached the age of training, even ab initio he is fit to read the Megilla. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda, as Rabbi Yehuda deems a minor fit, and his statement here comes to elucidate and not to dispute.

¹²⁹ The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion did you establish the mishna? In accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who holds that after the fact, yes, his reading is valid, but ab initio, no, he may not read? However, that baraita which was taught by Rabbi Yehuda, son of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi: A deaf person who speaks but does not hear may, ab initio, separate teruma.

¹³⁰ In accordance with whose opinion is this baraita? Neither the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda nor with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei. As, if you say that it is Rabbi Yehuda's opinion, didn't he say that after the fact, yes, he fulfilled his obligation, but ab initio, no, he may not fulfill his obligation in that manner? And if you say that it is Rabbi Yosei's opinion, didn't he say that even after the fact he did not fulfill his obligation?

¹³¹ This Gemara rejects this objection: But rather, what, will you explain the baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and a deaf-mute is also fit to fulfill his obligation even ab initio? However, that which was taught in a baraita: One may not recite the Grace after Meals in his heart, inaudibly, and if he recited the blessing in that manner, he fulfilled his obligation, in accordance with whose opinion is that baraita?

¹³² It is in accordance neither with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda nor with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei. As if you say that it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, didn't he say that even ab initio he may fulfill his obligation in that manner? And if you say that it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, didn't he say that even after the fact he did not fulfill his obligation?

¹³³ The Gemara responds: Actually, we can explain that the baraita: A deaf person may, ab initio, separate teruma, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, according to whom a deaf-mute is also permitted to do so even ab initio. With regard to the opinion expressed that he is prohibited to recite Shema and Grace after Meals ab initio, there is no difficulty, as this is his own opinion and that is his teacher's opinion. As it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda said in the name of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya: One who recites Shema must make it audible to his ears, as it is stated: "Hear, Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is One." The baraita continues: Rabbi Meir said to him: But it says: "Which I command you this day, upon your heart"; meaning that the significance of the words follows the intention of the heart and even ab initio one need not recite Shema audibly. The opinion

that after the fact, a deaf person fulfilled his obligation to recite Shema is the opinion of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya.

¹³⁴ The Gemara notes: Now that you have arrived at this point and the entire baraita has been cited, even if you say that Rabbi Yehuda holds in accordance with the opinion of his teacher, it is, nevertheless, not difficult. As this baraita that holds that he may not recite Grace after Meals *ab initio* but after the fact he fulfilled his obligation is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, while this baraita permitting a deaf person to separate *teruma ab initio* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir.

¹³⁵ Rav Ḥisda said that Rav Sheila said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda who said in the name of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, and the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda as cited in our mishna.

¹³⁶ The Gemara explains: And although that may seem redundant, both statements are necessary, as had Rav Ḥisda only taught us that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, I would have said, as was suggested in the Gemara above, that Rabbi Yehuda permits to do so even *ab initio*. Therefore, he teaches us that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda who said it in the name of his teacher, Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya; *ab initio* one must recite Shema in a manner audible to his own ears.

¹³⁷ And had Rav Ḥisda only taught us that the halakha is in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda in the name of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, I would have said that the phrase: Must make it audible, means not only must he recite it that way *ab initio*, but also after the fact he has no remedy if he failed to do so. Therefore, he teaches us that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda; *ab initio* one must recite Shema in a manner audible to his own ears, but if he failed to do so, after the fact his recitation is valid.

¹³⁸ Rav Yosef said: The dispute as to whether or not a deaf person fulfills his obligation is only in the case of the recitation of Shema, but with regard to the rest of the mitzvot, everyone agrees that he does not fulfill his obligation if he does not hear his recitation, as it is written: “Pay attention, and hear, Israel” (Deuteronomy 27:9); meaning that one is required to listen and hear.

¹³⁹ The Gemara objects based on what was taught in a baraita: One may not recite the Grace after Meals in his heart, inaudibly, and if he recited the blessing in that manner, he fulfilled his obligation. In this example of the rest of the mitzvot, the obligation to hear the recitation of the blessing is only *ab initio*. Rather, Rav Yosef’s statement must be emended. If this was said, it was said as follows; Rav Yosef said: The dispute as to whether or not a deaf person fulfills his obligation is only in the case of the recitation of Shema, as it is written: “Hear, Israel.” But regarding the rest of the mitzvot, all agree that a deaf-mute fulfills his obligation.

¹⁴⁰ The Gemara asks: Isn’t it written: “Pay attention, and hear, Israel”?

¹⁴¹ The Gemara responds: That verse is written with regard to matters of Torah; one must pay close attention to what is written in the Torah.

¹⁴² We learned in the mishna: One who recited Shema and was not sufficiently precise in his enunciation of its letters, Rabbi Yosei says: He fulfilled his obligation. Rabbi Yehuda says: He did not fulfill his obligation. Similarly, there is a dispute whether or not one who recites Shema in a

manner inaudible to his own ears fulfilled his obligation; the anonymous first tanna says: He fulfilled his obligation. Rabbi Yosei says: He did not fulfill his obligation.

¹⁴³ Rabbi Tavi said that Rabbi Yoshiya said: The halakha is in accordance with the statements in both disputes that rule leniently.

¹⁴⁴ Incidental to citing one statement by this combination of Sages, the Gemara cites another statement in their name: And Rabbi Tavi said that Rabbi Yoshiya said: What is meant by that which is written: “There are three that are never satisfied...the grave and the barren womb” (Proverbs 30:15–16)? We have to ask: What does a grave have to do with a womb? Rather, this juxtaposition comes to tell you: Just as a womb takes in and gives forth, so too a grave takes in and gives forth with the resurrection of the dead.

¹⁴⁵ And is this not an a fortiori inference: Just as the fetus is placed into the womb in private, and the baby is removed from it with loud cries at childbirth; the grave into which the deceased is placed with loud cries of mourning at burial, is it not right that the body should be removed with loud cries? From this verse there is a refutation to those who say that there is no Torah source for the resurrection of the dead.

¹⁴⁶ Rabbi Oshaya taught the following baraita before Rava: The verse, “And you shall write them [ukhtavtam] on the door posts of your house and your gates” (Deuteronomy 6:9), should be understood as though it were written: “And you shall write them completely [ukhtav tam],” i.e., in their entirety. Everything must be in writing in the mezuzah or phylacteries, even the commands to write mezuzot and phylacteries.

¹⁴⁷ Rava said to him: Who said this baraita to you? It was Rabbi Yehuda, who said with regard to the scroll of the sota that one writes curses, but one does not write commands and instructions how to administer the potion to the sota. According to Rabbi Yehuda, in the case of mezuzot and phylacteries the Torah taught that even the commands must be written in order to distinguish it from sota. There, in the case of the sota, it is written: “And the priest shall write [vekhatav] these curses in a scroll” (Numbers 5:23); only the curses are recorded in the scroll, and nothing more. But here in the case of mezuzah, where it is written: “And you shall write them [ukhtavtam],” even the commands must also be written.

¹⁴⁸ The Gemara questions this: Is that to say Rabbi Yehuda’s reason for writing only the curses in the sota scroll is because the verse in the portion of sota says: “And the priest shall write [vekhatav],” as opposed to: “And you shall write them [ukhtavtam]”? Rabbi Yehuda’s reason is because it is written in the portion of the sota: These curses, meaning curses, yes, they must be recorded; commands, no. If that is Rabbi Yehuda’s reasoning, there is no reason to derive the requirement to write the commands from the phrase: And you shall write them, in the case of the mitzva of mezuzah. Derive it simply from the fact that the Torah did not distinguish between the various components of the portion.

¹⁴⁹ The Gemara responds: “And you shall write them” was necessary, as otherwise it might have entered your mind to say: Let us derive it by means of a verbal analogy, writing mentioned here from writing mentioned there, that just as there curses, yes, commands, no; so too here, commands, no. Therefore, the Torah wrote: And you shall write them in their entirety, even the commands.

¹⁵⁰ On a similar note: Rav Ovadya taught a baraita before Rava: That which was stated: “And you shall teach them [velimadtem] to your children” (Deuteronomy 11:19) teaches that your teaching must be complete [tam] that one should leave space between adjacent words, where the last letter of the first and the first letter of the second are identical. One must distinguish between the words and enunciate each one clearly.

¹⁵¹ Rava responded after him by way of explanation: For example, one must enunciate al levavekha and not read them as one word. So too, al levavkhem, bekhhol levavekha, bekhhol levavkhem, esev besadkha, va’avadtem mehera, hakanaf petil, and etkhem me’eret. Because the last letter of the first word and the first letter of the second are identical, the words are liable to be enunciated together and the correct meaning is liable to be obscured.

¹⁵² On this same topic, Rabbi Ḥama, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: Anyone who recites Shema and is punctilious in enunciating its letters, Gehenna is cooled for him, as it is stated: “When the Almighty scatters [befares] kings over it, it will snow in Tzalmon” (Psalms 68:15). Do not read befares, When He scatters, but befaresh, When he enunciates. When one enunciates the name of God with precision, God will fulfill the verse: It will snow in Tzalmon, on his behalf. Do not read beTzalmon, in Tzalmon, but betzalmavet, in the shadow of death, a reference to Gehenna. As reward for enunciating God’s name precisely, God will cool Gehenna for him.

¹⁵³ Rabbi Ḥama, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, also said: Why were

¹⁵⁴ tents juxtaposed to streams, as it is written: “As streams stretched forth, as gardens by the riverside; as aloes [ahalim] planted by the Lord, as cedars by the water” (Numbers 24:6)? The Gemara vocalizes the word ohalim, tents, rather than ahalim. They are juxtaposed in order to tell you: Just as streams elevate a person from ritual impurity to purity after he immerses himself in their water, so too tents of Torah elevate a person from the scale of guilt to the scale of merit.

¹⁵⁵ We learned in our mishna: One who recited Shema out of order did not fulfill his obligation. One who recited and erred, should return to the place in Shema that he erred.

¹⁵⁶ With regard to an error in the recitation of Shema, the Gemara recounts: Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi were once tying a wedding canopy in preparation for the wedding of Rabbi Elazar. He said to them: In the meantime, until you finish, I will go and hear something in the study hall, and I will come and say it to you. He went and found the tanna who recited mishnayot in the study hall, who was reciting this Tosefta before Rabbi Yoḥanan:

¹⁵⁷ One who recited Shema and erred, and does not know where exactly he erred; if he was in the middle of a paragraph when he realized his error, he must return to the beginning of the paragraph; if he was between one paragraph and another when he realized his error but does not remember between which paragraphs, he must return to the first break between paragraphs. Similarly, if one erred between writing and writing, i.e., between the verse: “And you shall write them on the door posts of your house and on your gates” (Deuteronomy 6:9) in the first paragraph and the identical verse (Deuteronomy 11:20) in the second paragraph, he must return to the first writing.

¹⁵⁸ Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: They only taught this halakha in a case where one did not yet begin: “In order to lengthen your days” (Deuteronomy 11:21) which follows that verse at the end of the second paragraph. However, if he already began to recite: In order to lengthen your days, he can assume that he assumed his routine and continued and completed the second paragraph.

¹⁵⁹ Rabbi Elazar came and told Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi what he heard. They said to him: Had we come only to hear this, it would have been sufficient.

¹⁶⁰ MISHNA: The primary issue in this mishna is the requisite degree of concentration when reciting Shema. Laborers engaged in their work may recite Shema while standing atop the tree or atop the course of stones in a wall under construction, which they are not permitted to do for the Amida prayer, which requires intent of the heart.

¹⁶¹ The mishna continues: A groom is exempt from the recitation of Shema on the first night of his marriage, which was generally Wednesday night, until Saturday night, if he has not taken action and consummated the marriage, as he is preoccupied by concerns related to consummation of the marriage. The mishna relates that there was an incident where Rabban Gamliel married a woman and recited Shema even the first night. His students said to him: Didn't our teacher teach us that a groom is exempt from the recitation of Shema? He answered them: Nevertheless, I am not listening to you to refrain from reciting Shema, and in so doing preclude myself from the acceptance of the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven, for even one moment.

¹⁶² GEMARA: With regard to laborers, the Sages taught in a Tosefta: Laborers, while engaged in their labor, may recite Shema while standing atop the tree or atop the course of stones in a wall under construction. And they may pray atop the olive tree or the fig tree, as those trees have many branches close together, so one could stand on them and focus properly while praying. In the case of all the rest of the trees, however, they must climb down and pray. However, the homeowner, who is self-employed, in all cases, regardless of the type of tree, must climb down and pray, as he will be unable to focus appropriately. Since, in contrast to the laborers, it is his prerogative to climb down and pray, the Sages did not permit him to pray atop the tree.

¹⁶³ Rav Mari, son of the daughter of Shmuel, raised a contradiction before Rava: We learned in our mishna: Laborers may recite Shema atop the tree or atop the course of stones in a wall under construction. We see that he does not require intent, simple recitation is sufficient. And he raised a contradiction from the verbal analogy taught in a baraita: One who recites Shema must focus his heart, as it is stated: "Hear [Shema], Israel." And below, later in Deuteronomy, it says: "Pay attention, and hear [shema], Israel" (Deuteronomy 27:9). Just as there one must pay attention, so too here one must pay attention.

¹⁶⁴ Rava was silent as he had no response. But he said to him: Have you heard anything on this matter? He replied: Rav Sheshet said as follows: And this halakha, that laborers may recite Shema atop the tree only applies when they are idle from their work and recite it so they can focus their hearts.

¹⁶⁵ The Gemara challenges this: But wasn't it taught in a baraita that Beit Hillel say: Laborers engage in their labor and recite Shema?

¹⁶⁶ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult. This, which says that laborers must be idle from their labor, is referring to a case when they are reciting the first paragraph of Shema, while that, which says that they may continue to work, is in a case when they are reciting the second paragraph.

¹⁶⁷ The Sages taught in a Tosefta: Laborers who were working for a homeowner are obligated to recite Shema and recite the blessings before it and after it; and when they eat their bread they are obligated to recite the blessing before and after it; and they are obligated to recite the Amida prayer.

However, they do not descend before the ark as communal prayer leaders and the priests among them do not lift their hands to recite the Priestly Blessing, so as not to be derelict in the duties they were hired to perform.

¹⁶⁸ The Gemara challenges this: Didn't we learn in a different baraita that laborers recite an abridged prayer consisting of a microcosm of the Amida prayer in place of the full Amida prayer? Rav Sheshet said: This is not difficult. This baraita obligating laborers to recite the full Amida prayer is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Gamliel, as he holds that one must always recite the full eighteen blessings. This baraita which allows laborers to abridge their prayers is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua, who permits one to abridge the Amida prayer.

¹⁶⁹ The Gemara objects: But if this baraita is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua, why did the baraita discuss a case involving laborers in particular? Rabbi Yehoshua holds that every person may also recite an abridged version of the Amida prayer.

¹⁷⁰ Rather, we must say that this baraita and that baraita are both in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Gamliel, and this is not difficult: Here, in the baraita where laborers pray the abridged version of the Amida prayer, refers to a case where laborers work for their wage beyond the meal provided by their employer; while here, in the baraita where laborers must pray the full Amida prayer, refers to a case where laborers work only for their meal.

¹⁷¹ And indeed it was taught in a baraita: Laborers who were performing labor for the homeowner recite Shema and pray; and when they eat their bread they do not recite a blessing beforehand because the blessing recited before food is only an obligation by rabbinic law, but they recite two of the three blessings normally recited in the blessing thereafter, the Grace after Meals, which is an obligation by Torah law. How so? The first blessing is recited in its standard formula; the second blessing, he begins to recite the blessing of the land and they include the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem within the blessing of the land, at which point they conclude the Grace after Meals.

¹⁷² In what case is this said? This is said with regard to laborers who work for their wage, but if they work for their meal or if the homeowner reclined and ate the meal with them, they recite the blessings in their standard formula.

¹⁷³ We learned in the mishna that a groom is exempt from the recitation of Shema on the first night of his marriage. The Sages taught the source of this halakha in a baraita based on the verse: "When you sit in your home, and when you walk along the way." When you sit in your home, to the exclusion of one who is engaged in performance of a mitzva, who is exempt from the recitation of Shema; and when you walk along the way, to the exclusion of a groom, who is also exempt from the recitation of Shema. The baraita adds that from here, from this interpretation of the verses, they said: One who marries a virgin is exempt from the recitation of Shema on his wedding night, but one who marries a widow is obligated.

¹⁷⁴ The Gemara clarifies the meaning of this baraita, and asks: From where is it inferred that the verse: "When you walk along the way," enables us to derive that a groom is exempt from the obligation to recite Shema? Rav Pappa said that it is derived: Like the way; just as the journey along a specific way described in the verse is voluntary and involves no mitzva, so too all of those who are obligated to recite Shema are engaged in voluntary activities. However, one engaged in performance of a mitzva is exempt from the obligation to recite Shema.

¹⁷⁵ The Gemara asks: Are we not dealing with a case where one is walking along on his way to perform a mitzva; nevertheless, the Torah said to recite Shema, indicating that he is obligated even if he set out to perform a mitzva.

¹⁷⁶ The Gemara explains: If so, that the intention was to obligate in all cases, let the Torah say: When walking along the way. What is the meaning of: When you walk along the way? Conclude from this: It is in a case of your walking, meaning that when you do this for your own purposes and of your own volition, you are obligated to recite Shema, but when you go with the objective of performing a mitzva, you are exempt.

¹⁷⁷ The Gemara questions this: If so, why discuss a case of one who is marrying a virgin in particular? Even one who is marrying a widow is performing a mitzva and should also be exempt.

¹⁷⁸ The Gemara responds that nevertheless, there is a distinction between one marrying a virgin and one marrying a widow. Here, in the case of one who marries a virgin, the groom is preoccupied by his thoughts, while here, in the case of one who marries a widow, he is not preoccupied.

¹⁷⁹ The Gemara challenges: If a groom is exempt from the recitation of Shema simply due to preoccupation, then even one who is preoccupied because his ship sank at sea should be exempt. If so, why then did Rabbi Abba bar Zavda say that Rav said: A mourner is obligated in all the mitzvot mentioned in the Torah except for the mitzva to don phylacteries, as the term splendor is stated with regard to phylacteries, as it is stated that the prophet Ezekiel was prohibited to mourn and was told: "Bind your splendor upon yourself" (Ezekiel 24:17). If even a mourner, who is pained and preoccupied, is obligated to recite Shema, clearly preoccupation has no bearing upon one's obligation.

¹⁸⁰ The Gemara responds: Nevertheless, there is a distinction between the cases. There, it is a case of preoccupation with a voluntary act, as there is no mitzva to be preoccupied with his mourning, but here, in the case of a groom, the cause of the preoccupation is the mitzva itself.

¹⁸¹ MISHNA: The mishna relates another episode portraying unusual conduct by Rabban Gamliel. He bathed on the first night after his wife died. His students said to him: Have you not taught us, our teacher, that a mourner is prohibited to bathe? He answered them: I am not like other people, I am delicate [istenis]. For me, not bathing causes actual physical distress, and even a mourner need not suffer physical distress as part of his mourning.

¹⁸² Another exceptional incident is related: And when his slave, Tavi, died, Rabban Gamliel accepted condolences for his death as one would for a close family member. His students said to him: Have you not taught us, our teacher, that one does not accept condolences for the death of slaves? Rabban Gamliel said to his students: My slave, Tavi, is not like all the rest of the slaves, he was virtuous and it is appropriate to accord him the same respect accorded to a family member.

¹⁸³ With regard to the recitation of Shema on one's wedding night, the Sages said that if, despite his exemption, a groom wishes to recite Shema on the first night, he may do so. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Not everyone who wishes to assume the reputation of a God-fearing person may assume it, and consequently, not everyone who wishes to recite Shema on his wedding night may do so.

¹⁸⁴ GEMARA: With regard to Rabban Gamliel's bathing on the first night after the death of his wife, the Gemara asks: What is the reason that Rabban Gamliel did not practice the customs of mourning

after his wife died? The Gemara answers: He holds that acute mourning [aninut] is in effect only on the day of the death itself, but acute mourning at night is only by rabbinic law, as it is written: “And I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentations; I will bring sackcloth upon your loins and baldness upon every head; and I will make you like a mourner for an only child, and the end will be like a bitter day” (Amos 8:10). Therefore, by Torah law one’s acute mourning is only during the day, like a bitter day, while the acute mourning at night that follows is only rabbinic. And in the case of a delicate person, the Sages did not issue a decree that one should afflict himself during the period of acute mourning.

¹⁸⁵ We learned in our mishna that: When his servant, Tavi, died, Rabban Gamliel accepted condolences for him.

¹⁸⁶ The Sages taught in a baraita: For slaves and maidservants who die, one does not stand in a row of comforters to console the mourners, and one recites neither the blessing of the mourners nor the consolation of the mourners.

¹⁸⁷ An incident is related that when Rabbi Eliezer’s maidservant died, his students entered to console him. When he saw them approaching he went up to the second floor, and they went up after him. He entered the gatehouse [anpilon], and they entered after him. He entered the banquet hall [teraklin], and they entered after him. Having seen them follow him everywhere, he said to them: It seems to me that you would be burned by lukewarm water, meaning that you could take a hint and when I went up to the second floor, you would understand that I did not wish to receive your consolations. Now I see that you are not even burned by boiling hot water. Did I not teach you the following: For slaves and maidservants who die, one does not stand in a row of comforters to console the mourners, and one neither recites the blessing of the mourners nor does he recite the consolation of the mourners, as the relationship between master and slave is not like a familial relationship? Rather, what does one say about them when they die? Just as we say to a person about his ox or donkey which died: May the Omnipresent replenish your loss, so too do we say for one’s slave or maidservant who died: May the Omnipresent replenish your loss, as the connection between a master and his slave is only financial in nature.

¹⁸⁸ It was taught in another baraita: One does not eulogize slaves and maidservants. Rabbi Yosei says: If he was a virtuous servant, one recites over him a eulogy of sorts: Alas, a good and loyal man who enjoyed the fruits of his hard labor. They said to him: If so, what praise have you left for virtuous Jews? A Jewish person would be proud to be eulogized in that manner.

¹⁸⁹ The Sages taught in a baraita: One may only call three people patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but not Jacob’s children. And one may only call four people matriarchs, Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel, and Leah.

¹⁹⁰ The Gemara asks: What is the reason for this exclusivity with regard to the Patriarchs? If you say that it is because we do not know whether we descend from Reuben or from Simon, so we cannot accurately say our father Reuben, for example, if so, with regard to the Matriarchs as well, we do not know whether we descend from Rachel or from Leah, and we should not call Rachel and Leah matriarchs either. Instead, the reason the sons of Jacob are not called patriarchs is not for that reason, but because until Jacob they are significant enough to be referred to as patriarchs, but beyond Jacob, they are not significant enough to be referred to as patriarchs.

¹⁹¹ This serves as an introduction; although older people are often referred to with the honorific: Father so-and-so, it was taught in another baraita: One may not refer to slaves and maidservants as father [abba] so-and-so or mother [imma] so-and-so. But they would call the slaves and maidservants of Rabban Gamliel “father so-and-so” and “mother so-and-so.”

¹⁹² The Gemara asks: Is a story cited in order to contradict the previously stated halakha? The Gemara answers: There is no contradiction; rather, because Rabban Gamliel’s servants were significant, they were addressed with these honorifics.

¹⁹³ The Gemara cites an aggadic statement concerning prayer and the recitation of Shema. Rabbi Elazar said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “So I will bless You as I live, to Your name I will raise my hands” (Psalms 63:5)? So I will bless You as I live, refers to the recitation of Shema, and to Your name I will raise my hands, refers to the Amida prayer, which is characterized as lifting one’s hands to God. And if one does so, recites Shema and prays, the verse says about him: “As with fat and marrow, my soul will be satisfied” (Psalms 63:6). And not only does he receive this reward, but he inherits two worlds, this world and the World-to-Come, as it is stated: “With lips of joys [renanot], my mouth praises You” (Psalms 63:6). The plural, joys, refers to two joys, that of this world and that of the World-to-Come.

¹⁹⁴ The Gemara describes how after Rabbi Elazar concluded his prayer, he said the following additional prayer: May it be Your will, Lord our God, to cause to dwell in our lot love and brotherhood, peace and friendship. And may You make our borders rich in disciples and cause us to ultimately succeed, that we will have a good end and hope. And may You set our portion in the Garden of Eden, and may You establish for us a good companion and a good inclination in Your world. And may we rise early and find the aspiration of our hearts to fear Your name, and may the satisfaction of our souls come before You, i.e., may You hear our prayers that we may have spiritual contentment in this world for the best.

¹⁹⁵ Similarly, the Gemara recounts that after Rabbi Yoḥanan concluded his prayer, he said the following additional prayer: May it be Your will, Lord our God, that You look upon our shame and behold our plight, that You clothe Yourself in Your mercy, and cover Yourself with Your might, that You wrap Yourself in Your loving-kindness, and gird Yourself with Your grace, and may Your attributes of goodness and humility come before You.

¹⁹⁶ Similarly, after Rabbi Zeira concluded his prayers he said the following additional prayer: May it be Your will, Lord our God, that we not sin or shame ourselves, and that we not disgrace ourselves before our forefathers, in the sense that our actions should not disgrace the actions of our forefathers.

¹⁹⁷ After Rabbi Ḥiyya prayed he said the following: May it be Your will, Lord our God, that Your Torah should be our vocation, and may our heart not become faint nor our eyes dim.

¹⁹⁸ After his prayer, Rav said the following: May it be Your will, Lord our God, that You grant us long life, a life of peace, a life of goodness, a life of blessing, a life of sustenance, a life of freedom of movement from place to place, where we are not tied to one place, a life of dread of sin, a life without shame and disgrace, a life of wealth and honor, a life in which we have love of Torah and reverence for Heaven, a life in which You fulfill all the desires of our heart for good.

¹⁹⁹ After his prayer, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said the following: May it be Your will, Lord our God, and God of our forefathers, that You save us from the arrogant and from arrogance in general, from a

bad man, from a bad mishap, from an evil instinct, from a bad companion, from a bad neighbor, from the destructive Satan, from a harsh trial and from a harsh opponent, whether he is a member of the covenant, a Jew, or whether he is not a member of the covenant.

²⁰⁰ And the Gemara notes that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi would recite this prayer every day despite the fact that royal officers stood watch over Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi for his protection; nevertheless, he prayed to avoid conflict or hindrance resulting from arrogance.

²⁰¹ After his prayer, Rav Safra said the following: May it be Your will, Lord our God, that You establish peace

²⁰² in the heavenly entourage [pamalia] of angels each of whom ministers to a specific nation (see Daniel 10), and whose infighting causes war on earth; and in the earthly entourage, the Sages, and among the disciples engaged in the study of Your Torah, whether they engage in its study for its own sake or not for its own sake. And all those engaged in Torah study not for its own sake, may it be Your will that they will come to engage in its study for its own sake.

²⁰³ After his prayer, Rabbi Alexandri said the following: May it be Your will, Lord our God, that You station us in a lighted corner and not in a darkened corner, and do not let our hearts become faint nor our eyes dim. Some say that this was the prayer that Rav Hamnuna would recite, and that after Rabbi Alexandri prayed, he would say the following: Master of the Universe, it is revealed and known before You that our will is to perform Your will, and what prevents us? On the one hand, the yeast in the dough, the evil inclination that is within every person; and the subjugation to the kingdoms on the other. May it be Your will that You will deliver us from their hands, of both the evil inclination and the foreign kingdoms, so that we may return to perform the edicts of Your will with a perfect heart.

²⁰⁴ After his prayer, Rava said the following: My God, before I was created I was worthless, and now that I have been created it is as if I had not been created, I am no more significant. I am dust in life, all the more so in my death. I am before You as a vessel filled with shame and humiliation. Therefore, may it be Your will, Lord my God, that I will sin no more, and that those transgressions that I have committed, cleanse in Your abundant mercy; but may this cleansing not be by means of suffering and serious illness, but rather in a manner I will be able to easily endure. And this is the confession of Rav Hamnuna Zuti on Yom Kippur.

²⁰⁵ When Mar, son of Ravina, would conclude his prayer, he said the following: My God, guard my tongue from evil and my lips from speaking deceit. To those who curse me let my soul be silent and may my soul be like dust to all. Open my heart to Your Torah, and may my soul pursue your mitzvot. And save me from a bad mishap, from the evil inclination, from a bad woman, and from all evils that suddenly come upon the world. And all who plan evil against me, swiftly thwart their counsel, and frustrate their plans. May the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart find favor before You, Lord, my Rock and my Redeemer.

²⁰⁶ The Gemara recounts that when Rav Sheshet would sit in observance of a fast, after he prayed he said as follows: Master of the Universe, it is revealed before You that when the Temple is standing, one sins and offers a sacrifice. And although only its fat and blood were offered from that sacrifice on the altar, his transgression is atoned for him. And now, I sat in observance of a fast and my fat and blood diminished. May it be Your will that my fat and blood that diminished be considered as if I offered a sacrifice before You on the altar, and may I find favor in Your eyes. Having cited statements

that various Sages would recite after their prayers, the Gemara cites additional passages recited by the Sages on different occasions.

²⁰⁷ When Rabbi Yoḥanan would conclude study of the book of Job, he said the following: A person will ultimately die and an animal will ultimately be slaughtered, and all are destined for death. Therefore, death itself is not a cause for great anguish. Rather, happy is he who grew up in Torah, whose labor is in Torah, who gives pleasure to his Creator, who grew up with a good name and who took leave of the world with a good name. Such a person lived his life fully, and about him, Solomon said: “A good name is better than fine oil, and the day of death than the day of one’s birth” (Ecclesiastes 7:1); one who was faultless in life reaches the day of his death on a higher level than he was at the outset.

²⁰⁸ Rabbi Meir was wont to say the following idiom: Study with all your heart and with all your soul to know My ways and to be diligent at the doors of My Torah. Keep My Torah in your heart, and fear of Me should be before your eyes. Guard your mouth from all transgression, and purify and sanctify yourself from all fault and iniquity. And if you do so, I, God, will be with you everywhere.

²⁰⁹ The Sages in Yavne were wont to say: I who learn Torah am God’s creature and my counterpart who engages in other labor is God’s creature. My work is in the city and his work is in the field. I rise early for my work and he rises early for his work. And just as he does not presume to perform my work, so I do not presume to perform his work. Lest you say: I engage in Torah study a lot, while he only engages in Torah study a little, so I am better than he, it has already been taught: One who brings a substantial sacrifice and one who brings a meager sacrifice have equal merit, as long as he directs his heart towards Heaven (Rav Hai Gaon, Arukh).

²¹⁰ Abaye was wont to say: One must always be shrewd and utilize every strategy in order to achieve fear of Heaven and performance of mitzvot. One must fulfill the verse: “A soft answer turns away wrath” (Proverbs 15:1) and take steps to increase peace with one’s brethren and with one’s relatives, and with all people, even with a non-Jew in the marketplace, despite the fact that he is of no importance to him and does not know him at all (Me’iri), so that he will be loved above in God’s eyes, pleasant below in the eyes of the people, and acceptable to all of God’s creatures.

²¹¹ Tangentially, the Gemara mentions that they said about Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai that no one ever preceded him in issuing a greeting, not even a non-Jew in the marketplace, as Rabban Yoḥanan would always greet him first.

²¹² Rava was wont to say: The objective of Torah wisdom is to achieve repentance and good deeds; that one should not read the Torah and study mishna and become arrogant and spurn his father and his mother and his teacher and one who is greater than he in wisdom or in the number of students who study before him, as it is stated: “The beginning of wisdom is fear of the Lord, a good understanding have all who fulfill them” (Psalms 111:10). It is not stated simply: All who fulfill, but rather: All who fulfill them, those who perform these actions as they ought to be performed, meaning those who do such deeds for their own sake, for the sake of the deeds themselves, not those who do them not for their own sake. Rava continued: One who does them not for their own sake, it would have been preferable for him had he not been created.

²¹³ Rav was wont to say: The World-to-Come is not like this world. In the World-to-Come there is no eating, no drinking, no procreation, no business negotiations, no jealousy, no hatred, and no competition. Rather, the righteous sit with their crowns upon their heads, enjoying the splendor of the

Divine Presence, as it is stated: “And they beheld God, and they ate and drank” (Exodus 24:11), meaning that beholding God’s countenance is tantamount to eating and drinking.

²¹⁴ The Gemara states: Greater is the promise for the future made by the Holy One, Blessed be He, to women than to men, as it is stated: “Rise up, women at ease; hear My voice, confident daughters, listen to what I say” (Isaiah 32:9). This promise of ease and confidence is not given to men.

²¹⁵ Rav said to Rabbi Ḥiyya: By what virtue do women merit to receive this reward? Rabbi Ḥiyya answered: They merit this reward for bringing their children to read the Torah in the synagogue, and for sending their husbands to study mishna in the study hall, and for waiting for their husbands until they return from the study hall.

²¹⁶ When the Sages who had been studying there took leave of the study hall of Rabbi Ami, and some say it was the study hall of Rabbi Ḥanina, they would say to him the following blessing: May you see your world, may you benefit from all of the good in the world, in your lifetime, and may your end be to life in the World-to-Come, and may your hope be sustained for many generations. May your heart meditate understanding, your mouth speak wisdom, and your tongue whisper with praise. May your eyelids look directly before you, your eyes shine in the light of Torah, and your face radiate like the brightness of the firmament. May your lips express knowledge, your kidneys rejoice in the upright, and your feet run to hear the words of the Ancient of Days, God (see Daniel 7).

²¹⁷ When the Sages took leave of the study hall of Rav Ḥisda, and some say it was the study hall of Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani, they would say to him the following, in accordance with the verse: “Our leaders are laden, there is no breach and no going forth and no outcry in our open places” (Psalms 144:14).

²¹⁸ Our leaders are laden. Rav and Shmuel, and some say Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Elazar, disputed the proper understanding of this verse. One said: Our leaders in Torah are laden with mitzvot. And one said: Our leaders in Torah and mitzvot are laden with suffering.

²¹⁹ “There is no breach”; that our faction of Sages should not be like the faction of David, from which Ahitophel emerged, who caused a breach in the kingdom of David. “And no going forth”; that our faction should not be like the faction of Saul, from which Doeg the Edomite emerged, who set forth on an evil path. “And no outcry”; that our faction should not be like the faction of Elisha, from which Geihazi emerged. “In our open places”; that we should not have a child or student who overcooks his food in public, i.e., who sins in public and causes others to sin, as in the well-known case of Jesus the Nazarene.

²²⁰ Having cited a dispute with regard to the interpretation of a verse where we are uncertain whether the dispute is between Rav and Shmuel or Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Elazar, the Gemara cites another verse with regard to which there is a similar dispute. It is said: “Hear Me, stubborn-hearted who are far from charity” (Isaiah 46:12). While both agree that the verse refers to the righteous, Rav and Shmuel, and some say Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Elazar, disagreed as to how to interpret the verse. One said: The entire world is sustained by God’s charity, not because it deserves to exist, while the righteous who are far from God’s charity are sustained by force, as due to their own good deeds they have the right to demand their sustenance. And one said: The entire world is sustained by the merit of their righteousness, while they are not sustained at all, not even by their own merit, in accordance with the statement that Rav Yehuda said that Rav said.

²²¹ As Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: Every day a Divine Voice emerges from Mount Horeb and says: The entire world is sustained by the merit of Ḥanina ben Dosa, my son, and for Ḥanina, my son, a kav of carobs is sufficient to sustain him for an entire week, from one Shabbat eve to the next Shabbat eve.

²²² And this exegesis disagrees with the opinion of Rav Yehuda, as Rav Yehuda said, who are the stubborn-hearted? They are the foolish heathens of Gova'ei. Rav Yosef said: Know that this is so, as no convert has ever converted from their ranks.

²²³ Similarly, Rav Ashi said: The heathen residents of the city Mata Meḥasya are the stubborn-hearted, as they witness the glory of the Torah twice a year at the kalla gatherings in Adar and Elul, when thousands of people congregate and study Torah en masse, yet no convert has ever converted from their ranks.

²²⁴ We learned in our mishna that if a groom wishes to recite Shema on the first night of his marriage, he may do so, and Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel prohibited doing so because of the appearance of presumptuousness.

²²⁵ The Gemara asks: Is that to say that Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel is concerned about presumptuousness and the Rabbis are not concerned about presumptuousness? Didn't we learn that they say the opposite? As we learned in a mishna: A place where they were accustomed to perform labor on Ninth of Av, one may perform labor. A place where they were accustomed not to perform labor on Ninth of Av, one may not perform labor. And everywhere, Torah scholars are idle and do not perform labor. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: With regard to performing labor on the Ninth of Av, one should always conduct himself as a Torah scholar.

²²⁶ If so, there is a contradiction between the statement of the Rabbis here and the statement of the Rabbis there. And, there is a contradiction between the statement of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel here and the statement of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel there.

²²⁷ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The attribution of the opinions is reversed in one of the sources in the interest of avoiding contradiction. Rav Sheisha, son of Rav Idi, said: Actually, you need not reverse the opinions, as the contradiction between the statement of the Rabbis here and the statement of the Rabbis there is not difficult. In the case of the recitation of Shema on his wedding night, since everyone is reciting Shema and he is also reciting Shema, he is not conspicuous and it does not appear as presumptuousness. Here, in the case of the Ninth of Av, however, since everyone is performing labor and he is not performing labor, his idleness is conspicuous and appears as presumptuousness.

²²⁸ So too, the contradiction between the statement of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel here and the statement of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel there is not difficult. There, in the case of the recitation of Shema on his wedding night, the matter is dependent upon his capacity to concentrate, and it is clear to all that he is unable to concentrate. Reciting Shema under those circumstances is a display of presumptuousness. But here, in the case of the Ninth of Av, one who sees him idle says: It is because he has no labor to perform. Go out and see how many idle people there are in the marketplace, even on days when one is permitted to work. Consequently, his idleness is not conspicuous.

Chapter 3

¹ MISHNA: One whose deceased relative is laid out unburied before him is exempt from the recitation of Shema, from the Amida prayer, and from the mitzva to don phylacteries, as well as all positive mitzvot mentioned in the Torah, until the deceased has been buried.

² With regard to the pallbearers and their replacements and the replacements of their replacements, those located before the bier who have not yet carried the deceased and those located after the bier. Those before the bier who are needed to carry the bier are exempt from reciting Shema; while those after the bier, even if they are still needed to carry it, since they have already carried the deceased, they are obligated to recite Shema. However, both these and those are exempt from reciting the Amida prayer, since they are preoccupied and are unable to focus and pray with the appropriate intent.

³ After they buried the deceased and returned, if they have sufficient time to begin to recite Shema and conclude before they arrive at the row, formed by those who attended the burial, through which the bereaved family will pass in order to receive consolation, they should begin. If they do not have sufficient time to conclude reciting the entire Shema, then they should not begin.

⁴ And those standing in the row, those in the interior row, directly before whom the mourners will pass and who will console them, are exempt from reciting Shema, while those in the exterior row, who stand there only to show their respect, are obligated to recite Shema. Women, slaves and minors are exempt from the recitation of Shema and from phylacteries, but are obligated in prayer, mezuzah and Grace after Meals.

⁵ GEMARA: We learned in the mishna that one whose deceased relative is laid out before him is exempt from the recitation of Shema and other positive mitzvot. The Gemara deduces: When the corpse is laid out before him, yes, he is exempt, but when the corpse is not physically laid out before him, no, he is not exempt from these mitzvot.

⁶ The Gemara raises a contradiction from a baraita: One whose deceased relative is laid out before him eats in another room. If he does not have another room, he eats in the house of a friend. If he does not have a friend's house available, he makes a partition between him and the deceased and eats. If he does not have material with which to make a partition, he averts his face from the dead and eats. And in any case, he does not recline while he eats, as reclining is characteristic of a festive meal. Furthermore, he neither eats meat nor drinks wine, and does not recite a blessing before eating, and does not recite the formula to invite the participants in the meal to join together in the Grace after Meals [zimmin], i.e., he is exempt from the obligation of Grace after Meals.

⁷ And there is no need for others to recite a blessing beforehand on his behalf, nor do others invite him to join in Grace after Meals, as he cannot be a member of the quorum of three required to recite the formula. He is exempt from the recitation of Shema, from the Amida prayer and from phylacteries, and from all mitzvot mentioned in the Torah. On Shabbat, however, he reclines at the meal as per his custom, and eats meat and drinks wine, and recites blessings and recites the formula to invite the participants in the meal to join together in the Grace after Meals, and others may recite blessings on his behalf and invite him to join in Grace after Meals, and he is obligated in all mitzvot mentioned in the Torah. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Just as he is obligated on Shabbat to fulfill these mitzvot associated with Shabbat meals, he is obligated to fulfill all mitzvot.

⁸ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: What is the practical difference between the apparently identical statements of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel and the first tanna? The practical difference between them is with regard to conjugal relations. The first tanna holds that although there is no mourning on Shabbat, since refraining from addressing his wife's conjugal rights would not be a public display of mourning, conjugal relations are prohibited. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel holds that since there is no mourning on Shabbat, he must fulfill the mitzva of addressing his wife's conjugal rights.

⁹ In any event, the baraita teaches that one is exempt from the recitation of Shema, from the Amida prayer and from phylacteries, and from all mitzvot mentioned in the Torah. This is an apparent contradiction of our mishna which states that one is exempt only when the deceased is laid before him. To resolve this contradiction, Rav Pappa said: Explain the baraita as applicable only to the particular case when one turns his face away and eats, with the deceased laid out before him. In the other cases, when he is in a different room, he is obligated in all mitzvot. Rav Ashi says: The phrase: The deceased is laid out before him, is not to be taken literally, but rather, since it is incumbent upon him to bury the deceased, and he is not yet buried, it is as if he is laid out before him, as it is stated: "And Abraham rose up from before his dead" (Genesis 23:3), and when Abraham speaks with the Hittites, it is stated: "So that I may bury my dead from before me" (Genesis 23:4). As long as it is incumbent upon him to bury him, it is as he is laid out before him.

¹⁰ From the mishna one can infer that when his deceased relative is laid out before him, yes, he is exempt from mitzvot. But, if it is not his relative and he is only watching over the deceased, no, he is not exempt.

¹¹ The Gemara challenges: Wasn't it taught in a baraita: One who watches over the deceased, even if it is not his deceased relative, is exempt from the recitation of Shema, from prayer and from phylacteries, and from all mitzvot mentioned in the Torah? The Gemara responds that these two sources should not be understood as contradictory, but as complementary. In both the cases, he is exempt; where one watches over the deceased, but it is not his deceased relative, as well as the case where it is his deceased relative, but he is not watching over the deceased.

¹² The Gemara further challenges: We concluded that, in both cases, if it is his deceased relative or if he was watching over the unrelated deceased, he is exempt from mitzvot. However, one walking in a cemetery is not exempt. Wasn't it taught explicitly in a baraita: One may not walk in a cemetery with phylacteries on his head and a Torah scroll in his arm and read from it? If one does so he commits a transgression due to the verse: "He who mocks the poor blasphemes his Creator" (Proverbs 17:5). As the deceased is incapable of fulfilling mitzvot, fulfilling a mitzva in his presence is seen as mocking him.

¹³ The Gemara answers: There, when one walks in a cemetery, within four cubits of a grave, that is prohibited. However, beyond four cubits from a grave, one is obligated in prayer and phylacteries. As the Master said: The deceased occupies four cubits with regard to the exemption from the recitation of Shema. One who walks within four cubits of the deceased is exempt. Here, however, in the case where it is either his deceased relative or he is watching over an unrelated deceased, beyond four cubits he is also exempt.

¹⁴ The Gemara discusses the matter of the baraita itself. It was taught in the baraita: One who watches over the deceased, even though it is not his dead relative, is exempt from the recitation of Shema, from the Amida prayer and from phylacteries, and from all mitzvot mentioned in the Torah.

The baraita continues: If two individuals were watching over the deceased, this one watches and that one recites Shema, and then that one watches and this one recites Shema. Ben Azzai says: If they were traveling with the deceased on a boat, they are permitted to set the deceased down in this corner of the boat and both pray in another corner of the boat.

¹⁵ The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference between these two opinions? Ravina said: The practical difference between them is whether or not one need be concerned about mice even inside the boat. The first Sage holds that we are concerned about mice everywhere, and it is therefore inappropriate to leave the deceased unguarded, even on a boat, lest he be eaten by mice. The other Sage, ben Azzai, maintains that we are not concerned about mice on a boat.

¹⁶ The Gemara discusses other issues concerning the dignity of the deceased. The Sages taught: One who transports bones from place to place may not place them in a saddlebag [disakaya] and place them on the donkey's back and ride on them, as in doing so he treats the remains disgracefully. However, if he is afraid of gentiles or highwaymen and therefore must move quickly, he is permitted to do so. And just as they said with regard to bones, so they said with regard to a Torah scroll.

¹⁷ With regard to this last statement, the Gemara asks: To what section of the baraita does the parallel to a Torah scroll refer? If you say that this refers to the first clause of the baraita, this is obvious. Is a Torah scroll less important than bones of the dead? Certainly one may not treat a Torah disgracefully. Rather, this statement must refer to the latter clause of the baraita, that in a dangerous situation, one is permitted to ride on a Torah scroll as well.

¹⁸ Raḥava said that Rav Yehuda said: One who sees the deceased taken to burial and does not escort him has committed a transgression due to the verse: "He who mocks the poor blasphemes his Creator." (Proverbs 17:5) And if he does escort him, what is his reward? Rav Asi said: The verse says about him: "He who gives to the poor gives a loan to the Lord, and the Lord will repay him" (Proverbs 19:17), and: "He who oppresses the poor blasphemes his Creator, but he who is gracious to the poor honors Him" (Proverbs 14:31).

¹⁹ The Gemara relates that Rabbi Ḥiyya and Rabbi Yonatan were walking in a cemetery and the sky-blue string of Rabbi Yonatan's ritual fringes was cast to the ground and dragging across the graves. Rabbi Ḥiyya said to him: Lift it, so the dead will not say: Tomorrow, when their day comes, they will come to be buried with us, and now they are insulting us.

²⁰ Rabbi Yonatan said to him: Do the dead know so much? Isn't it stated: "And the dead know nothing" (Ecclesiastes 9:5)? Rabbi Ḥiyya said to him: If you read the verse, you did not read it a second time, and if you read it a second time, you did not read it a third time, and if you read it a third time, they did not explain it to you properly. The meaning of the verse: "For the living know that they will die, and the dead know nothing and have no more reward, for their memory has been forgotten" (Ecclesiastes 9:5): For the living know that they will die, these are the righteous, who even in their death are called living. An allusion to this is as it is stated: "And Benayahu, son of Yehoyada, son of a valiant man of Kabze'el, who had done mighty deeds, he smote the two altar-hearths of Moab; he went down also and slew a lion in the midst of a pit in time of snow" (II Samuel 23:20).

²¹ He was referred to in the verse as son of a living man. The Gemara wonders: Is that to say, the fact that the Bible referred to him with that appellation, that all others are children of the dead? Rather, the verse should be explained as follows: The son of a living man who lives forever, who even in death is referred to as living. Man of Kabze'el who had done mighty deeds, as he accumulated and

gathered many workers for the sake of the Torah. Who killed the two lion-hearted men [Ariel] of Moab, as after his death he left no one his equal, in either the First Temple or the Second Temple periods, as the Temple is called Ariel (see Isaiah 29:1), and the two Ariel refers to the two Temples.

²² The Sages disagreed over the interpretation of the rest of the verse: “And who descended and slew the lion in the pit on the snowy day.” Some say that this means that he broke blocks of hail and descended and immersed himself in the water to purify himself. Others say that he learned all of the Sifra, the halakhic midrash on the book of Leviticus of the school of Rav, on a winter’s day.

²³ In contrast to the righteous, who are referred to as living even after their death, the verse states explicitly: “The dead know nothing.” These are the wicked, who even during their lives are called dead, as the prophet Ezekiel said in reference to a king of Israel who was alive: “And you are a slain, wicked prince of Israel” (Ezekiel 21:30). And if you wish, say instead that the proof is from here: “At the mouth of two witnesses or three witnesses the dead shall be put to death” (Deuteronomy 17:6). This is puzzling. As long as the accused has not been sentenced to death, he is alive. Rather, this person who is wicked is considered dead from the outset.

²⁴ The Gemara relates a story on this topic: The sons of Rabbi Ḥiyya went out to the villages to oversee the laborers. They forgot what they had learned and were struggling to recall it. One of them said to the other: Does our deceased father know of our anguish? The other said to him: From where would he know? Isn’t it written: “His sons are honored yet he shall not know it, they come to sorrow and he shall not understand them” (Job 14:21)? The dead do not know.

²⁵ The other said back to him: And do the dead truly not know? Isn’t it written: “Only in his flesh does he feel pain, in his soul does he mourn” (Job 14:22)? Based on this verse Rabbi Yitzḥak said: Gnawing maggots are as excruciating to the dead as the stab of a needle to the flesh of the living. The dead must have the capacity to feel and know.

²⁶ In order to reconcile this contradiction they said: They know of their own pain but do not know of the pain of others.

²⁷ The Gemara challenges this: And is it so that the dead do not know of the pain of others? Wasn’t it taught in a baraita: There was an incident involving a pious man who gave a poor man a dinar on the eve of Rosh HaShana during drought years, and his wife mocked him for giving so large a sum at so difficult a time? And in order to escape her incessant mockery, he went and slept in the cemetery. That night in his dream (Ritva, HaKotev, Maharsha), he heard two spirits conversing with each other. One said to the other: My friend, let us roam the world and hear from behind the heavenly curtain [pargod], which separates the Divine Presence from the world, what calamity will befall the world. The other spirit said to her: I cannot go with you, as I am buried in a mat of reeds, but you go, and tell me what you hear. She went, and roamed, and came back. The other spirit said: My friend, what did you hear from behind the heavenly curtain? She replied: I heard that anyone who sows during the first rainy season of this year, hail will fall and strike his crops. Hearing this, the pious man went and sowed his seeds during the second rainy season. Ultimately, the crops of the entire world were stricken by hail and his crops were not stricken.

²⁸ The following year, on the eve of Rosh HaShana, the same pious man went and slept in the cemetery at his own initiative, and again he heard the two spirits conversing with each other. One said to the other: Let us roam the world and hear from behind the heavenly curtain what calamity will befall the world. She said to her: My friend, have I not already told you that I cannot, as I am buried

in a mat of reeds? Rather, you go, and tell me what you hear. She went, and roamed, and returned. The other spirit said to her: My friend, what did you hear from behind the curtain? She said to her: I heard that those who sow during the second rainy season blight will strike his crops. That pious man went and sowed during the first rainy season. Since everyone else sowed during the second rainy season, ultimately, the crops of the entire world were blighted and his crops were not blighted.

²⁹ The pious man's wife said to him: Why is it that last year, the crops of the entire world were stricken and yours were not stricken, and now this year, the crops of the entire world were blighted and yours were not blighted? He related to her the entire story. They said: It was not even a few days later that a quarrel fell between the pious man's wife and the mother of the young woman who was buried there. The pious man's wife said to her scornfully: Go and I will show you your daughter, and you will see that she is buried in a mat of reeds.

³⁰ The following year, he again went and slept in the cemetery, and heard the same spirits conversing with each other. One said to the other: My friend, let us roam the world and hear from behind the heavenly curtain what calamity will befall the world. She said to her: My friend, leave me alone, as words that we have privately exchanged between us have already been heard among the living. Apparently, the dead know what transpires in this world.

³¹ The Gemara responds: This is no proof; perhaps another person, who heard about the conversation of the spirits secondhand, died and he went and told them that they had been overheard.

³² With regard to the deceased's knowledge of what transpires, come and hear a proof, as it is told: Ze'iri would deposit his dinars with his innkeeper. While he was going and coming to and from the school of Rav, she died, and he did not know where she had put the money. So he went after her to her grave in the cemetery and said to her: Where are the dinars? She replied: Go and get them from beneath the hinge of the door in such and such a place, and tell my mother that she should send me my comb and a tube of eyeshadow with such and such a woman who will die and come here tomorrow. Apparently, the dead know what transpires in this world.

³³ The Gemara rejects this proof: Perhaps the angel Duma, who oversees the dead, comes beforehand and announces to them that a particular individual will arrive the next day, but they themselves do not know.

³⁴ The Gemara cites another proof: Come and hear, as it is told: They would deposit the money of orphans with Shmuel's father for safekeeping. When Shmuel's father died, Shmuel was not with him, and did not learn from him the location of the money. Since he did not return it, Shmuel was called: Son of him who consumes the money of orphans. Shmuel went after his father to the cemetery and said to the dead: I want Abba. The dead said to him: There are many Abbas here. He told them: I want Abba bar Abba. They said to him: There are also many people named Abba bar Abba here. He told them: I want Abba bar Abba, the father of Shmuel. Where is he? They replied: Ascend to the yeshiva on high. Meanwhile, he saw his friend Levi sitting outside the yeshiva, away from the rest of the deceased. He asked him: Why do you sit outside? Why did you not ascend to the yeshiva? He replied: Because they tell me that for all those years that you didn't enter the yeshiva of Rabbi Afes, and thereby upset him, we will not grant you entry to the yeshiva on high.

³⁵ Meanwhile, Shmuel's father came and Shmuel saw that he was crying and laughing. Shmuel said to his father: Why are you crying? His father replied: Because you will come here soon. Shmuel continued and asked: Why are you laughing? His father replied: Because you are extremely

important in this world. Shmuel said to him: If I am important, then let them grant Levi entry to the yeshiva. And so it was that they granted Levi entry to the yeshiva.

³⁶ Shmuel said to his father: Where is the orphans' money? He said to him: Go and retrieve it from the millhouse, where you will find the uppermost and the lowermost money is ours, and the money in the middle belongs to the orphans. Shmuel said to him: Why did you do that? He replied: If thieves stole, they would steal from our money on top, which the thief would see first. If the earth swallowed up any of it, it would swallow from our money, on the bottom. Apparently, the dead, in this case Shmuel's father, know when others will die. Since Shmuel did not die the next day, clearly the angel Duma could not have informed them (Tosafot). The Gemara responds: Perhaps Shmuel is different, and because he is so important they announce beforehand: Clear place for his arrival.

³⁷ In any case, with regard to the crux of the issue, Rabbi Yonatan also reconsidered his opinion, as Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: From where is it derived that the dead converse with each other? As it is stated: "And the Lord said to him, this is the land that I swore to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, saying: I will give it to your offspring" (Deuteronomy 34:4). What is the meaning of "saying"? It means that God told Moses: Go and tell Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that the oath that I swore to you I have already fulfilled for your descendants.

³⁸ And if it should enter your mind that the dead do not know, then what of it if he tells them? The Gemara rejects this: Rather what will you say, that they know? Then why does he need to tell them? The Gemara replies: This is not difficult, as he is telling them so that they will give credit to Moses.

³⁹ On this subject, Rabbi Yitzhak said: Anyone who speaks negatively after the deceased it is as if he speaks after the stone. The Gemara offers two interpretations of this: Some say this is because the dead do not know, and some say that they know, but they do not care that they are spoken of in such a manner.

⁴⁰ The Gemara asks: Is that so? Didn't Rav Pappa say: There was once someone who spoke disparagingly after the death of Mar Shmuel and a reed fell from the ceiling, fracturing his skull? Obviously, the dead care when people speak ill of them.

⁴¹ The Gemara rejects this: This is no proof that the dead care. Rather, a Torah scholar is different, as God Himself demands that his honor be upheld.

⁴² Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said similarly: One who speaks disparagingly after the biers of Torah scholars and maligns them after their death will fall in Gehenna, as it is stated: "But those who turn aside unto their crooked ways, the Lord will lead them away with the workers of iniquity; peace be upon Israel" (Psalms 125:5). Even if he speaks ill of them when there is peace upon Israel, after death, when they are no longer able to fight those denouncing them (Tosafot); nevertheless the Lord will lead them away with the workers of iniquity, to Gehenna.

⁴³ On a similar note, it was taught in the school of Rabbi Yishmael: If you saw a Torah scholar transgress a prohibition at night, do not think badly of him during the day; perhaps he has repented in the meantime. The Gemara challenges this: Does it enter your mind that only perhaps he has repented? Shouldn't he be given the benefit of the doubt? Rather, he has certainly repented. The Gemara notes: The idea that one must always give a Torah scholar the benefit of the doubt and assume that he has repented refers specifically to matters affecting himself, but, if one witnesses a Torah scholar committing a transgression involving the property of another, one is not required to

give him the benefit of the doubt. Rather, he should not assume that he has repented until he sees him return the money to its owner.

⁴⁴ Since matters relating to the respect due Torah scholars were raised, the Gemara continues, citing Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, who said: There are twenty-four places in which the court ostracizes over matters of respect due the rabbi, and we learned them all in our Mishna. Rabbi Elazar said to him: Where are those cases to be found? Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said to him: When you look, you will find them.

⁴⁵ He went out, analyzed, and found three examples: One who demeans the ritual of washing of the hands, one who speaks disparagingly after the bier of Torah scholars, and one who is arrogant vis-à-vis Heaven. The Gemara cites sources for each of these cases.

⁴⁶ What is the source for one who speaks disparagingly after the biers of Torah scholars? As we learned in the mishna: Akavya ben Mahalalel would say: In the case of a woman whose husband suspects her of adultery, who was warned by her husband not to seclude herself with another man and she did not listen (see Numbers 5), the court does not administer the bitter water potion of a sota to a convert or an emancipated maidservant. And the Rabbis say: The court administers the bitter water potion to them. And the Rabbis said to him as proof: There is the story of Kharkemit, an emancipated maidservant in Jerusalem, and Shemaya and Avtalyon administered her the bitter waters. Akavya ben Mahalalel said to the Sages: That is no proof. Shemaya and Avtalyon, who were also from families of converts, required the maidservant to drink the potion because she was like them [dugma]. And since Akavya ben Mahalalel cast aspersion on the deceased Torah scholars, he was ostracized and died while he was still under the ban of ostracism. And in accordance with the halakha with regard to one who dies while under a ban of ostracism, the court stoned his coffin. Apparently, one who deprecates a deceased Torah scholar is sentenced to ostracism.

⁴⁷ And what is the source for one who demeans the ritual of washing of the hands? We learned later in the same mishna: Rabbi Yehuda said: That story related with regard to the ostracism of Akavya ben Mahalalel is completely untrue; God forbid that Akavya ben Mahalalel was ostracized, as the Temple courtyard is not closed on any Jew, meaning that even when all of Israel made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, when each of the three groups that gathered to offer the Paschal lamb filled the courtyard, leading the Temple administration to close the courtyard, there was no one there as perfect in wisdom, purity and fear of sin as Akavya ben Mahalalel. Rather, whom did they excommunicate? Elazar ben Ḥanokh, because he doubted and demeaned the rabbinic ordinance of washing of the hands. And when he died, the court sent instructions and they placed a large rock upon his coffin in order to teach you that one who is ostracized and dies in a state of ostracism, the court stones his coffin, as if symbolically stoning him. Apparently, one who makes light of the ritual of washing of the hands is sentenced to ostracism.

⁴⁸ What is the source for the third case, one who is arrogant vis-à-vis Heaven? The mishna relates that Ḥoni HaMe'aggel, the circle-drawer, drew a circle and stood inside it, and said that he would not leave the circle until it rained, and he went so far as to make demands in terms of the manner in which he wanted the rain to fall. After it rained, Shimon ben Shataḥ, the Nasi of the Sanhedrin, relayed to Ḥoni HaMe'aggel: Actually, you should be ostracized for what you said, and if you were not Ḥoni, I would have decreed ostracism upon you, but what can I do? You nag God and He does your bidding, like a son who nags his father and his father does his bidding without reprimand. After

all, the rain fell as you requested. About you, the verse states: “Your father and mother will be glad and she who bore you will rejoice” (Proverbs 23:25). Apparently, one who is arrogant vis-à-vis Heaven would ordinarily merit excommunication.

⁴⁹ The Gemara challenges this: And are there no more cases of excommunication or threats of excommunication? Surely there are additional cases like the one in the baraita taught by Rav Yosef: It is told that Theodosius of Rome, leader of the Jewish community there, instituted the custom for the Roman Jews to eat whole kids, young goats roasted with their entrails over their heads, as was the custom when roasting the Paschal lamb, on the eve of Passover, as they did in the Temple. Shimon ben Shataḥ sent a message to him: If you were not Theodosius, an important person, I would have decreed ostracism upon you, as it appears as if you are feeding Israel consecrated food, which may only be eaten in and around the Temple itself, outside the Temple.

⁵⁰ The Gemara responds: This case should not be included, as Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said that there were twenty-four cases in our Mishna, and this is merely a baraita.

⁵¹ The Gemara asks: And are there none in the Mishna? Isn't there that which we learned in the mishna: One who cut an earthenware oven horizontally into ring-shaped pieces and put sand between the pieces, Rabbi Eliezer deems the oven ritually pure, i.e., it is no longer susceptible to ritual impurity. He holds that, although the fragments of the oven were pieced together, it is not considered an intact vessel but, rather, as a collection of fragments, and a broken earthenware vessel cannot become ritually impure. And the Rabbis deem it ritually impure. Since the oven continues to serve its original function, it is still considered a single entity and a whole vessel despite the sand put between the pieces. And this is called the oven of akhnai, snake.

⁵² The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of oven of the snake? Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: It is called snake to teach that the Rabbis surrounded Rabbi Eliezer with halakhot and proofs like a snake surrounds its prey, and declared the oven and its contents ritually impure.

⁵³ And it was taught in a baraita: On that day, they gathered all of the ritually pure food items that had come into contact with the oven that Rabbi Eliezer had declared ritually pure, and burned them before him, and because he did not accept the decision of the majority, in the end they “blessed,” a euphemism for ostracized, him. This is another case that ended in ostracism.

⁵⁴ The Gemara answers: Even so, we did not learn the ruling with regard to his ostracism in the mishna. The Gemara asks: Then where do you find the twenty-four places mentioned in Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi's statement? The Gemara responds: Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi likens one matter to another similar matter. Whenever he would encounter a case in a mishna where one of the Sages expressed himself inappropriately in reference to other Sages, he concluded that they should have been excommunicated. Rabbi Elazar does not liken one matter to another similar matter, and therefore located only three explicit cases of ostracism.

⁵⁵ We learned in the mishna that the pallbearers and their replacements are exempt from the recitation of Shema. On this subject, the Gemara cites that which the Sages taught in a baraita: The deceased may not be taken out to be buried adjacent to the time for the recitation of Shema, but should be buried later. And if they already started to take him out, they need not stop in order to recite Shema. The Gemara challenges: Is that so? Didn't they take Rav Yosef out to be buried adjacent to the time for the recitation of Shema? The Gemara resolves this contradiction: The case of an important person is different, and they are more lenient in order to honor him at his burial.

⁵⁶ In the mishna, we learned the halakha with regard to the pallbearers and their obligation to recite Shema, and a distinction was made between those who are before the bier and those after the bier. Our Rabbis taught in a baraita: Those involved in eulogy must slip away from the eulogy one by one while the deceased is laid out before them and recite Shema elsewhere. And if the deceased is not laid out before them, the eulogizers must sit and recite Shema while the bereaved sits silently. They stand and pray and he stands and justifies God's judgment, saying: Master of the Universe, I have sinned greatly against You, and You have not collected even one one-thousandth of my debt. May it be Your will, Lord our God, to mercifully repair the breaches in our fence and the breaches of Your nation, the House of Israel.

⁵⁷ Abaye said: A person should not say that, as Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said, and it was also taught in the name of Rabbi Yosei: One must never open his mouth to the Satan, i.e., one must not leave room for or raise the possibility of disaster or evil. This formula, which states that the entire debt owed due to his transgressions has not been collected, raises the possibility that further payment will be exacted from him.

⁵⁸ And Rav Yosef said: What is the verse from which it is derived? As it is stated: "We should have almost been as Sodom, we should have been like unto Gomorrah" (Isaiah 1:9), after which what did the prophet reply to them? "Hear the word of the Lord, rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, people of Gomorrah" (Isaiah 1:10).

⁵⁹ We learned in the mishna that, in a case when they buried the deceased and returned, if they have sufficient time to begin to recite Shema and conclude before they arrive at the row formed by those who came to console the bereaved, they should begin. Here, the Gemara clarifies: This is the case only if they can begin and complete recitation of Shema in its entirety. However, if they can only complete one chapter or one verse, they should not stop to do so. The Gemara raises a contradiction from that which we learned in the baraita: After they buried the deceased and returned, if they can begin the recitation of Shema and finish even a single chapter or verse, they should begin.

⁶⁰ The Gemara responds: That is also what the tanna of the mishna said and this is the conclusion drawn from his statement: If one can begin and conclude even one chapter or one verse before they arrive at the row of consolers, they should begin. And if not, they should not begin.

⁶¹ We learned in the mishna that those standing in the row, those in the interior row, are exempt from reciting Shema and the others are obligated. The Sages taught this more expansively in the Tosefta: The consolers standing in a row from which one sees inside the area where the mourners are passing are exempt, and those standing in a row from which one does not see inside are obligated. And Rabbi Yehuda elaborates and says: The consolers standing in the row who come on account of the bereaved are exempt, while those who come on account of their own curiosity are obligated to recite Shema.

⁶² We learned that some who come to console the bereaved are exempt from Shema as a means of honoring the deceased. The Gemara expands the discussion to raise the general question: To what degree does preserving human dignity take precedence over mitzvot enumerated in the Torah? Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: One who discovers diverse kinds [kilayim], i.e., a prohibited mixture of wool and linen, in his garment, must remove them even in the public marketplace. He may not wait until he reaches home. What is the reason for this? As it is stated: "There is neither wisdom, nor understanding, nor counsel against the Lord" (Proverbs 21:30). From here, the general principle:

Anywhere that there is desecration of the Lord's name, one does not show respect to the teacher, is derived.

⁶³ The Gemara cites several sources to challenge this principle. The Gemara raised an objection from a baraita: After they buried the deceased and returned, and on their way there are two paths before them, one ritually pure and one ritually impure, e.g., it passes through a cemetery, if the mourner comes on the pure path, they come with him on the pure path; if he comes on the impure path, all of the funeral participants accompany him on the impure path in order to show him respect. Why would they do this? Let us say here too that, "There is neither wisdom, nor understanding...against the Lord!"

⁶⁴ Rabbi Abba explained that the baraita is referring to a path that passes through an area where there is uncertainty with regard to the location of a grave or a corpse [beit haperas]. For example, with regard to a field in which there is a grave that was plowed and no longer intact, the entire field is deemed impure due to concern that the plow scattered bones throughout the field. The field is impure only by rabbinic law but not according to Torah law. Since it is only prohibited by rabbinic law, one is permitted to walk through the field to show the mourner respect.

⁶⁵ The Gemara cites proof that the legal status of a beit haperas is unlike the legal status of impurity by Torah law: Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: One who passes through a beit haperas may blow on the dust before taking each step, so that if there is a bone beneath the dust, he will expose it, avoid it, and walk. One may not rely on that method of examination with regard to impurity by Torah law. And Rav Yehuda bar Ashi said in the name of Rav: A beit haperas that has been trodden underfoot, creating a path, is pure, and one no longer need be concerned about bones. Clearly, the entire prohibition is a stringency decreed by the Sages.

⁶⁶ The Gemara cites additional proof with regard to the extent to which human dignity overrides mitzvot in the Torah. Come and hear, as Rabbi Elazar bar Tzadok the priest said: I and my fellow priests would jump over coffins of the deceased in order to hurry towards kings of Israel to greet them. And they did not say this only towards kings of Israel, but they said this even towards kings of the nations of the world, so that if one will be privileged to witness the redemption of Israel, he will distinguish between kings of Israel and kings of the nations of the world. The priest violated the Torah prohibition to become ritually impure through contact with the dead, in order to show respect for a king. And why is this? Let us say here too: "There is neither wisdom, nor understanding, nor counsel against the Lord."

⁶⁷ The Gemara responds to this challenge by saying that it must be understood in accordance with the opinion of Rava, as Rava said: By Torah law, a tent over a corpse, as long as there is a handbreadth of space between the corpse and the tent over it, constitutes a barrier before the spread of impurity and nothing above the tent can become ritually impure due to impurity imparted by the corpse. And when there is not a handbreadth of space between the corpse and the tent over it, the tent does not constitute a barrier before the spread of impurity and the "pressed" ritual impurity, can reach the heavens.

⁶⁸ Most coffins have a handbreadth of space. Consequently, their impurity does not spread above the coffin. However, the Sages issued a decree regarding coffins in which there is a handbreadth of space because of those coffins in which there is not. Nevertheless, due to respect for kings, the Sages did not issue a decree in a case involving them and the priests were permitted to jump over the coffins, as

it is permitted by Torah law. Therefore, there is no proof from here regarding the question of whether or not human dignity overrides Torah law.

⁶⁹ The Gemara cites an additional proof from a baraita: Come and hear: Great is human dignity, as it overrides a prohibition in the Torah.

⁷⁰ The Gemara asks: Why? Let us also say here: “There is neither wisdom, nor understanding, nor counsel against the Lord.” Rav bar Shaba interpreted this prohibition, which is overridden by human dignity, before Rav Kahana as referring to the prohibition of: “According to the Torah taught to you and the ruling handed down to you, you shall do, you shall not deviate to the left or the right from that which they tell you” (Deuteronomy 17:11). The Yeshiva students laughed at him, as the prohibition of “you shall not deviate” is by Torah law, like all other Torah prohibitions. Why should human dignity override it any more than any other Torah prohibition?

⁷¹ Rav Kahana replied to them: A great man has spoken, do not laugh at him. The Sages based all rabbinic law on the prohibition of “you shall not deviate”; however, due to concern for human dignity, the Sages permitted suspension of rabbinic law in cases where the two collide. All rabbinic decrees are predicated on the mitzva in the Torah to heed the judges in each generation and to never stray from their words. Therefore, when the Sages suspend a decree in the interest of preserving human dignity, human dignity is overriding a Torah prohibition. In any case, it only overrides rabbinic decrees.

⁷² The Gemara cites an additional proof from a baraita: Come and hear: With regard to the laws of returning a lost object, it is stated: “You shall not see the ox of your brother or his sheep go astray and ignore them; return them to your brother” (Deuteronomy 22:1). The baraita explains that the seemingly extraneous expression and disregard them must be understood to give license that at times you disregard lost objects and at times you do not disregard them.

⁷³ How so? If he was a priest and the lost object was in the cemetery, or if he was an elder and it is beneath his dignity to tend to a lost object of that kind, or if he had more work to do than another person and he does not want to set it all aside when another person is available to tend to the lost object. Therefore, with regard to those cases it is stated: And disregard them to permit one to refrain from returning the object. Why? Let us say here, too: Although handling the lost object would be beneath his dignity, “there is neither wisdom, nor understanding, nor counsel against the Lord.”

⁷⁴ The Gemara answers: There it is different, as it is written: “And disregard them,” indicating that under certain circumstances one is permitted to disregard a lost object. In that case, there is a biblical directive that creates an exception to the prohibition: “You may not disregard” (Deuteronomy 22:3). We found a case in which human dignity overrides a Torah prohibition. The Gemara suggests: Let us derive a general principle that human dignity takes precedence over all mitzvot in the Torah from this case. This possibility is rejected: We do not derive halakhot pertaining to prohibitions from monetary laws, and the case of the lost object merely entails a monetary loss, unlike other prohibitions.

⁷⁵ The Gemara cites an additional proof from a baraita. Come and hear what was said in the Torah with regard to the Nazirite: “He shall not become impure for his father or his mother or his brother or his sister in their death, for the crown of his God is on his head” (Numbers 6:7). Since it was already written with regard to the Nazirite: “He shall not come upon a dead body” (Numbers 6:6), why is it necessary to elaborate and specify his parents and siblings?

⁷⁶ The Sages derived through halakhic midrash that each of these relationships come to teach a specific nuance of the law. They learned: To what purpose did the verse state: And his sister? To teach that one who was going to slaughter his Paschal lamb and to circumcise his son, both of which are positive mitzvot that if he fails to fulfill them, he is punished with karet, and he heard that a relative of his died, I might have thought that he should return and become ritually impure with the impurity imparted by a corpse. You said: “He shall not become impure”; the death of his relative will not override so significant a mitzva from the Torah.

⁷⁷ I might have thought: Just as he does not become impure for his relatives, so he does not become impure for a corpse with no one to bury it [met mitzva]. The verse states: “And his sister”; he may not become impure for his sister, as someone else can attend to her burial,

⁷⁸ but he does become impure for a met mitzva. Here too, the question is asked: Let us say that the obligation to bury a met mitzva, which is predicated on the preservation of human dignity, should not override mitzvot explicitly written in the Torah, as it is stated: “There is neither wisdom, nor understanding, nor counsel against the Lord.”

⁷⁹ The Gemara answers: There it is different, as it is explicitly written: “And his sister,” from which we derive that although he may not become ritually impure to bury his sister, he must do so for a met mitzva.

⁸⁰ The Gemara suggests: Let us derive a general principle that human dignity takes precedence over all mitzvot in the Torah from this case. This possibility is rejected: This is a special case, because a case of “sit and refrain from action” [shev ve’al ta’aseh] is different. Engaging in the burial of a met mitzva is not actually in contravention of a mitzva. Rather, by doing so he becomes ritually impure and is then rendered incapable of fulfilling that mitzva. We cannot derive a general principle from here that human dignity would also override a Torah prohibition in a case where that prohibition is directly contravened.

⁸¹ The Gemara responds: In the context of the discussion whether or not human dignity overrides honoring God in the sense of fulfilling his mitzvot, Rav Pappa said to Abaye: What is different about the earlier generations, for whom miracles occurred and what is different about us, for whom miracles do not occur? If it is because of Torah study; in the years of Rav Yehuda all of their learning was confined to the order of Nezikin, while we learn all six orders! Moreover, when Rav Yehuda would reach in tractate Okatzin, which discusses the extent to which the stems of various fruits and vegetables are considered an integral part of the produce in terms of becoming ritually impure, the halakha that a woman who pickles a vegetable in a pot, and some say when he would reach the halakha that olives pickled with their leaves are pure, because after pickling, it is no longer possible to lift the fruit by its leaves, they are no longer considered part of the fruit; he would find it difficult to understand. He would say: Those are the disputes between Rav and Shmuel that we see here. And we, in contrast, learn thirteen versions of Okatzin. While, with regard to miracles, after declaring a fast to pray for a drought to end, when Rav Yehuda would remove one of his shoes the rain would immediately fall, whereas we torment ourselves and cry out and no one notices us.

⁸² Abaye said to Rav Pappa: The previous generations were wholly dedicated to the sanctification of God’s name, while we are not as dedicated to the sanctification of God’s name. Typical of the earlier generations’ commitment, the Gemara relates: Like this incident involving Rav Adda bar Ahava who saw a non-Jewish woman who was wearing a garment made of a forbidden mixture of wool and

linen [karbalta] in the marketplace. Since he thought that she was Jewish, he stood and ripped it from her. It was then divulged that she was a non-Jew and he was taken to court due to the shame that he caused her, and they assessed the payment for the shame that he caused her at four hundred zuz. Ultimately, Rav Adda said to her: What is your name? She replied: Matun. In a play on words, he said to her: Matun, her name, plus matun, the Aramaic word for two hundred, is worth four hundred zuz.

⁸³ It was also related about the earlier generations, that they would degrade themselves in the desire to glorify God. Rav Giddel was accustomed to go and sit at the gates of the women's immersion sites. He said to them: Immerse yourselves in this way, and immerse yourselves in that way. The Sages said to him: Master, do you not fear the evil inclination? He said to them: In my eyes, they are comparable to white geese.

⁸⁴ Similarly, the Gemara relates that Rabbi Yoḥanan was accustomed to go and sit at the gates of the women's immersion sites. Rabbi Yoḥanan, who was known for his extraordinary good looks, explained this and said: When the daughters of Israel emerge from their immersion, they will look at me, and will have children as beautiful as I. The Sages asked him: Master, do you not fear the evil eye? He said to them: I descend from the seed of Joseph over whom the evil eye has no dominion, as it is written: "Joseph is a bountiful vine, a bountiful vine on a spring [alei ayin]" (Genesis 49:22). "Ayin" can mean both "spring" and "eye." And Rabbi Abbahu said a homiletic interpretation: Do not read it alei ayin, rather olei ayin, above the eye; they transcend the influence of the evil eye.

⁸⁵ Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, cited a different proof, from Jacob's blessing of Joseph's sons, Ephraim and Menashe: "The angel who redeems me from all evil shall bless the young and in them may my name be recalled, and the name of my fathers, Abraham and Isaac, and may they multiply [veyidgu] in the midst of the earth" (Genesis 48:16). Veyidgu is related etymologically to the word fish [dag]. Just as the fish in the sea, water covers them and the evil eye has no dominion over them, so too the seed of Joseph, the evil eye has no dominion over them.

⁸⁶ And if you wish, say instead: Joseph's eye, which did not seek to feast on that which was not his, Potiphar's wife, the evil eye has no dominion over him.

⁸⁷ MISHNA Women, slaves, and minors, who have parallel obligations in various mitzvot, are exempt from the recitation of Shema

⁸⁸ and from phylacteries, but they are obligated in the mitzvot of prayer, mezuzah, and Grace after Meals. The Gemara explains the rationale for these exemptions and obligations.

⁸⁹ GEMARA With regard to the mishna's statement that women are exempt from the recitation of Shema, the Gemara asks: That is obvious, as Shema is a time-bound, positive mitzva, and the halakhic principle is: Women are exempt from any time-bound, positive mitzva, i.e., any mitzva whose performance is only in effect at a particular time. Shema falls into that category as its recitation is restricted to the morning and the evening. Why then did the mishna need to mention it specifically?

⁹⁰ The Gemara replies: Lest you say: Since Shema includes the acceptance of the yoke of the kingdom of Heaven, perhaps women are obligated in its recitation despite the fact that it is a time-bound, positive mitzva. Therefore, the mishna teaches us that, nevertheless, women are exempt.

⁹¹ We also learned in the mishna that women are exempt from phylacteries. The Gemara asks: That is obvious as well. The donning of phylacteries is only in effect at particular times; during the day but not at night, on weekdays but not on Shabbat or Festivals. The Gemara replies: Lest you say: Since the mitzva of phylacteries is juxtaposed in the Torah to the mitzva of mezuzah, as it is written: “And you shall bind them as a sign upon your hands and they shall be frontlets between your eyes” (Deuteronomy 6:8), followed by: “And you shall write them upon the door posts of your house and on your gates” (Deuteronomy 6:9), just as women are obligated in the mitzva of mezuzah, so too they are obligated in the mitzva of phylacteries. Therefore, the mishna teaches us that nevertheless, women are exempt.

⁹² We also learned in the mishna that women, slaves, and children are obligated in prayer. The Gemara explains that, although the mitzva of prayer is only in effect at particular times, which would lead to the conclusion that women are exempt, nevertheless, since prayer is supplication for mercy and women also require divine mercy, they are obligated. However, lest you say: Since regarding prayer it is written: “Evening and morning and afternoon I pray and cry aloud and He hears my voice” (Psalms 55:18), perhaps prayer should be considered a time-bound, positive mitzva and women would be exempt, the mishna teaches us that, fundamentally, the mitzva of prayer is not time-bound and, therefore, everyone is obligated.

⁹³ We also learned in the mishna that women are obligated in the mitzva of mezuzah. The Gemara asks: That too is obvious. Why would they be exempt from fulfilling this obligation, it is a positive mitzva that is not time-bound? The Gemara replies: Lest you say: Since the mitzva of mezuzah is juxtaposed in the Torah to the mitzva of Torah study (Deuteronomy 11:19–20), just as women are exempt from Torah study, so too they are exempt from the mitzva of mezuzah. Therefore, the mishna explicitly teaches us that they are obligated.

⁹⁴ We also learned in the mishna that women are obligated to recite the Grace after Meals. The Gemara asks: That too is obvious. The Gemara replies: Lest you say: Since it is written: “When the Lord shall give you meat to eat in the evening and bread in the morning to the full” (Exodus 16:8), one might conclude that the Torah established fixed times for the meals and, consequently, for the mitzva of Grace after Meals and, therefore, it is considered a time-bound, positive mitzva, exempting women from its recitation. Therefore, the mishna teaches us that women are obligated.

⁹⁵ Rav Adda bar Ahava said: Women are obligated to recite the sanctification of the Shabbat day [kiddush] by Torah law. The Gemara asks: Why? Kiddush is a time-bound, positive mitzva, and women are exempt from all time-bound, positive mitzvot. Abaye said: Indeed, women are obligated to recite kiddush by rabbinic, but not by Torah law.

⁹⁶ Rava said to Abaye: There are two refutations to your explanation. First, Rav Adda bar Ahava said that women are obligated to recite kiddush by Torah law, and, furthermore, the very explanation is difficult to understand. If the Sages do indeed institute ordinances in these circumstances, let us obligate them to fulfill all time-bound, positive mitzvot by rabbinic law, even though they are exempt by Torah law.

⁹⁷ Rather, Rava said: This has a unique explanation. In the Ten Commandments in the book of Exodus, the verse said: “Remember Shabbat and sanctify it” (Exodus 20:8), while in the book of Deuteronomy it is said: “Observe Shabbat and sanctify it” (Deuteronomy 5:12). From these two variants we can deduce that anyone included in the obligation to observe Shabbat by avoiding its

desecration, is also included in the mitzva to remember Shabbat by reciting kiddush. Since these women are included in the mitzva to observe Shabbat, as there is no distinction between men and women in the obligation to observe prohibitions in general and to refrain from the desecration of Shabbat in particular, so too are they included in the mitzva of remembering Shabbat.

⁹⁸ Ravina said to Rava: We learned in the mishna that women are obligated in the mitzva of Grace after Meals. However, are they obligated by Torah law or merely by rabbinic law? What difference does it make whether it is by Torah or rabbinic law? The difference is regarding her ability to fulfill the obligation of others when reciting the blessing on their behalf. Granted, if you say that their obligation is by Torah law, one whose obligation is by Torah law can come and fulfill the obligation of others who are obligated by Torah law. However, if you say that their obligation is by rabbinic law, then from the perspective of Torah law, women are considered to be one who is not obligated, and the general principle is that one who is not obligated to fulfill a particular mitzva cannot fulfill the obligations of the many in that mitzva. Therefore, it is important to know what is the resolution of this dilemma.

⁹⁹ Come and hear from what was taught in a baraita: Actually they said that a son may recite a blessing on behalf of his father, and a slave may recite a blessing on behalf of his master, and a woman may recite a blessing on behalf of her husband, but the Sages said: May a curse come to a man who, due to his ignorance, requires his wife and children to recite a blessing on his behalf.

¹⁰⁰ From here we may infer: Granted, if you say that their obligation is by Torah law, one whose obligation is by Torah law can come and fulfill the obligation of others who are obligated by Torah law. However, if you say that their obligation is by rabbinic law, can one who is obligated by rabbinic law, come and fulfill the obligation of one whose obligation is by Torah law?

¹⁰¹ The Gemara challenges this proof: And according to your reasoning, is a minor obligated by Torah law to perform mitzvot? Everyone agrees that a minor is exempt by Torah law, yet here the baraita said that he may recite a blessing on behalf of his father. There must be another way to explain the baraita. With what we are dealing here? With a case where his father ate a quantity of food that did not satisfy his hunger, a measure for which one is only obligated by rabbinic law to recite Grace after Meals. In that case, one whose obligation is by rabbinic law can come and fulfill the obligation of another whose obligation is by rabbinic law.

¹⁰² After citing the halakha that one who eats a quantity of food that does not satisfy his hunger is obligated by rabbinic law to recite Grace after Meals, the Gemara cites a related homiletic interpretation. Rav Avira taught, sometimes he said it in the name of Rabbi Ami, and sometimes he said it in the name of Rabbi Asi: The ministering angels said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, in Your Torah it is written: “The great, mighty and awesome God who favors no one and takes no bribe” (Deuteronomy 10:17), yet You, nevertheless, show favor to Israel, as it is written: “The Lord shall show favor to you and give you peace” (Numbers 6:26). He replied to them: And how can I not show favor to Israel, as I wrote for them in the Torah: “And you shall eat and be satisfied, and bless the Lord your God” (Deuteronomy 8:10), meaning that there is no obligation to bless the Lord until one is satiated; yet they are exacting with themselves to recite Grace after Meals even if they have eaten as much as an olive-bulk or an egg-bulk. Since they go beyond the requirements of the law, they are worthy of favor.

¹⁰³ MISHNA: Ezra the Scribe decreed that one who is ritually impure because of a seminal emission may not engage in matters of Torah until he has immersed in a ritual bath and purified himself. This halakha was accepted over the course of many generations; however, many disputes arose with regard to the Torah matters to which it applies. Regarding this, the mishna says: If the time for the recitation of Shema arrived and one is impure due to a seminal emission, he may contemplate Shema in his heart, but neither recites the blessings preceding Shema, nor the blessings following it. Over food which, after partaking, one is obligated by Torah law to recite a blessing, one recites a blessing afterward, but one does not recite a blessing beforehand, because the blessing recited prior to eating is a requirement by rabbinic law. And in all of these instances Rabbi Yehuda says: He recites a blessing beforehand and thereafter in both the case of Shema and in the case of food.

¹⁰⁴ GEMARA: Ravina said: That is to say, from the mishna that contemplation is tantamount to speech. As if it would enter your mind that it is not tantamount to speech, then why does one who is impure because of a seminal emission contemplate? It must be that it is tantamount to speech.

¹⁰⁵ The Gemara rejects this: But what are you saying, that contemplation is tantamount to speech? Then, if one who is impure because of a seminal emission is permitted to contemplate, why does he not utter the words with his lips?

¹⁰⁶ The Gemara answers: As we found at Mount Sinai. There one who had sexual relations with a woman was required to immerse himself before receiving the Torah, which was spoken and not merely contemplated. Here, too, it was decreed that one who was impure due to a seminal emission may not recite matters of Torah out loud until he immerses himself.

¹⁰⁷ And Rav Ḥisda said that the opposite conclusion should be drawn from the mishna: Contemplation is not tantamount to speech, as if it would enter your mind that contemplation is tantamount to speech, then one who is impure because of a seminal emission should ab initio, utter Shema with his lips.

¹⁰⁸ The Gemara challenges this argument: But what are you saying, that contemplation is not tantamount to speech? If so, why does he contemplate? Rabbi Elazar said: So that a situation will not arise where everyone is engaged in reciting Shema and he sits idly by.

¹⁰⁹ The Gemara asks: If that is the only purpose, let him study another chapter and not specifically Shema or one of the blessings. Rav Adda bar Ahava said: It is fitting that one engage in a matter in which the community is engaged.

¹¹⁰ The Gemara challenges: And prayer, which is also a matter in which the community is engaged, and we learned in the mishna: One who was standing in prayer and remembered that he is one who experienced a seminal emission and did not yet immerse himself should not interrupt his prayer, rather he should abridge it. The Gemara infers: The reason is because he already began to pray; however, if he did not yet begin, then he should not begin, even by means of contemplation.

¹¹¹ The Gemara responds: Prayer is different in that it does not contain the acceptance of the yoke of the kingdom of Heaven. The Gemara rejects this: And Grace after Meals does not contain the acceptance of the yoke of the kingdom of Heaven, and yet we learned in the mishna: Over food, one recites a blessing afterward, but does not recite a blessing beforehand. Rather, the differences must be explained otherwise: The recitation of Shema and Grace after Meals are both mitzvot by Torah law, while prayer is only by rabbinic law. Therefore, one who is impure need not pray.

¹¹² Rav Yehuda said: From where is the mitzva by Torah law to recite Grace after Meals, derived? As it is stated: “And you shall eat and be satisfied and bless the Lord your God” (Deuteronomy 8:10).

¹¹³ And from where is the mitzva by Torah law to recite the blessing over the Torah before it is read, derived? As it is stated: “When I proclaim the Lord’s name, give glory to our God” (Deuteronomy 32:3), meaning that before one proclaims the Lord’s name by reading the Torah, he must give glory to God.

¹¹⁴ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: We derived that one must recite the blessing over the Torah after it is read from Grace after Meals by means of an a fortiori inference. And we derive the obligation to recite a blessing before partaking of food from the blessing over the Torah by means of an a fortiori inference. The blessing over the Torah after it is read from Grace after Meals by means of an a fortiori inference: Food, which does not require a blessing beforehand by Torah law, requires a blessing afterward; Torah, which requires a blessing beforehand, is it not right that it requires a blessing afterward? And similarly: The blessing before partaking of food from the blessing over the Torah by means of an a fortiori inference: Torah, which requires no blessing afterward by Torah law, requires a blessing beforehand; food, which requires a blessing afterward, is it not right that it requires a blessing beforehand?

¹¹⁵ The Gemara notes: The logic of this a fortiori inference can be refuted: What is true with regard to food, where one derives pleasure from eating, is not true with regard to matters which offer no bodily pleasure. Therefore, the blessing over the Torah cannot be derived from the blessing over food. And similarly: What is true with regard to Torah, that provides eternal life to those who engage in its study, is not true with regard to matters that do not provide eternal life. Therefore, the blessing before partaking of food cannot be derived from the blessing over the Torah. Furthermore, we learned in the mishna: Over food, one who is impure due to a seminal emission recites a blessing afterward, but does not recite a blessing beforehand. The mishna does not derive the blessing recited before a meal from the blessing recited over Torah. Consequently, this is a conclusive refutation of Rabbi Yoḥanan’s statement.

¹¹⁶ Rav Yehuda said: One who is uncertain whether he recited Shema or whether he did not recite it does not recite it again. However, one who is uncertain whether he recited: True and Firm [emet veyatziv], the blessing that follows Shema in the morning, must recite emet veyatziv again. What is the reason for this? In his opinion, the obligation to recite Shema is only by rabbinic law. His ruling follows the principle that in cases of uncertainty involving rabbinic law, the ruling is lenient and he need not repeat it. However, since emet veyatziv is primarily a commemoration of the exodus from Egypt, it is a mitzva by Torah law, and, in cases of uncertainty involving Torah law, the ruling is stringent and he must repeat it.

¹¹⁷ Rav Yosef raises an objection: How can you say that the obligation to recite Shema is only by rabbinic law when it is explicitly written: “And you shall recite them to your children and speak of them when you sit in your home and when you walk by the way, when you lie down and when you rise” (Deuteronomy 6:7)? Abaye said to him: That verse was written with regard to matters of Torah. One need not interpret the verse in the conventional manner, as obligating the recitation of Shema, but rather as referring to the general obligation to study Torah.

¹¹⁸ From here, the Gemara attempts to resolve this issue by citing proof from the mishna. We learned in the mishna: One who experienced a seminal emission may contemplate Shema in his heart, but

neither recites the blessings preceding Shema, nor the blessings thereafter. Over food which, after partaking, one is obligated by Torah law to recite a blessing, one recites a blessing thereafter, but not beforehand.

¹¹⁹ And if it would enter your mind that the obligation to recite *emet veyatziv* is by Torah law, let him recite the blessing after Shema. Since he does not recite the blessing, apparently, he is exempt.

¹²⁰ The Gemara refutes this: What is the reason that he recites *emet veyatziv*? If it is because it deals primarily with the exodus from Egypt, wasn't it already mentioned in the recitation of Shema, in the portion of the ritual fringes?

¹²¹ The Gemara challenges: And let him say this, *emet veyatziv*, and he will not need to recite that, Shema. The Gemara responds: While one may commemorate the exodus from Egypt in either Shema or *emet veyatziv*, Shema is preferable as it contains two elements, both a commemoration of the exodus and an acceptance of the yoke of the kingdom of Heaven.

¹²² And Rabbi Elazar said a different opinion: One who is uncertain whether he recited Shema or whether he did not recite Shema, must recite Shema again. According to his opinion, there is a *mitzva* by Torah law to recite Shema. However, if one is uncertain whether he prayed or whether he did not pray, he does not pray again, as the obligation to pray is by rabbinic law. And Rabbi Yohanan said: He must pray again; if only a person would pray throughout the entire day.

¹²³ And Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: One who was standing in prayer and remembered that he already prayed must interrupt his prayer, even in the middle of a blessing. The Gemara challenges this: Is that so? Didn't Rav Nahman say: When we were in the school of Rabba bar Avuh we raised a dilemma before him: Those students in the school of Rav who mistakenly recited a blessing from the weekday Amida on Shabbat, what is the ruling with regards to completing the weekday prayer? And Rabba bar Avuh said to us: The ruling is that one must complete that entire blessing. How then did Rav Yehuda say that one must interrupt his prayer even in the middle of a blessing?

¹²⁴ The Gemara rejects this: How can you compare the two cases? There, on Shabbat, the individual is one who is obligated and should actually recite all eighteen blessings, and it is the Sages who did not impose upon him in deference to Shabbat and instituted an abridged formula. But here, didn't he already pray? Therefore he can stop, even in the middle of a blessing.

¹²⁵ And Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: One who already prayed, and then enters a synagogue to find a congregation standing and praying, if he is able to introduce a new element, an expression or request, into his prayer, he may pray again, and if not, he may not pray again.

¹²⁶ The Gemara notes: This concept is identical to Shmuel's previous statement regarding one who already prayed that he need not pray again. Nevertheless, both statements are necessary. If he had taught us the first halakha, we would have said that applies only to a case involving an individual who prayed and an individual who began to repeat the prayer,

¹²⁷ or a case where he prayed as part of a congregation and began to repeat it as part of a congregation; however, in a case where he initially prayed by himself and subsequently joined the congregation at the venue where it was praying, we might have said that an individual vis-à-vis the congregation is considered as one who has not prayed. Therefore, he taught us that in this case, too, one may not repeat the prayer. And, on the other hand, if he had taught us here only with regard to one who entered a synagogue, we would have thought that the reason he may not pray again is

because he did not yet begin to recite the prayer, but there, in the case where he already began to recite the prayer, say that this is not the case and he may continue to repeat the prayer. Therefore, both statements are necessary.

¹²⁸ Rav Huna said: One who did not yet pray and enters a synagogue and found that the congregation is in the midst of reciting the Amidah prayer, if he is able to begin and complete his own prayer before the prayer leader reaches the blessing of thanksgiving [modim], he should begin to pray, and, if not, he should not begin to pray. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: If he is able to begin and complete his prayer before the prayer leader reaches sanctification [kedusha], then he should begin to pray. If not, then he should not begin to pray.

¹²⁹ The Gemara clarifies: With regard to what do they disagree? The basis for their dispute is that one Sage, Rav Huna, holds: An individual is permitted to recite kedusha on his own, so he need not insist on reciting it along with the prayer leader; and the other Sage, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, holds that an individual may not recite kedusha alone, and, therefore he is required to complete his prayer before the communal prayer leader reaches kedusha.

¹³⁰ Similarly, Rav Adda bar Ahava stated, in accordance with the second opinion: From where is it derived that an individual may not recite kedusha alone? As it is stated: “And I shall be hallowed among the children of Israel” (Leviticus 22:32), any expression of sanctity may not be recited in a quorum of fewer than ten men.

¹³¹ The Gemara asks: How is this inferred from that verse? The Gemara responds: This must be understood in light of a baraita, which was taught by Rabbenai, the brother of Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba: It is inferred by means of a verbal analogy [gezerah shava] between the words among, among. Here it is written: “And I shall be hallowed among the children of Israel,” and there, regarding Korah’s congregation, it is written “Separate yourselves from among this congregation” (Numbers 16:21). Just as there among connotes ten, so too here, among connotes ten. The connotation of ten associated with the word among written in the portion of Korah is, in turn, derived by means of another verbal analogy between the word congregation written there and the word congregation written in reference to the ten spies who slandered Eretz Yisrael: “How long shall I bear with this evil congregation?” (Numbers 14:27). Consequently, among the congregation there must be at least ten.

¹³² And, in any case, everyone agrees that one may not interrupt his prayer in order to respond to kedusha.

¹³³ However, a dilemma was raised before the Sages of the yeshiva: What is the ruling? Is one permitted to interrupt his prayer in order to recite: “May His great name be blessed” in kaddish? When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said: Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon, disciples of Rabbi Yoḥanan, said: One may not interrupt his prayer for anything, except for: “May His great name be blessed,” as even if one was engaged in the exalted study of the Act of the Divine Chariot [Ma’aseh Merkava] (see Ezekiel 1) he stops to recite it. However, the Gemara concludes: The halakha is not in accordance with his opinion.

¹³⁴ We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says with regard to one who experiences a seminal emission; he recites a blessing beforehand and afterward in both the case of Shema and in the case of food. The Gemara asks: Is that to say that Rabbi Yehuda holds that one who experienced a seminal emission is permitted to engage in matters of Torah? Didn’t Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi say: From where in the Torah is it derived that one who experiences a seminal emission is prohibited from

engaging in matters of Torah? As it is stated: “Just take heed and guard your soul diligently lest you forget the things your eyes have seen, and lest they depart from your heart, for all the days of your life, and you shall impart them to your children and your children’s children” (Deuteronomy 4:9), from which we derive, among other things, the obligation to study Torah. And, juxtaposed to it, is the verse: “The day that you stood before the Lord your God at Horeb” (Deuteronomy 4:10). This juxtaposition teaches us that just as below, at the revelation at Mount Sinai, those who experienced a seminal emission were prohibited and were commanded to refrain from relations with their wives and immerse themselves, so too here, throughout the generations, those who experience a seminal emission are prohibited from engaging in Torah study.

¹³⁵ And if you say that Rabbi Yehuda does not derive homiletic interpretations from juxtaposed verses, didn’t Rav Yosef already say: Even one who does not derive homiletic interpretations from juxtaposed verses throughout the entire Torah, nevertheless, derives them in Deuteronomy [Mishne Torah], as Rabbi Yehuda does not derive homiletic interpretations from juxtaposed verses throughout the entire Torah and he does derive them in Mishne Torah.

¹³⁶ And from where do we derive that Rabbi Yehuda does not derive homiletic interpretations from juxtaposed verses throughout the entire Torah? As it was taught in a baraita with regard to the punishment of a sorceress, ben Azzai says: It is stated: “You shall not allow a sorceress to live” (Exodus 22:17), although the manner of her execution is not specified, and it is stated: “Whoever lies with a beast shall surely be put to death” (Exodus 22:18). The fact that the Torah juxtaposed this matter to that was to say: Just as one who lies with a beast is executed by stoning (see Leviticus 20), so too a sorceress is executed by stoning.

¹³⁷ With regard to this proof Rabbi Yehuda said to him: And does the fact that the Torah juxtaposed this matter to that warrant taking this person out to be stoned? Should he be sentenced to the most severe of the death penalties on that basis? Rather, the source is: Mediums and wizards were included among all sorcerers. And why were they singled out from the rest, in the verse: “And a man or a woman who is a medium or a wizard shall surely be put to death; they shall stone them with stones, their blood is upon them” (Leviticus 20:27)? In order to draw an analogy to them and say to you: Just as a medium and a wizard are executed by stoning, so too is a sorceress executed by stoning.

¹³⁸ And from where do we derive that Rabbi Yehuda derives homiletic interpretations from juxtaposed verses in Mishne Torah? As it was taught in another baraita: Rabbi Eliezer said that a man may wed a woman raped by his father and one seduced by his father; a woman raped by his son and one seduced by his son. Though one is prohibited by Torah law from marrying the wife of his father or the wife of his son, this prohibition does not apply to a woman raped or seduced by them.

¹³⁹ And Rabbi Yehuda prohibits him from marrying a woman raped by his father and a woman seduced by his father. And Rav Giddel said that Rav said: What is the reason for Rabbi Yehuda’s opinion? As it is written: “A man shall not take his father’s wife, and shall not uncover his father’s skirt” (Deuteronomy 23:1). The last expression, “and shall not uncover his father’s skirt,” implies that: A skirt that has been seen by his father, i.e., any woman who has had sexual relations with his father, may not be uncovered by his son, i.e., his son may not marry her.

¹⁴⁰ And from where do we know that the verse is written with regard to a woman raped by his father? As the previous section, juxtaposed to it, deals with the laws of rape: “And the man who lay with her must give her father fifty shekels...because he has violated her” (Deuteronomy 22:29).

¹⁴¹ At any rate, we see that in Deuteronomy, Rabbi Yehuda derives homiletic interpretations from juxtaposed verses. Why does he fail to derive that one who experiences a seminal emission is prohibited from engaging in matters of Torah from the juxtaposition of the verses? They replied: Indeed, in Mishne Torah Rabbi Yehuda does derive homiletic interpretations from the juxtaposition of verses, but he requires these juxtaposed verses in order to derive another statement of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, as Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One who teaches his son Torah, the verse ascribes to him credit as if he received the Torah from Mount Horeb. As it is stated: “And you shall impart them to your children and your children’s children” (Deuteronomy 4:9) after which it is written: “The day that you stood before the Lord your God at Horeb.” Therefore, Rabbi Yehuda cannot derive from that same juxtaposition a prohibition banning one who experienced a seminal emission from engaging in matters of Torah.

¹⁴² We learned in a mishna that a zav who experienced a seminal emission, and a menstruating woman who discharged semen, and a woman who engaged in intercourse with her husband and she saw menstrual blood, all of whom are ritually impure for at least seven days due to the severity of their impurity, nevertheless require ritual immersion in order to purify themselves from the impurity of the seminal emission before they may engage in matters of Torah. And Rabbi Yehuda exempts them from immersion.

¹⁴³ However, Rabbi Yehuda only exempted from immersion in the case of a zav who experienced a seminal emission, who was unfit to immerse himself from the outset, as even after immersion he would remain impure with the seven-day impurity of the zav. But, in the case of one who experienced a seminal emission alone, with no concurrent impurity, even Rabbi Yehuda requires immersion before he may engage in Torah matters.

¹⁴⁴ And if you say: The same is true even in the case of one who experienced a seminal emission alone, that Rabbi Yehuda also exempts him from immersion, and the fact that they disagree in the case of a zav who experienced a seminal emission and not in the case of a person who experienced a seminal emission alone is in order to convey the far-reaching nature of the opinion of the Rabbis, who require immersion even in this case. If so, say the last case of that same mishna: A woman who was engaged in intercourse and she saw menstrual blood requires immersion.

¹⁴⁵ The Gemara seeks to clarify: In accordance with whose opinion was this case in the mishna taught? If you say that it is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, that is obvious; if in the case of a zav who experienced a seminal emission who was unfit to immerse himself from the outset, when he experienced the seminal emission, the Rabbis nevertheless require immersion, all the more so wouldn’t they require immersion for a woman who engaged in intercourse and only then saw blood, who was fit to immerse herself from the outset, when she came into contact with the seminal emission of her husband? Rather, isn’t this Rabbi Yehuda’s opinion, and this case was taught specifically in order to teach

¹⁴⁶ that a woman who engaged in intercourse and saw menstrual blood is not required to immerse herself, but one who experienced a seminal emission alone, with no concurrent impurity, is required to do so? If so, we must interpret Rabbi Yehuda’s statement in the mishna that one recites a blessing both beforehand and thereafter as follows: Do not say that one recites a blessing orally, but rather he means that one contemplates those blessings in his heart.

¹⁴⁷ The Gemara challenges this explanation: And does Rabbi Yehuda maintain that there is validity to contemplating in his heart? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: One who experienced a seminal emission and who has no water to immerse and purify himself recites Shema and neither recites the blessings of Shema beforehand nor thereafter? And when he eats his bread, he recites the blessing thereafter, Grace after Meals, but does not recite the blessing: Who brings forth bread from the earth, beforehand. However, in the instances where he may not recite the blessing, he contemplates it in his heart rather than utter it with his lips, this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. However Rabbi Yehuda says: In either case, he utters all of the blessings with his lips. Rabbi Yehuda does not consider contemplating the blessings in his heart a solution and permits them to be recited.

¹⁴⁸ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: Rabbi Yehuda's statement in the mishna should be interpreted in another way. Rabbi Yehuda rendered the blessings like *Hilkhot Derekh Eretz*, which according to some Sages were not considered to be in the same category as all other matters of Torah and therefore, one is permitted to engage in their study even after having experienced a seminal emission.

¹⁴⁹ As it was taught in a baraita: It is written: "And you shall impart them to your children and your children's children" (Deuteronomy 4:9), and it is written thereafter: "The day that you stood before the Lord your God at Horeb" (Deuteronomy 4:10). Just as below, the Revelation at Sinai was in reverence, fear, quaking, and trembling, so too here, in every generation, Torah must be studied with a sense of reverence, fear, quaking, and trembling.

¹⁵⁰ From here the Sages stated: Zavim, lepers, and those who engaged in intercourse with menstruating women, despite their severe impurity, are permitted to read the Torah, Prophets, and Writings, and to study Mishna and Gemara and halakhot and aggada. However, those who experienced a seminal emission are prohibited from doing so. The reason for this distinction is that the cases of severe impurity are caused by ailment or other circumstances beyond his control and, as a result, they do not necessarily preclude a sense of reverence and awe as he studies Torah. This, however, is not the case with regard to impurity resulting from a seminal emission, which usually comes about due to frivolity and a lack of reverence and awe. Therefore, it is inappropriate for one who experiences a seminal emission to engage in matters of in Torah.

¹⁵¹ However, there are many opinions concerning the precise parameters of the Torah matters prohibited by this decree. Rabbi Yosei says: One who experiences a seminal emission studies mishnayot that he is accustomed to study, as long as he does not expound upon a new mishna to study it in depth. Rabbi Yonatan ben Yosef says: He expounds upon the mishna but he does not expound upon the Gemara, which is the in-depth analysis of the Torah. Rabbi Natan ben Avishalom says: He may even expound upon the Gemara, as long as he does not utter the mentions of God's name therein. Rabbi Yoḥanan the Cobbler, Rabbi Akiva's student, says in the name of Rabbi Akiva: One who experiences a seminal emission may not enter into homiletic interpretation [*midrash*] of verses at all. Some say that he says: He may not enter the study hall [*beit hamidrash*] at all. Rabbi Yehuda says: He may study only *Hilkhot Derekh Eretz*. In terms of the problem raised above, apparently Rabbi Yehuda considers the legal status of the blessings to be parallel to the legal status of *Hilkhot Derekh Eretz*, and therefore one may utter them orally.

¹⁵² The Gemara relates an incident involving Rabbi Yehuda himself, who experienced a seminal emission and was walking along the riverbank with his disciples. His disciples said to him: Rabbi, teach us a chapter from *Hilkhot Derekh Eretz*, as he maintained that even in a state of impurity, it is

permitted. He descended and immersed himself in the river and taught them Hilkhoh Derekh Eretz. They said to him: Did you not teach us, our teacher, that he may study Hilkhoh Derekh Eretz? He said to them: Although I am lenient with others, and allow them to study it without immersion, I am stringent with myself.

¹⁵³ Further elaborating on the issue of Torah study while in a state of impurity, it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira would say: Matters of Torah do not become ritually impure and therefore one who is impure is permitted to engage in Torah study. He implemented this halakha in practice. The Gemara relates an incident involving a student who was reciting mishnayot and baraitot hesitantly before the study hall of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira. The student experienced a seminal emission, and when he was asked to recite he did so in a rushed, uneven manner, as he did not want to utter the words of Torah explicitly. Rabbi Yehuda said to him: My son, open your mouth and let your words illuminate, as matters of Torah do not become ritually impure, as it is stated: “Is not my word like fire, says the Lord” (Jeremiah 23:29). Just as fire does not become ritually impure, so too matters of Torah do not become ritually impure.

¹⁵⁴ In this baraita the Master said that one who is impure because of a seminal emission expounds upon the mishna but does not expound upon the Gemara. The Gemara notes: This statement supports the opinion of Rabbi El’ai, as Rabbi El’ai said that Rabbi Aḥa bar Ya’akov said in the name of Rabbeinu, Rav: The halakha is that one who experienced a seminal emission may expound upon the mishna but may not expound upon the Gemara. This dispute is parallel a tannaitic dispute, as it was taught: One who experienced a seminal emission expounds upon the mishna but does not expound upon the Gemara; that is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda ben Gamliel says in the name of Rabbi Ḥanina ben Gamliel: Both this and that are prohibited. And some say that he said: Both this and that are permitted.

¹⁵⁵ Comparing these opinions: The one who said that both this and that are prohibited holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan the Cobbler; the one who said that both this and that are permitted holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira.

¹⁵⁶ Summarizing the halakha, Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: The universally accepted practice is in accordance with the opinions of these three elders: In accordance with the opinion of Rabbi El’ai with regard to the halakhot of the first shearing, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoshiya with regard to the laws of prohibited diverse kinds, and in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira with regard to matters of Torah.

¹⁵⁷ The Gemara elaborates: In accordance with the opinion of Rabbi El’ai with regard to the first shearing, as it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi El’ai says: The obligation to set aside the first shearing from the sheep for the priest is only practiced in Eretz Yisrael and not in the Diaspora, and that is the accepted practice.

¹⁵⁸ In accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoshiya with regard to diverse kinds, as it is written: “You shall not sow your vineyard with diverse kinds” (Deuteronomy 22:9). Rabbi Yoshiya says: This means that one who sows diverse kinds is not liable by Torah law until he sows wheat and barley and a grape pit with a single hand motion, meaning that while sowing in the vineyard he violates the prohibition of diverse kinds that applies to seeds and to the vineyard simultaneously.

¹⁵⁹ In accordance with Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira with regard to one who experiences a seminal emission is permitted to engage in matters of Torah, as it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira says: Matters of Torah do not become ritually impure.

¹⁶⁰ And the Gemara relates: When Ze'iri came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he succinctly capsulated this halakha and said: They abolished ritual immersion, and some say that he said: They abolished ritual washing of the hands. The Gemara explains: The one who says that they abolished immersion holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira that one who experienced a seminal emission is not required to immerse. And the one who says that they abolished washing of the hands holds in accordance with that which Rav Hisda cursed one who goes out of his way to seek water at the time of prayer.

¹⁶¹ The Sages taught in a baraita: One who experienced a seminal emission who had nine kav of drawn water poured over him, that is sufficient to render him ritually pure and he need not immerse himself in a ritual bath. The Gemara relates: Nahum of Gam Zo whispered this halakha to Rabbi Akiva, and Rabbi Akiva whispered it to his student ben Azzai, and ben Azzai went out and taught it to his students publicly in the marketplace. Two amora'im in Eretz Yisrael, Rabbi Yosei bar Avin and Rabbi Yosei bar Zevida, disagreed as to the correct version of the conclusion of the incident. One taught: Ben Azzai taught it to his students in the market. And the other taught: Ben Azzai also whispered it to his students.

¹⁶² The Gemara explains the rationale behind the two versions of this incident. The Sage who taught that ben Azzai taught the law openly in the market held that the leniency was due to concern that the halakhot requiring ritual immersion would promote dereliction in the study of Torah. The ruling of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira eases the way for an individual who experienced a seminal emission to study Torah. This was also due to concern that the halakhot requiring ritual immersion would promote the suspension of procreation, as one might abstain from marital relations to avoid the immersion required thereafter. And the Sage, who taught that ben Azzai only whispered this halakha to his students, held that he did so in order that Torah scholars would not be with their wives like roosters. If the purification process was that simple, Torah scholars would engage in sexual activity constantly, which would distract them from their studies.

¹⁶³ With regard to this ritual immersion, Rabbi Yannai said: I heard that there are those who are lenient with regard to it and I have heard that there are those who are stringent with regard to it. The halakha in this matter was never conclusively established and anyone who accepts upon himself to be stringent with regard to it, they prolong for him his days and years.

¹⁶⁴ The Gemara relates that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: What is the essence of those who immerse themselves in the morning? The Gemara retorts: How can one ask what is their essence? Isn't he the one who said that one who experiences a seminal emission is prohibited from engaging in matters of Torah and is required to immerse himself in the morning? Rather, this is what he meant to say: What is the essence of immersion in a ritual bath of forty se'a of water when it is possible to purify oneself with nine kav? Furthermore, what is the essence of immersion when it is also possible to purify oneself by pouring water?

¹⁶⁵ Regarding this, Rabbi Hanina said: They established a massive fence protecting one from sinning with their decree that one must immerse himself in forty se'a of water. As it was taught in a baraita: There was an incident involving one who solicited a woman to commit a sinful act. She said to him:

Good-for-nothing. Do you have forty se'a in which to immerse and purify yourself afterwards? He immediately desisted. The obligation to immerse oneself caused individuals to refrain from transgression.

¹⁶⁶ Rav Huna said to the Sages: Gentlemen, why do you disdain this immersion? If it is because it is difficult for you to immerse in the cold waters of the ritual bath, it is possible to purify oneself by immersing oneself in the heated bathhouses, which are unfit for immersion for other forms of ritual impurity but are fit for immersion in this case.

¹⁶⁷ Rabbi Ḥisda said to him: Is there ritual immersion in hot water? Rav Huna said to him: Indeed, doubts with regard to the fitness of baths have been raised, and Rav Adda bar Ahava holds in accordance with your opinion. Nevertheless, I remain convinced that it is permitted.

¹⁶⁸ The Gemara relates: Rabbi Zeira was sitting in a tub of water in the bathhouse. He said to his attendant: Go and get nine kav of water and pour it over me so that I may purify myself from the impurity caused by a seminal emission. Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said to him: Why does my master require all of this? Aren't you seated in at least nine kav of water in the tub. He said to him: The law of nine kav parallels the law of forty se'a, in that their halakhot are exclusive. Just as forty se'a can only purify an individual through immersion and not through pouring, so too nine kav can only purify one who experienced a seminal emission through pouring and not through immersion.

¹⁶⁹ The Gemara relates that Rav Naḥman prepared a jug with a capacity of nine kav so that his students could pour water over themselves and become pure. When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said: Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Yehuda Gelostera said: The halakha that one who experienced a seminal emission can be purified by pouring nine kav was only taught for a sick person who experienced the emission involuntarily. However, a sick person who experienced a normal seminal emission in the course of marital relations, is required to immerse himself in forty se'a.

¹⁷⁰ Rav Yosef said: In that case, Rav Naḥman's jug is broken, meaning it is no longer of any use, as few people fall into the category of sick people who experienced seminal emissions. Nevertheless, when Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: In Usha there was an incident

¹⁷¹ that this problem was raised in Rav Oshaya's chamber, and they came and asked Rav Asi. He said to them: They only stated the obligation to pour water over one who is impure because of a seminal emission with regard to a sick person who experienced a normal seminal emission, but a sick person who experienced an involuntary seminal emission is clearly exempt from anything and requires no immersion whatsoever. Rav Yosef said: In that case, Rav Naḥman's jug is rejoined, meaning that it is effective with regard to purification.

¹⁷² Up to now, discussion has focused on various problems pertaining to the laws of immersion as they concern one whose impurity is due to seminal emission. The Gemara asks: Since all of the amora'im and tanna'im disagree with regard to the decree of Ezra, let us examine how Ezra instituted this ordinance, as this is not an uncommon circumstance and we can see how they conducted themselves.

¹⁷³ Abaye said: Ezra did not institute a sweeping ordinance concerning every case of one who experienced a seminal emission; rather, he instituted only that a healthy person who experienced a normal seminal emission is required to immerse himself in forty se'a, while for a healthy person who

experienced an involuntary seminal emission, nine kav are sufficient. And the amora'im came and disagreed with regard to a sick person. One Sage held that a sick person who experienced a normal seminal emission is considered like a healthy person who experienced a normal seminal emission, while a sick person who experienced an involuntary seminal emission is considered like a healthy person who experienced an involuntary seminal emission. However, another Sage maintained that a sick person who experienced a normal seminal emission is considered like a healthy person who experienced an involuntary seminal emission, and consequently requires only that nine kav be poured over him, while a sick person who experienced an involuntary seminal emission is exempt from any form of immersion or purification.

¹⁷⁴ Rava said: Although Ezra instituted immersion for one who experienced a seminal emission, did he institute the pouring of nine kav? Didn't the Master say that we have a tradition that Ezra only instituted immersion for those who experienced a seminal emission? Rather, Rava said: We must explain that the diverse opinions developed after Ezra's decree. Ezra himself instituted immersion in forty se'a only for a healthy person who experienced a normal seminal emission. And the Sages came and instituted that a healthy person who experienced an involuntary seminal emission should have nine kav poured over him. And then the amora'im came and disagreed with regard to a sick person; one Sage held that a sick person who experienced a normal seminal emission is considered like a healthy person who experienced a normal seminal emission, while a sick person who experienced an involuntary seminal emission is considered like a healthy person who experienced an involuntary seminal emission, another Sage maintained that only a healthy person who experienced a normal seminal emission is required to immerse himself in forty se'a while a sick person who experienced a normal seminal emission is considered like a healthy person who experienced an involuntary seminal emission, requiring only nine kav. But a sick person who experienced an involuntary seminal emission is exempt from any form of immersion or purification.

¹⁷⁵ Rava stated that the halakhic ruling is in accordance with the first opinion: A healthy person who experienced a normal seminal emission and a sick person who experienced a normal seminal emission require forty se'a, while a healthy person who experienced an involuntary seminal emission suffices with nine kav. But a sick person who experienced an involuntary seminal emission is exempt from undergoing any rite of purification.

¹⁷⁶ The Sages taught in a Tosefta: One who experienced a seminal emission and had nine kav of drawn water poured over him is ritually pure. In what case is this statement said? In a case involving Torah study for himself, but in order to purify himself that he may teach Torah to others, he must immerse himself in forty se'a. Rabbi Yehuda says: Forty se'a is required for purification in any case.

¹⁷⁷ With regard to this issue, a dispute arose between Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, and Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina. One member of this pair and one member of that pair disagreed with regard to the first clause of the Tosefta. One said: That which you said: In what case is this statement said? In a case involving Torah study for himself, but in order to purify himself that he may teach Torah to others, he must immerse himself in forty se'a, was only taught regarding a sick person who experienced a normal seminal emission, but for a sick person who experienced an involuntary seminal emission, nine kav is sufficient even for teaching others. And one said that anyone who teaches others, even if he was sick and experienced an involuntary seminal emission, is not considered pure until there are forty se'a.

¹⁷⁸ And one member of this pair and one member of that pair disagreed with regard to the latter clause of the Tosefta. One said: That which Rabbi Yehuda said: Forty se'a in any case, was only taught when the water is in the ground, in accordance with the Torah law of ritual bath, but not if it was collected in vessels. And one said: Even forty se'a collected in vessels are sufficient for purification.

¹⁷⁹ The Gemara clarifies this problem: Granted, according to the one who said that forty se'a purifies even in vessels. That is why the Tosefta taught: Rabbi Yehuda says: Forty se'a in any case. However, according to the one who said that Rabbi Yehuda's opinion is that forty se'a in the ground, yes, it purifies, but in vessels, no, it does not purify, what does the expression in any case come to include?

¹⁸⁰ The Gemara explains: In any case comes to include drawn water, as Rabbi Yehuda permits immersion in forty se'a of water collected in the ground even if the water was drawn by human hand.

¹⁸¹ The Gemara relates that Rav Pappa and Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, and Rava bar Shmuel ate bread together. Rav Pappa said to them: Allow me to recite Grace after Meals for the group, as I am ritually pure because nine kav of water fell upon me; in other words, he poured it over himself. Rava bar Shmuel said to them: We learned, in what case is this statement that nine kav purify, said? In a case involving Torah study for himself. But, in order to purify himself that he may teach Torah to others, and by extension to fulfill the obligation of others, he must immerse himself in forty se'a. Rather, allow me to recite Grace after Meals for the group, as forty se'a of water fell upon me; in other words, I immersed myself in a ritual bath. Rav Huna said to them: Allow me to recite Grace after Meals for the group, as I have had neither this nor that upon me because I remained ritually pure.

¹⁸² It is also said that Rav Hama would immerse himself on Passover eve in order to fulfill the obligations of the masses. However the Gemara concludes: The halakha is not in accordance with his opinion that distinguishes between the purification for oneself and purification for the sake of others.

¹⁸³ MISHNA: This mishna contains various statements with regard to individuals with different types of ritual impurity as well as the need to distance oneself from filth and impurity. One who was standing in prayer and he recalled that he experienced a seminal emission, and according to this opinion he is prohibited from praying, should not interrupt his prayer, rather he should abridge each individual blessing.

¹⁸⁴ They stated a general principle: One who descended to immerse himself, if he is able to ascend, cover himself with a garment, and recite the morning Shema before sunrise, he should ascend, cover himself, and recite Shema, and if not, he should cover himself in the water and recite Shema there. He may not, however, cover himself in either foul water, or water in which flax was soaked, until he pours other water into it. And in general, how far must one distance himself from urine and feces in order to recite Shema? At least four cubits.

¹⁸⁵ GEMARA: A baraita further elaborates on the first halakha in the mishna. The Sages taught: One who was standing in prayer and he recalled that he had experienced a seminal emission, should not interrupt his prayer. Rather, he should abridge. One who was reading the Torah and recalled that he experienced a seminal emission, does not interrupt his reading, but rather reads quickly with less than perfect diction. Rabbi Meir disagrees and says: One who experienced a seminal emission is not permitted to read more than three verses in the Torah, as one may read no fewer than three verses in the Torah. After he completes three verses, he must stop and let someone else continue.

¹⁸⁶ It was taught in another baraita: One who was standing in prayer and he saw feces before him must walk forward until he has placed it four cubits behind him. The Gemara challenges this: Wasn't it taught in another baraita that it is sufficient if he distances himself four cubits to the side? The Gemara resolves this contradiction: This is not difficult, as that baraita which taught that it must be four cubits behind him, is referring to a case where it is possible for him to advance that distance, while that baraita which taught that he may distance himself four cubits to the side, is referring to a case where it is not possible to advance four cubits, in which case he must at least step to the side.

¹⁸⁷ The Gemara cites another halakha: One who was praying and later found feces in the place where he prayed, Rabba said: Although he committed a transgression in his failure to examine that venue to determine if it was worthy of prayer (Tosafot), his prayer is a valid prayer and he fulfilled his obligation. Rava strongly objects to his statement: Isn't it stated: "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination, the more so as he offers it in depravity" (Proverbs 21:27), from which we derive that a mitzva performed inappropriately is no mitzva at all? Consequently, the fact that he did not pay proper attention invalidates his prayer. Rather, Rava said: Because this person committed a transgression, although he prayed, his prayer is an abomination and he must pray again.

¹⁸⁸ The Sages taught in a baraita: One who was standing in prayer when, for some reason, urine is flowing on his knees, he must interrupt his prayer until the urine ceases, and then resume praying. The Gemara asks: To where in the prayer does he return when he resumes his prayer? Rav H̥isda and Rav Hamnuna disagreed; one said: He must return to the beginning of the prayer, and the other said: He must return to the point where he stopped.

¹⁸⁹ The Gemara notes: Let us say that they disagree about this:

¹⁹⁰ One Sage held that, as a rule, if one interrupted his prayer and delayed continuing his prayer for an interval sufficient to complete the entire prayer, he returns to the beginning of the prayer. And one Sage held: He returns to the place in the prayer where he stopped.

¹⁹¹ Rejecting this possibility, Rav Ashi said: If that was the crux of their dispute, they should have discussed the element of: If he delayed, and: If he did not delay. Nowhere in their dispute do they mention the matter of how long the delay was for. Rather, everyone, both Rav H̥isda and Rav Hamnuna, agrees that if one delayed continuing his prayer for an interval sufficient to complete the entire prayer, he returns to the beginning of the prayer. And there, in the dispute under discussion, they disagree with regard to one who did not delay that long. The dispute centers on the status of the one praying in this particular case. As one Sage holds that since he evidently needed to urinate before starting his prayer, he is a man who was disqualified, and unfit for prayer, and his prayer is not a valid prayer; therefore he must repeat it in its entirety. And one Sage holds he is a man who was fit for prayer and his prayer is a valid prayer.

¹⁹² The Sages taught in a baraita: One who needs to relieve himself may not pray, and if he prayed, his prayer is an abomination. Rav Zevid and some say Rav Yehuda said in qualifying this statement: They only taught this halakha in a case where one cannot restrain himself. But, if he can restrain himself, his prayer is a valid prayer as he is not tarnished by his need to relieve himself.

¹⁹³ The Gemara asks: And for how long must he be able to restrain himself? Rav Sheshet said: For as long as it takes to walk one parasang. Some teach this halakha directly on what was taught in the baraita: In what case is this statement said? Where he is unable to restrain himself, but if he is able to

restrain himself, his prayer is a valid prayer. And for how long? Rav Zevid said: For as long as it takes to walk one parasang.

¹⁹⁴ Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: One who needs to relieve himself may not pray, because it is stated: “Prepare to greet your God, O Israel” (Amos 4:12), and one must clear his mind of all distractions to prepare to receive the Lord during prayer.

¹⁹⁵ In this context, the Gemara cites an additional statement, which Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “Guard your foot when you go to the house of God, and prepare to listen; it is better than when fools offer sacrifices, as they know not to do evil” (Ecclesiastes 4:17)? It means: When you enter the house of the Lord, guard yourself from transgression, and if you commit a transgression, bring a sacrifice before Me in atonement. The verse continues: “And draw near and listen to the words of the wise.” Rava said: Be prepared to hearken to the words of the wise, who, if they commit a transgression, they bring a sacrifice and repent. He interprets the next part of the verse: “It is better than when fools give sacrifices,” that one should not act like the fools who commit a transgression and bring a sacrifice but do not repent.

¹⁹⁶ Regarding the end of the verse: “As they know not to do evil,” the Gemara asks: If so, they are righteous. Rather it must be understood: Do not be like the fools who commit a transgression and bring a sacrifice, but are unaware whether they are bringing it as a thanks-offering for the good, or as an offering of atonement for the evil. This is the meaning of the verse: “As they know not to do evil”; they know not if and when their actions are evil. With regard to those individuals, the Holy One, Blessed be He, said: They cannot distinguish between good and evil and yet they bring a sacrifice before me?

¹⁹⁷ Rav Ashi and some say Rabbi Ḥanina bar Pappa said: Mind your orifices when you stand before me in prayer.

¹⁹⁸ The Sages taught: One who enters a bathroom must remove his phylacteries at a distance of four cubits and enter. Rav Aḥa bar Rav Huna said that Rav Sheshet said: This was only taught with regard to one entering a regular bathroom, but one who enters a makeshift bathroom may remove his phylacteries and defecate immediately. But when one exits from a makeshift bathroom, he must distance himself four cubits before donning his phylacteries because he has now rendered that place a regular bathroom.

¹⁹⁹ A dilemma was raised before the Sages in the yeshiva: What is the halakha; may one enter a regular bathroom wearing his phylacteries in order to urinate? The Sages disagreed: Ravina permitted to do so while Rav Adda bar Mattana prohibited it. They came and asked this of Rava. He said to them: It is forbidden because we are concerned lest he will come to defecate with them still on. Others say that this halakha is because we are concerned that, since he is already in the bathroom, he might forget that his phylacteries are on his head and will break wind with them still on him.

²⁰⁰ It was taught in another baraita: One who enters a regular bathroom must remove his phylacteries at a distance of four cubits, place them in the window in the wall of the bathroom adjacent to the public domain, and then enter. And when he exits, he must distance himself four cubits before donning them. This is the statement of Beit Shammai. Beit Hillel say: He must remove his phylacteries but he holds them in his hand and enters. Rabbi Akiva says: He holds them in his garment and enters.

²⁰¹ The Gemara wonders: Does it enter your mind to say in his garment? There is room for concern because sometimes he forgets them and they fall. Rather, say: He holds them with his garment and in his hand and enters the bathroom. He holds the phylacteries in his hand and covers it with the garment.

²⁰² It was established in the baraita: And if there is room to place them, he places them in the holes adjacent to the bathroom, but he does not place them in the holes adjacent to the public domain, lest the phylacteries will be taken by passersby and he will come to be suspect.

²⁰³ And an incident occurred involving a student who placed his phylacteries in the holes adjacent to the public domain, and a prostitute passed by and took the phylacteries. She came to the study hall and said: See what so-and-so gave me as my payment. When that student heard this, he ascended to the rooftop and fell and died. At that moment they instituted that one should hold them with his garment and in his hand and enter to avoid situations of that kind.

²⁰⁴ The Sages taught in a baraita on this topic: At first, they would place the phylacteries in the holes adjacent to the bathroom, and mice would come and take them or gnaw upon them. Therefore, they instituted that they should place them in the holes adjacent to the public domain, where there were no mice. However, passersby would come and take the phylacteries. Ultimately, they instituted that one should hold the phylacteries in his hand and enter.

²⁰⁵ On this topic, Rabbi Meyasha, son of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, said: The halakha in this case is that one rolls up the phylacteries in their straps like a scroll, and holds them in his hand opposite his heart. Rav Yosef bar Manyumi said that Rav Nahman said: This is provided that the strap of the phylacteries does not emerge more than a handbreadth below his hand.

²⁰⁶ Rabbi Ya'akov bar Aha said that Rabbi Zeira said: It was only taught that one rolls up his phylacteries when there is still time left in the day to don them. If there is not time left in the day to don them before nightfall, when phylacteries are not donned, he makes a one-handbreadth pouch of sorts for them and he places them in it.

²⁰⁷ Similarly, Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: During the day one rolls up the phylacteries like a scroll and places them in his hand opposite his heart, and at night he makes a one-handbreadth pouch of sorts for them and he places them in it.

²⁰⁸ Abaye said: They only taught that it must be a one-handbreadth pouch with regard to a vessel that is the phylacteries' regular vessel, but in a vessel that is not their regular vessel, he may place the phylacteries in it, even if it is less than a handbreadth.

²⁰⁹ Mar Zutra and, some say, Rav Ashi, said as proof for that distinction: The laws of impurity state that only a space of at least a handbreadth can serve as a barrier to prevent the spread of impurity imparted by a corpse. Nevertheless, small sealed vessels less than a handbreadth in size protect their contents from ritual impurity even if they are inside a tent over a corpse. This proves that even a space smaller than a handbreadth can serve as a barrier before impurity.

²¹⁰ Rabba bar bar Hana said: When we would walk after Rabbi Yoḥanan, we would see that when he sought to enter the bathroom while holding a book of aggada, he would give it to us. When he was holding phylacteries, he would not give them to us, as he said: Since the Sages permitted to hold them,

²¹¹ they will protect me. Although there were people on hand to whom he could have handed the phylacteries, he kept them to protect himself from danger. Rava said: When we would walk after Rabbi Nahman, we would see that when he was holding a book of aggada, he would give it to us. When he was holding phylacteries, he would not give them to us, as he said: Since the Sages permitted to hold them, they will protect me.

²¹² The Sages taught: One may not hold phylacteries in his hand or a Torah scroll in his arm and pray, because his concern that the phylacteries or Torah scroll might fall will distract him from his prayer. And so too, with regard to sacred objects, one may not urinate with them in his hands and may not sleep with them in his hands, neither a deep sleep nor even a brief nap. Shmuel said: Not only should one holding phylacteries refrain from prayer, but one holding a knife, money, a bowl, or a loaf of bread have a similar status in that his concern that they might fall will distract him from his prayer.

²¹³ Rava said that Rav Sheshet said: The halakha is not in accordance with this baraita, because it is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai. As if it was in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, now Beit Hillel permitted to hold phylacteries in his hand when he defecates in a regular bathroom, is it necessary to say that it is permitted when he urinates in a makeshift bathroom?

²¹⁴ The Gemara raised an objection based on the second part of the baraita, where it was taught: Matters which I permitted you to do here, I prohibited you from doing there. In other words, there are matters that were permitted in a regular bathroom and not in a makeshift bathroom. What, is it not referring to phylacteries? Granted, if you say that the prohibition against urinating while wearing phylacteries is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, then we would understand the baraita as follows: Matters which I permitted you to do here, to hold phylacteries in a regular bathroom, I have prohibited you from doing there, in the makeshift bathroom. But if you hold that this baraita is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai, they did not permit anything in a regular bathroom. What, then, is the meaning of matters which I permitted you to do here?

²¹⁵ This challenge is rejected by the Gemara, which explains: When that baraita was taught it was not in reference to phylacteries, but with regard to the matter of one handbreadth and two handbreadths. As is it was taught in one baraita: When one relieves himself, he must maintain modesty and bare a single handbreadth of his flesh behind him and two handbreadths before him. And it was taught in another baraita: One may only bare a single handbreadth behind him and nothing before him.

²¹⁶ What, are not both this baraita and that one referring to a male, and the apparent contradiction between the two baraitot is not difficult, as here the baraita that states that one may bare a handbreadth behind him and nothing before him is referring to defecation, while here, the other baraita that states that one may bare a handbreadth behind him and two handbreadths before him is referring to urination. Accordingly, despite the fact that one may bare two handbreadths before him when urinating in a makeshift bathroom, matters that I have permitted you to do here, one may bare nothing before him when defecating in an established bathroom, I have prohibited you from doing there.

²¹⁷ The Gemara rejects this explanation: And how can you understand it that way? If that baraita is referring to urination, why do I need to bare one handbreadth behind him? Rather, both this baraita and that baraita are referring to defecation, and the apparent contradiction between the two baraitot is not difficult. This baraita that states that one may bare two handbreadths before him is referring to a

man, who must bare himself in case he inadvertently urinates. That baraita that states that one may not bare anything in front is referring to a woman, who does not need to uncover herself to account for inadvertent urination.

²¹⁸ The Gemara challenges this: If so, then that which is taught with regard to this halakha in the baraita: This is an a fortiori inference for which there is no refutation, meaning that even though logically it would seem correct to be stricter in the case of defecating in a regular bathroom than in the case of urinating in a makeshift bathroom, that is not the ruling, is difficult. According to the distinction suggested above, what is the meaning of: for which there is no refutation? That is the nature of the matter; men and women need to uncover themselves differently.

²¹⁹ Rather, is it not so that the baraita that states: Matters which I permitted you to do here, I prohibited you from doing there, is referring to phylacteries, and the a fortiori inference that cannot be refuted is similarly referring to phylacteries. And the refutation of that which Rava says that Rav Sheshet says, that the baraita is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai, is indeed a conclusive refutation.

²²⁰ The Gemara asks: Nevertheless, it remains difficult: Now, holding phylacteries in his hand when he defecates in a regular bathroom is permitted, all the more so that it is permitted when he urinates in a makeshift bathroom.

²²¹ The Gemara explains: It says as follows: When defecating in a regular bathroom, where one sits there are no drops of urine on one's clothes or shoes, he need not dirty his hands to clean his garment, and therefore one is permitted to hold phylacteries in his hand. However, in a makeshift bathroom, where one stands, and there are ricocheting drops which he may touch with his hand, it is prohibited.

²²² The Gemara challenges: If so, then why was it referred to as an a fortiori inference that "cannot be refuted"? This seems an excellent refutation that explains the distinction.

²²³ The Gemara explains that it says as follows: Derive this matter based on the reason mentioned above that due to different circumstances the ruling is different. Do not derive it by means of an a fortiori inference, as if you were to derive it by means of an a fortiori inference, it would certainly be an a fortiori inference that cannot be rebutted.

²²⁴ The Sages taught: One who wishes to enter and partake of a regular meal that will last for some time, paces a distance of four cubits ten times, or ten cubits four times, in order to expedite the movement of the bowels, and defecates. Only then may he enter and partake of the meal. That way he spares himself the unpleasantness of being forced to leave in the middle of the meal.

²²⁵ On this same subject, Rabbi Yitzḥak said: One who partakes of a regular meal removes his phylacteries and then enters, as it is inappropriate to partake in a meal where there is frivolity while wearing phylacteries. And this statement disputes the statement of Rabbi Ḥiyya, as Rabbi Ḥiyya said: During a formal meal one places his phylacteries on his table, and it is admirable for him to do so in order that they will be available to don immediately if he so desires.

²²⁶ The Gemara asks: And until when in the meal must he refrain from wearing phylacteries? Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: Until the time of the recitation of the blessing of Grace after Meals.

²²⁷ It was taught in one baraita: One may bundle his phylacteries with his money in his head covering [aprakuto], and it was taught in another baraita: One may not bundle phylacteries and money together.

²²⁸ The Gemara explains: This is not difficult, as one must distinguish and say that this baraita, which prohibits bundling phylacteries and money together, refers to a case where the vessel was designated for use with phylacteries, while this baraita, which permits one to do so, refers to a case where the vessel was not designated for that purpose. As Rav Ḥisda said: With regard to this cloth used with phylacteries that one designated to bundle phylacteries in it, if one already bundled phylacteries in it then it is prohibited to bundle coins in it, but if he only designated it for that purpose, but did not yet bundle phylacteries in it, or if he bundled phylacteries in it but did not originally designate it for that purpose, then it is permitted to bundle money in it.

²²⁹ And according to Abaye, who said that designation is significant, as Abaye holds that all relevant halakhot apply to an object designated for a specific purpose, whether or not it has been already used for that purpose, the halakha is: If he designated the cloth, even if he did not bundle phylacteries in it, he is prohibited from bundling money in it. However, if he bundled phylacteries in it, if he designated the cloth for that particular use, it is prohibited to bundle money in it, but if he did not designate it, no, it is not prohibited.

²³⁰ Rav Yosef, son of Rav Nehunya, raised a dilemma before Rav Yehuda: What is the halakha; may a man place his phylacteries in his bed, under his head while he sleeps? He himself explains: With regard to whether or not one may place them under his feet, I have no dilemma, as that would be treating them in a deprecating manner and is certainly prohibited. My dilemma is whether or not one may place them under his head; what is the halakha in that case? Rav Yehuda said to him, Shmuel said as follows: It is permitted, even if his wife is with him in his bed.

²³¹ The Gemara raises an objection based on what was taught in a baraita: A man may not place his phylacteries under his feet, as in doing so, he treats them in a deprecating manner, but he may place them under his head. And if his wife was with him, it is prohibited even to place it under his head. If there was a place where he could place the phylacteries three handbreadths above or three handbreadths below his head it is permissible, as that space is sufficient for the phylacteries to be considered in a separate place.

²³² This is a conclusive refutation of Shmuel's statement. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, it is a conclusive refutation.

²³³ Rava said: Although a baraita was taught that constitutes a conclusive refutation of Shmuel, the halakha is in accordance with his opinion in this matter. What is the reason for this?

²³⁴ Because whatever offers more protection is preferable even at the cost of deprecation. And where under his head does he place them? Rabbi Yirmeya said: He places them between the pillow and the mattress, not directly aligned with his head but rather a bit to the side.

²³⁵ The Gemara asks: Didn't Rabbi Ḥiyya teach a baraita that in that case he places them in a pouch used for phylacteries, directly under his head? The Gemara replies: He does so in a manner that the bulge in the pouch, where the phylacteries are, protrudes out and is not beneath his head.

²³⁶ On this note, the Gemara relates that Bar Kappara would tie them in his bed curtain and project their bulge outward. Rav Sheisha, son of Rav Idi, would place them on a bench and spread a cloth over them.

²³⁷ Rav Hamnuna, son of Rav Yosef, said: I was once standing before Rava and he told me: Go and bring me my phylacteries. And I found them in his bed, between the mattress and the pillow, not

aligned with his head. And I knew that it was the day of his wife's immersion in the ritual bath for purification from the ritual impurity of a menstruating woman, and he certainly engaged in marital relations in order to fulfill the mitzva, and he did so, he sent me to bring him his phylacteries, to teach us the practical halakha in that case.

²³⁸ Rav Yosef, son of Rav Nehunya, who raised a dilemma above, raised a dilemma before Rav Yehuda: Two individuals sleeping in a single bed, given that it was standard practice to sleep without clothing, what is the halakha; is it permissible for this one to turn his head aside and recite Shema and for that one turns his head and recites Shema; or is it prohibited because they are unclothed and are considered unfit to recite Shema even though they are covered with a blanket? He said to him: Shmuel said as follows: This is permitted even if his wife is in bed with him.

²³⁹ Rav Yosef strongly objects to this response: You say that he is permitted to recite Shema in bed with his wife, and needless to say he is permitted to do so when in bed with another. On the contrary, since his wife is like his own flesh, and he will not have lustful thoughts of her, it is permitted; another is not like his own flesh and it is prohibited.

²⁴⁰ The Gemara raises an objection to this from the resolution of an apparent contradiction between two baraitot. It was taught in one baraita: Two unclothed individuals who are sleeping in a single bed, this one turns his head aside and recites Shema and that one turns his head aside and recites Shema. And it was taught in another baraita: One who is sleeping in bed and his unclothed children and members of his household are beside him, may not recite Shema unless a garment separates between them. If his children and the members of his household were minors, it is permitted to recite Shema even without a garment separating between them.

²⁴¹ Granted, according to Rav Yosef, the apparent contradiction between the two baraitot is not difficult, as this baraita is referring to a case where his wife is in the bed with him, while this other baraita is referring to a case where another person is in bed with him and there is concern lest he will have lustful thoughts. However, according to Shmuel, who permits one to recite Shema regardless of who is in bed with him, it is indeed difficult. How would he interpret the baraita that prohibits?

²⁴² The Gemara replies: Shmuel could have said to you: And according to Rav Yosef's opinion, does it work out well? Wasn't it taught in that same baraita that one who is sleeping in bed and his children and members of his household are beside him, may not recite Shema unless a garment separates between them? Doesn't Rav Yosef hold that his wife is like his own flesh and no separation is necessary? Rather, what have you to say in response? Rav Yosef holds that there is a tannaitic dispute in the case of one's wife; I, too, hold that it is a tannaitic dispute, and I accept the ruling of one of the baraitot.

²⁴³ The Gemara reverts to clarify something mentioned above. The Master said in a baraita: This one turns his head aside and recites Shema. The Gemara notes a difficulty: Aren't there bare buttocks? This supports the opinion of Rav Huna, as Rav Huna said: Buttocks do not constitute nakedness. Let us say that the following mishna supports Rav Huna's opinion: A woman sits and separates her *halla* naked, despite the fact that she must recite a blessing over the separation of the *halla*, because she can cover her face, a euphemism for her genitals, in the ground, but a male, whose genitals are not covered when he sits, may not do so. The mishna teaches that exposed buttocks do not constitute nakedness.

²⁴⁴ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak interpreted the mishna as referring to a case where her face, genitals, was completely covered in the ground such that her posterior was covered by the ground. Therefore, proof for Rav Huna's opinion cannot be brought from this mishna.

²⁴⁵ The Master said in a baraita: If his children and the members of his household were minors, even though they are unclothed, it is permitted to recite Shema even without a garment separating between them. The Gemara asks: Until what age is one still considered a minor? Rav Ḥisda said: A girl until she is three years and one day old, and a boy until he is nine years and one day old, for these are the ages from which a sexual act in which they participate is considered a sexual act. Some say: A girl eleven years and one day old and a boy of twelve years and one day old, as that is the age at which they are considered adults in this regard. This age is only approximate, as the age of majority for both this, the boy, and that, the girl, is at the onset of puberty in accordance with the verse: "Your breasts were formed and your hair was grown" (Ezekiel 16:7).

²⁴⁶ Rav Kahana said to Rav Ashi: There, with regard to the law of phylacteries, Rava said: Despite a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Shmuel, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel. Here, what is the ruling? He said to him: Were all of them woven in the same act of weaving? Are there no distinctions between different cases? Rather, where it is stated, it is stated, and where it is not stated, it is not stated, and there is no comparison.

²⁴⁷ Rav Mari said to Rav Pappa: Does it constitute nakedness if one's pubic hair protruded from his garment? Rav Pappa said about him: A hair, a hair. You are splitting hairs and being pedantic over trivialities.

²⁴⁸ Rabbi Yitzḥak stated: An exposed handbreadth in a woman constitutes nakedness. The Gemara asks: Regarding which halakha was this said? If you say that it comes to prohibit looking at an exposed handbreadth in her, didn't Rav Sheshet say: Why did the verse enumerate "anklets and bracelets, rings, earrings and girdles" (Numbers 31:50), jewelry that is worn externally, over her clothing, e.g., bracelets, together with jewelry worn internally, beneath her clothing, near her nakedness, e.g., girdles? This was to tell you: Anyone who gazes upon a woman's little finger is considered as if he gazed upon her naked genitals, for if his intentions are impure, it makes no difference where he looks or how much is exposed; even less than a handbreadth.

²⁴⁹ Rather, it is referring even to his wife, with regard to the recitation of Shema. One may not recite Shema before an exposed handbreadth of his wife.

²⁵⁰ Along these lines, Rav Ḥisda said: Even a woman's exposed leg is considered nakedness, as it is stated: "Uncover the leg and pass through the rivers" (Isaiah 47:2), and it is written in the following verse: "Your nakedness shall be revealed and your shame shall be seen" (Isaiah 47:3). Shmuel further stated: A woman's singing voice is considered nakedness, which he derives from the praise accorded a woman's voice, as it is stated: "Sweet is your voice and your countenance is alluring" (Song of Songs 2:14). Similarly, Rav Sheshet stated: Even a woman's hair is considered nakedness, for it too is praised, as it is written: "Your hair is like a flock of goats, trailing down from Mount Gilead" (Song of Songs 4:1).

²⁵¹ The Gemara resumes its discussion of phylacteries. Rabbi Ḥanina said: I saw Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi hang his phylacteries. The Gemara raises an objection: It was taught in a baraita that one who hangs his phylacteries will have his life hang in the balance.

²⁵² Moreover, the Symbolic Interpreters of the Torah said that the verse: “And your life shall hang in doubt before you [minneged]” (Deuteronomy 28:66), that is the punishment of one who hangs his phylacteries.

²⁵³ The Gemara replies: This apparent contradiction is not difficult, as this baraita, which condemns one who hangs his phylacteries, refers to one who hangs them by the strap, allowing the leather boxes into which the parchment is placed to dangle in a deprecating way, which is certainly prohibited. That baraita, which relates that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi would hang his phylacteries and that it is clearly permitted, refers to when one hangs them from the box with the straps dangling.

²⁵⁴ And if you wish, say another explanation instead: There is no difference whether he hangs the phylacteries from the strap and there is no difference whether he hangs the phylacteries from the box; both are prohibited. And when Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi hung his phylacteries, he hung them in their pouch.

²⁵⁵ The Gemara asks: If so, what is the purpose to relate that incident? The Gemara replies: Lest you say that phylacteries would require placement atop a surface, as is the custom with a Torah scroll. Therefore, it teaches us that this is unnecessary.

²⁵⁶ Since Rabbi Ḥanina related a story involving Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, the Gemara cites another such story. Rabbi Ḥanina said: I saw Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, while he was praying, belch, yawn, sneeze, spit,

²⁵⁷ and if he was stung by a louse, he may feel for it and remove it with his garment, but he would not wrap himself in his prayer shawl if it fell during prayer. And when he would yawn he would place his hand on his chin so that his open mouth would not be visible.

²⁵⁸ The Gemara raises an objection based on a baraita: One who sounds his voice during his Amida prayer is among those of little faith, as he seems to believe that the Lord cannot hear his prayer when it is uttered silently. One who raises his voice during prayer is considered to be among the false prophets, as they too were wont to cry out and shout to their gods.

²⁵⁹ Furthermore, one who belches and yawns while praying is surely among the uncouth. One who sneezes during his prayer, for him it is a bad omen. And some say: It is clear that he is repulsive. Also, one who spits during prayer, it is tantamount to spitting in the face of the king. In light of all this, how could Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi have done all that while praying?

²⁶⁰ The Gemara explains: Granted, with regard to one who belches and yawns, it is not difficult: Here, in the case where Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi did so, it was involuntary and therefore permissible; here, where it is considered uncouth, is in a case where it is deliberate. However, the contradiction between sneezing in the case where Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi did so and sneezing where it is considered a bad omen is difficult.

²⁶¹ The Gemara responds: The contradiction between sneezing in one case and sneezing in the other case is also not difficult: Here, in the case of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, it is referring to sneezing from above, his nose; here, where it is a bad omen, is referring to sneezing from below, flatulence. As Rav Zeira said: In the school of Rav Hamnuna I absorbed this matter in passing, and it is equal in significance to all the rest of my learning: One who sneezes in the midst of prayer, it is a good omen for him. Just as the sneeze soothes his irritation, giving him pleasure below, it is a sign that they are

similarly giving him pleasure above. Since Rav Zeira sneezed often, he was extremely pleased to hear this.

²⁶² However, The contradiction between spitting in the case where Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi did so and spitting where it is deemed tantamount to spitting in the face of the king is difficult. The Gemara replies: The contradiction between spitting in one case and spitting in the other case is also not difficult, as it is possible to resolve it in accordance with the opinion of Rav Yehuda, as Rav Yehuda said: One who was standing in prayer, and saliva happened to accumulate in his mouth, he absorbs it in his garment. And if it was a fine garment and he does not want it to become sullied, he may cover it up in his head covering. That way, one is permitted to spit. The Gemara relates: Ravina was standing behind Rav Ashi during prayer when saliva happened to accumulate in his mouth, so he discharged it behind him. Rav Ashi said to him: And does the Master not hold in accordance with that statement of Rav Yehuda, who said that one absorbs it in his head covering? He said to him: I am delicate, and the mere knowledge that there is spittle in my head covering disturbs my prayer.

²⁶³ It was taught in a baraita: One who sounds his voice during his Amida prayer is among those of little faith. Rav Huna said: This was only taught in a case where one is able to focus his heart while praying silently, but if he is unable to focus his heart while praying silently, he is permitted to sound his voice. This applies only to one praying alone, but when he is praying in a congregation his voice will come to disturb the congregation and it is prohibited.

²⁶⁴ The Gemara relates that Rabbi Abba was avoiding being seen by his teacher Rav Yehuda, as Rabbi Abba sought to ascend to Eretz Yisrael and his teacher disapproved, as Rav Yehuda said: Anyone who ascends from Babylonia to Eretz Yisrael transgresses a positive commandment, as it is stated: “They shall be taken to Babylonia and there they shall remain until the day that I recall them, said the Lord” (Jeremiah 27:22). Rabbi Abba did not want to discuss his desire to emigrate with Rav Yehuda. Nevertheless he said: I will go and hear something from him at the hall where the Sages assemble, without being seen, and afterwards I will leave Babylonia.

²⁶⁵ He went and found the tanna, who recites the tannaitic sources before the study hall, reciting the following baraita before Rav Yehuda: One who was standing in prayer and sneezed from below waits until the odor dissipates and resumes praying. Some say: One who was standing in prayer when he felt the need to sneeze from below, retreats four cubits, sneezes, waits until the odor dissipates and resumes praying. And before resuming his prayer, he says: Master of the universe, You have formed us with many orifices and cavities; our disgrace and shame in life are clear and evident before You, as is our destiny with maggots and worms, and so we should not be judged harshly. And he resumes his prayer from where he stopped.

²⁶⁶ Rabbi Abba said to him: Had I only come to the assembly of the Sages to hear this teaching, it would have been sufficient for me.

²⁶⁷ The Sages taught: One who was sleeping unclothed, but was covered with his garment, and he is unable to stick his head out from under the garment because of the cold, may form a barrier with his garment at his neck and recite Shema in bed. And some say: He must form a barrier with his garment at his heart.

²⁶⁸ The Gemara asks: And according to the first tanna, shouldn't he be prohibited from reciting Shema because his heart sees his nakedness, as there is no barrier between them? The Gemara

responds: Indeed, the first tanna holds that when one's heart sees his nakedness, it is permitted to recite Shema, and a barrier is only necessary to separate between his mouth and his nakedness.

²⁶⁹ Rav Huna said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One who was walking in alleyways filthy with human excrement and he must recite Shema, he places his hand over his mouth and recites Shema. Rav Ḥisda said to him: By God! Even if Rabbi Yoḥanan had said it to me directly, with his own mouth, I would not have obeyed him.

²⁷⁰ Some say this halakha: Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One who was walking in alleyways filthy with human excrement and he must recite Shema, he places his hand over his mouth and recites Shema. Rav Ḥisda said to him: By God! Even if Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi had said it to me directly, with his own mouth, I would not have obeyed him.

²⁷¹ The Gemara challenges this: Did Rav Huna really say that? Didn't Rav Huna say: A Torah scholar is prohibited from standing in a place of filth, as he is unable to stand without contemplating Torah, and uttering Shema orally is graver than mere contemplation. The Gemara responds: This is not difficult; here, Rav Huna prohibited contemplating Torah in a case where one is standing in a place of filth, while here he permitted to recite Shema in a case where one is walking through a place of filth.

²⁷² The Gemara asks: Did Rabbi Yoḥanan really say that? Didn't Rabba bar bar Ḥana say that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One is permitted to contemplate matters of Torah everywhere, except the bathhouse and the bathroom? Consequently, it is prohibited to even contemplate Torah in a place of filth. And if you say: Here, too, there is a distinction between the two cases, here, Rabbi Yoḥanan prohibited contemplating Torah in a case where one is standing; here, Rabbi Yoḥanan permitted to recite Shema in a case where one is walking, is that so? Wasn't Rabbi Abbahu walking after Rabbi Yoḥanan and reciting Shema, and when he reached a filthy alleyway he fell silent and stopped reciting Shema. When they emerged, Rabbi Abbahu said to Rabbi Yoḥanan: To where in Shema should I return and resume reciting it? Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: If you delayed continuing Shema for an interval sufficient to complete the entire Shema, return to the beginning and recite it from there. From the fact that Rabbi Yoḥanan did not admonish him for interrupting his recitation, apparently he, too, prohibits reciting Shema while walking through a filthy alleyway.

²⁷³ The Gemara responds: This is not a proof, as he says to him as follows: I do not hold that one must interrupt the recitation of Shema in this case, but for you, who holds that one must, if you delayed Shema for an interval sufficient to complete the entire Shema, return to the beginning and recite it from there.

²⁷⁴ The Gemara cites tannaitic sources to corroborate both the lenient and the stringent opinions. It is taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna, and it is taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rav Ḥisda. It is taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna: One who was walking in filthy alleyways places his hand over his mouth and recites Shema. It is taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rav Ḥisda: One who was walking in filthy alleyways may not recite Shema. Furthermore, if he was in the course of reciting Shema when he reached a filthy alleyway, he stops his recitation at that point.

²⁷⁵ The Gemara asks: If one did not stop, what is his status? Rabbi Meyasha, son of the son of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, said: Of him the verse says: "Moreover, I gave them statutes that were not good

and laws by which they could not live” (Ezekiel 20:25), as in this case following these statutes and laws led to sin, not to mitzva.

²⁷⁶ Rav Asi said that this is derived from the verse: “Woe to those who draw iniquity with cords of vanity” (Isaiah 5:18), meaning that this man brings sin upon himself for naught. Rav Adda bar Ahava said it is derived from here: “For he has shown contempt for the word of the Lord” (Numbers 15:31), meaning that uttering God’s word in a place of filth shows contempt for the Lord.

²⁷⁷ The Gemara asks: And if he stopped his recitation, what is his reward? Rabbi Abbahu said: Of him the verse says: “And it is through this matter that you will prolong your days” (Deuteronomy 32:47), meaning that by being careful with one’s speech one merits longevity.

²⁷⁸ Rav Huna said: One whose garment was tied around his waist, even if he was bare above the waist, is permitted to recite Shema. Indeed, that opinion was also taught in a baraita: One whose garment made of cloth, of leather, of sack or of any other material was strapped around his waist, he is permitted to recite Shema.

²⁷⁹ However, for prayer, one may not recite it until he covers his heart, because in prayer he addresses God directly and he must dress accordingly.

²⁸⁰ And Rav Huna said: One who forgot and entered the bathroom while donning phylacteries places his hand on them until he finishes. The Gemara wonders: Does it enter your mind that he can do so until he is finished? Rather, as Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: Until he finishes discharging the first mass of feces, at which point he can step out and remove his phylacteries. The Gemara asks: Let him stop immediately when he realizes that he is donning phylacteries and stand and step out. The Gemara replies: He cannot do so because of the statement of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel. As it was taught in a baraita: A mass of feces that is held back without having been discharged causes a person to suffer from dropsy [hidrokan], while a stream of urine that is held back causes a person to suffer from jaundice [yerakon]. Since there is potential danger, the Sages did not require him to step out.

²⁸¹ It was stated that the Sages disagreed with regard to one who had fecal matter on his skin or whose hand, but not the rest of his body, was placed inside the bathroom. Under those circumstances, Rav Huna said: He is permitted to recite Shema. Rav Ḥisda said: He is prohibited from reciting Shema. Rava said: What is the reason for Rav Huna’s opinion? As it is written: “Let every soul [neshama] praise the Lord; Halleluya” (Psalms 150:6), which he interprets as “Let everything that has breath” [neshima]. As long as the mouth with which one recites praise is in a place of purity, the location of the other limbs of his body is irrelevant.

²⁸² And Rav Ḥisda said: He is prohibited from reciting Shema. What is the reason for Rav Ḥisda’s opinion? As it is written: “All of my bones shall say: Lord, who is like You” (Psalms 35:10). Since this praise is undertaken with one’s entire body, he may not recite Shema even if just one limb is not appropriately clean.

²⁸³ It was said that the Sages disagreed over a similar issue: What is the legal status of a foul odor that emanates from a visible source? Rav Huna said: He distances himself four cubits from the source of the odor and recites Shema. And Rav Ḥisda said: The source is irrelevant; he distances himself four cubits from the place that the odor ceased and recites Shema.

²⁸⁴ The Gemara notes that it was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rav Ḥisda: A person may not recite Shema opposite human excrement, dog excrement, pig excrement, chicken

excrement, a foul-smelling dung-heap or anything repulsive. However, if the filth were in a place ten handbreadths above or ten handbreadths below him, he may sit alongside it and recite Shema, as a height disparity of ten handbreadths renders it a separate domain. And if the filth were not ten handbreadths above or below him, he must distance himself until it remains beyond his range of vision. And the same is true of prayer. However, from a foul odor with a visible source, he distances himself four cubits from the place that the odor ceased and recites Shema.

²⁸⁵ Rava said: The halakha is not in accordance with this baraita in all of these rulings, but rather in accordance with that which was taught in another baraita: One may neither recite Shema opposite human excrement under all circumstances, nor opposite pig excrement, nor opposite dog excrement into which skins had been placed for tanning, but other materials do not defile the venue of prayer.

²⁸⁶ They raised a dilemma before Rav Sheshet: What is the legal status of a foul odor that has no visible source, e.g., flatulence? He said to them: Come and see these mats in the study hall, as these students are sleeping on them and these other students are studying, and they are not concerned about foul odors. However, this only applies to Torah study because there is no alternative, but not to the recitation of Shema. And with regard to Torah study we said that it is permitted only when the odor originated with another, but not when it originated with himself.

²⁸⁷ It was stated that the Sages disagreed over a parallel issue: What is the law with regard to feces passing before him, being moved from place to place? Abaye stated: One is permitted to recite Shema opposite it, while Rava said: One is forbidden to recite Shema opposite it.

²⁸⁸ Abaye said: From where do I say this halakha? I say this on the basis of what we learned in a mishna: One who is afflicted with biblical leprosy renders the area beneath any covering under which he is located ritually impure. In a case where the ritually impure leper is standing under the branches of a tree and a ritually pure person passes under the branches of that same tree, the pure person is rendered impure, as the entire area under that covering is impure. However, if the pure person is standing under the tree and the impure leper passes, he remains pure. And if the leper stopped under the tree, the pure person is immediately rendered impure. The same is true with regard to a stone afflicted with biblical leprosy (see Leviticus 14), in that if it is merely being moved from place to place, it does not cause impurity. The upshot is that impurity is only disseminated in all directions when the source of the impurity is stationary.

²⁸⁹ And Rava could have said to you: There, in the case of leprosy, it is contingent upon the permanence of the place, as with regard to the leper it is written: “He shall dwell alone; outside the camp shall his dwelling be” (Leviticus 13:46). His impurity is in his permanent dwelling-place. Here, with regard to the obligation to distance oneself from something repulsive, the Torah stated the principle: “And your camp shall be holy” (Deuteronomy 23:15), and there is no holiness in those circumstances.

²⁹⁰ On this topic Rav Pappa said: The mouth of a pig is like passing feces. The Gemara asks: That is obvious. The Gemara replies: No, this halakha is only necessary to teach that even though the pig emerged from the river and one might assume that its mouth was thereby cleansed, it never becomes completely clean.

²⁹¹ Rav Yehuda said: If there is uncertainty as to the presence of feces, e.g., whether something is or is not feces, and therefore whether or not one is permitted to utter sacred matters in its presence, it is prohibited to do so. However, if there is uncertainty as to the presence of urine, it is permitted to do

so. Some say an alternative version of this. Rav Yehuda said: If there is uncertainty as to the presence of feces, in the home one may assume that there is no feces present and it is permitted to speak sacred matters, but if there is doubt as to the presences of feces in the dung-heap it is forbidden to do so. If there is uncertainty as to the presence of urine, however, even in the dung-heap it is permitted to do so.

²⁹² He holds in accordance with that which Rav Hamnuna said, as Rav Hamnuna said: The Torah prohibited the utterance of sacred matters only opposite the stream of urine.

²⁹³ And in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yonatan, as Rabbi Yonatan raised a contradiction between two verses: On the one hand it is written: “You shall also have a place outside the camp, to which you will go” (Deuteronomy 23:13), meaning that one must exit the camp before attending to his bodily needs but there is no obligation to cover it; and it is written in another verse: “And you shall have a spade among your weapons; and when you ease yourself outside, you shall dig with it, and turn back and cover your excrement” (Deuteronomy 23:14), indicating a clear obligation to conceal one’s excrement.

²⁹⁴ He resolves this contradiction: How is this resolved? Here, where one is required to conceal his bodily needs, it refers to feces; here, where there is no requirement to conceal his bodily needs, it refers to urine. Consequently, with regard to urine, reciting Shema was only prohibited by Torah law opposite the stream of urine, but once it has fallen to the ground, it is permitted. And the Sages are those who issued a decree with regard to urine. And when they issued a decree, it was only in a case of their certain presence, but in a case of their uncertain presence, they did not issue a decree.

²⁹⁵ The Gemara asks: In a case of the certain presence of urine, until when and in what state does its presence preclude one from uttering sacred matters? Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: As long as it is wet enough to moisten the hands of one who touches it. And so too Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: As long as it moistens. And so too Ulla said: As long as it moistens. Geniva in the name of Rav said: It is forbidden as long as its mark is apparent on the ground.

²⁹⁶ Rav Yosef said: May God, his Master, forgive Geniva, as Rav could have said no such thing. Now, in the case of feces, Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: Once its surface has dried sufficiently to form a crust, one is permitted to utter sacred matters opposite it; is it necessary to say that opposite urine it is permitted once it dries?

²⁹⁷ Abaye said to him: What did you see that led you to rely on that halakha? Rely on this halakha; as Rabba bar Rav Huna said that Rav said: Uttering sacred matters opposite feces, even if it is as dry as earthenware, is prohibited.

²⁹⁸ The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances of feces like earthenware? Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: As long as one throws it and it does not crumble, it is still considered moist. And some say: As long as one can roll it from place to place and it does not crumble.

²⁹⁹ Ravina said: I was standing before Rav Yehuda of Difti when he saw feces. He said to me: Examine it and see whether or not its surface has dried sufficiently to form a crust. Some say that he said to him as follows: Examine it and see if it is cracked, as only then is it considered dry.

³⁰⁰ Since several opinions were expressed on the subject, the Gemara asks: What halakhic conclusion was reached about this? It was stated that the halakha is subject to dispute: Reciting sacred matters opposite feces as dry as earthenware; Ameimar said: It is prohibited, and Mar Zutra

said: It is permitted. Rava said that the halakha is: Opposite feces as dry as earthenware it is prohibited, and opposite urine, it is prohibited as long as it moistens.

³⁰¹ The Gemara raises an objection based on what was taught in a baraita: Urine, as long as it moistens it is prohibited. If it was absorbed into the ground or dried in place, it is permitted. What, is urine that was absorbed not similar to urine that dried? Just as when it dries its mark is no longer apparent, so too when it is absorbed, its mark is no longer apparent and then it is permissible. But when its mark is apparent, it is prohibited, even though it no longer moistens.

³⁰² The Gemara raises a difficulty to counter this: And according to your reasoning, say the first clause: As long as it moistens it is prohibited, from which one can infer: But if it does not moisten, but its mark is apparent, it is permitted. Rather, no inference beyond its basic meaning can be deduced from this baraita, as the inferences are contradictory.

³⁰³ The Gemara notes: Let us say that this is parallel to a dispute between the tanna'im, as it was taught a baraita: It is forbidden to recite Shema opposite a vessel from which urine was poured. However, the urine itself that was poured, if it was absorbed it is permitted; if it was not absorbed, it is prohibited. Rabbi Yosei disagrees and says: It is prohibited as long as it moistens.

³⁰⁴ The Gemara clarifies this dispute: What is the meaning of absorbed and not absorbed in what the first tanna says? If you say that absorbed means that it does not moisten and not absorbed means that it moistens, and Rabbi Yosei came to say: As long as it moistens it is prohibited, but if there is no moisture but its mark is apparent, it is permitted. If so, that is identical to the opinion of the first tanna and there is no dispute at all. Rather, absorbed means that its mark is not apparent and not absorbed means that its mark is apparent. And Rabbi Yosei came to say: As long as it moistens, it is prohibited, but if there is no moisture but its mark is apparent, it is permitted, in which case the dispute in our Gemara is parallel to this tannaitic dispute.

³⁰⁵ The Gemara states that it is not necessarily parallel: No, everyone, both tanna'im, agrees that as long as it moistens, it is prohibited, and if there is no moisture but its mark is apparent, it is permitted.

³⁰⁶ And here, the difference between them is in a case where it is moist enough to moisten other things. According to the first tanna the prohibition is only in effect when the urine is moist enough to moisten other objects, while according to Rabbi Yosei it applies as long as the urine itself is moist, even if it is not moist enough to moisten other objects.

³⁰⁷ We learned in a mishna that one who descended to immerse himself due to a seminal emission must calculate, whether or not he is able to ascend, cover himself with a garment and recite the morning Shema before sunrise. The Gemara asks: Let us say that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi taught this in the unattributed mishna in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who said: One may recite Shema until sunrise.

³⁰⁸ The Gemara immediately rejects this assumption: Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua, who disagrees with Rabbi Eliezer and holds that one may recite the morning Shema until the third hour of the day, and perhaps the halakha in the mishna was directed toward those whose practice was in accordance with the custom of the vatikin, pious individuals who were scrupulous in their performance of mitzvot, with regard to whom Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The vatikin would conclude the recitation of Shema with sunrise.

³⁰⁹ We learned in the mishna: And if one calculates that he will not be able to ascend and cover himself with a garment in time to recite Shema, he should cover himself in the water and recite Shema there. The Gemara asks: How can one recite Shema with his head above water? His heart sees his nakedness as there is no barrier between them.

³¹⁰ Regarding this Rabbi Elazar said, and some say it was Rabbi Aḥa bar Abba bar Aḥa in the name of Rabbeinu, Rav: This was taught with regard to murky water, which is considered to be like solid earth. Therefore, it constitutes a barrier so that his heart does not see his nakedness.

³¹¹ On this same topic, the Sages taught in a baraita: If one was in clear water, he should sit in it up to his neck and recite Shema. And some say: He sullies the water with his foot.

³¹² The Gemara asks: And according to the first tanna doesn't his heart see his nakedness through the clear water? The Gemara replies: He holds that even if his heart sees his nakedness, it is permitted to recite Shema. The Gemara continues and asks: But in the clear water, doesn't his heel see his nakedness? The Gemara replies: Here too, the first tanna holds that in a case where his heel sees his nakedness it is permitted.

³¹³ The Gemara notes, it was stated: If one's heel sees his nakedness it is permitted. However, what is the halakha in a case where his heel touches his nakedness? May one in that circumstance recite Shema or not? Abaye said: It is prohibited, and Rava said: It is permitted. The Gemara notes: Rav Zevid taught this halakha in that manner. Rav Ḥinnana, son of Rav Ika, taught it as follows: In a case where his heel touches his nakedness, everyone agrees that it is prohibited. Their dispute is with regard to a case where his heel sees his nakedness. Abaye said: It is prohibited, and Rava said: It is permitted; the Torah was not given to the ministering angels, and a person, who, as opposed to a ministering angel, has genitals, cannot avoid this. And the halakha is that if his heel touches his nakedness it is prohibited, but if it merely sees his nakedness, it is permitted.

³¹⁴ Rava said: Opposite feces covered only by a lantern-like covering, which is transparent, it is permitted to recite Shema. But opposite nakedness covered only by a lantern-like covering, it is prohibited to recite Shema. Opposite feces in a lantern, it is permitted to recite Shema because with regard to feces, the ability to recite Shema is contingent upon covering, as it is said: "And cover your excrement" (Deuteronomy 23:14), and although it is visible, it is covered. On the other hand, opposite nakedness covered only by a lantern-like covering, it is prohibited to recite Shema; the Torah said: "And no indecent thing shall be seen in you" (Deuteronomy 23:15), and here it is seen.

³¹⁵ Abaye said: A small amount of feces may be nullified with spittle, and as long as it is covered, it is permitted to recite Shema. Rava said: This applies specifically when it is thick spittle. Rava said: Feces in a hole in the ground, he places his sandal over the hole to cover it and recites Shema. Mar, son of Ravina, raised a dilemma: What is the halakha in a case where feces is stuck to his sandal? Perhaps he would be considered filthy in that case? Let this dilemma stand unresolved.

³¹⁶ Rav Yehuda said: Opposite a naked gentile, it is forbidden to recite Shema. The Gemara asks: Why did Rav Yehuda discuss particularly the case of a gentile? Even with regard to a Jew it is also prohibited. The Gemara replies: Opposite the nakedness of a Jew, it is obvious that it is prohibited; however, opposite the nakedness of a gentile, it was necessary for him to say. Lest you say that since it is written about gentiles: "Their flesh is the flesh of donkeys" (Ezekiel 23:20), say that his nakedness is like that of a mere donkey and does not constitute nakedness. Rav Yehuda taught us that their nakedness is also considered nakedness, as it is written regarding the sons of Noah: "And their

father's nakedness they did not see" (Genesis 9:23). Although Noah predated Abraham and was consequently not Jewish, his nakedness is mentioned.

³¹⁷ And we learned in the mishna: And one who needs to recite Shema may not cover himself with either foul water or water in which flax was soaked until he pours other water into it. The Gemara asks: How much water does he continue to pour in order to render them a permissible covering. If he is covering himself in water in which flax was soaked, it must be a considerable amount of water, requiring at least an equally considerable amount of water to neutralize it. Rather, this is what it says: One may neither cover himself with foul water nor water in which flax was soaked at all; and urine, which is considered repugnant, until he adds clean water to it, and only then he may recite Shema.

³¹⁸ The Sages taught a related disagreement in a baraita: How much water must one add in order to nullify urine? Any quantity is sufficient. Rabbi Zakkai says: One must add a quarter of a log.

³¹⁹ Rav Nahman said: This dispute is with regard to a case where the urine is already in a vessel, and afterward one seeks to nullify it. However, if the clean water was in a vessel at the beginning, before the urine, each drop of urine is nullified as it enters the vessel and therefore any amount of clean water in the vessel is sufficient.

³²⁰ And Rav Yosef said: This dispute is with regard to the amount of water necessary to have in the vessel at the beginning, before the urine. However, afterward, everyone agrees that a quarter of a log is required. The Gemara relates: Rav Yosef said to his servant at the beginning: Bring me a quarter of a log of water, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Zakkai.

³²¹ The Sages taught an elaboration of this point in the Tosefta: Opposite a chamber pot used for excrement or urine, it is prohibited to recite Shema, even if there is nothing in it, as it is always considered filthy. Opposite urine itself, one may not recite Shema until he pours water into it. And how much water must he pour into it? Any quantity. Rabbi Zakkai says: A quarter of a log. That is the ruling both when it is before the bed and when it is behind the bed. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: When it is behind the bed, one may recite Shema, but when it is before the bed, one may not recite Shema, but he must distance himself four cubits and only then recite Shema. Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar is even more strict, saying: Even in a house one hundred cubits in size, one may not recite Shema until he removes it or places it beneath the bed.

³²² A dilemma was raised before students at the yeshiva: How does Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel state this halakha? What did he mean? Did he mean that if the chamber pot is behind the bed, he recites Shema immediately; before the bed, he distances himself four cubits and recites? Or perhaps he states the following: If the chamber pot is behind the bed, he distances himself four cubits and then recites Shema, but if it is before the bed he may not recite Shema at all?

³²³ In order to resolve this dilemma, the Gemara cites proof. Come and hear that it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: If it is behind the bed he recites Shema immediately; before the bed, he distances himself four cubits. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Even in a large house of one hundred cubits one may not recite Shema until he removes it or places it beneath the bed. Thus we see from this baraita that if the vessel is obstructed by the bed he may recite Shema immediately.

³²⁴ The Gemara notes: Our dilemma has been resolved, but the baraitot contradict each other. The statements made in the name of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel in one baraita were made in the name

of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar in the other. The Gemara resolves the contradiction: Reverse the latter baraita and say that the names of the tanna'im were attached to the wrong opinions.

³²⁵ This solution is difficult: What did you see that led you to reverse the latter baraita? Reverse the first one.

³²⁶ The Gemara proves that the latter baraita should be reversed in accordance with the opinions expressed by these Sages in general. Who did you hear that said that an entire house is considered like four cubits? It is Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar, who expressed that opinion in the halakhot of eiruv (Rav Nissim). Consequently, it is reasonable to posit that this would also be his opinion with regard to these halakhot, and the baraita was reversed accordingly.

³²⁷ Rav Yosef said: I raised a dilemma before Rav Huna: It is obvious to me that a bed under which there is a space of less than three handbreadths is considered connected [lavud] to the ground as if the void beneath it does not exist, as halakha considers a void of less than three handbreadths as sealed. What, then, is the dilemma? What is the halakha if that space is three, four, five, six, seven, eight or nine handbreadths? He said to him: I do not know. However, with regard to a space greater than ten handbreadths I certainly have no dilemma, as it is clear that this space is considered a separate domain. Abaye said to him: You did well that you did not have a dilemma, as the halakha is that any space ten handbreadths high is a separate domain.

³²⁸ Rava summarized and said: The halakha is that less than three handbreadths is considered connected and it is permitted to recite Shema. Ten handbreadths is a separate domain. Three to ten handbreadths is the case with regard to which Rav Yosef raised a dilemma before Rav Huna, and Rav Huna did not resolve it for him. Rav said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar. And, so too, the Sage Bali said that Rav Ya'akov, son of Shmuel's daughter, said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar. And Rava said: The halakha is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.

³²⁹ The Gemara relates: Rav Aḥai arranged for his son to marry into the family of Rav Yitzḥak bar Shmuel bar Marta. He led him to enter the wedding canopy for the wedding ceremony, but he was unsuccessful in his attempts to consummate the marriage. Rav Aḥai followed him to examine possible causes of the problem and he saw a Torah scroll placed there. He said to them: Had I not come now, you would have endangered the life of my son. As it was taught in a baraita: In a room in which there is a Torah scroll or phylacteries, it is forbidden to engage in conjugal relations until he takes them out of the room or places them in a vessel inside a second vessel.

³³⁰ Abaye said: They only taught that a vessel inside a second vessel is sufficient when the vessel is not their, the Torah scroll's or the phylacteries', regular vessel. But a vessel that is their regular vessel, even ten vessels are considered as one vessel, and the Torah or phylacteries must be covered in another vessel not typically used for that purpose. Rava said: A cloak

³³¹ atop a chest is like a vessel within a vessel. On a similar note, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One who wishes to engage in marital relations in a room in which there is a Torah scroll, must erect a partition ten handbreadths high. The Gemara relates: Mar Zutra happened to come to the house of Rav Ashi and he saw that in the bed chamber of his son Mar bar Rav Ashi, there was a Torah scroll, and a partition of ten handbreadths had been erected for it. He said to him: In accordance with whose opinion did you do this? Is it in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi? Say that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said this only as a makeshift solution in exigent situations, when he has no

other room in which to place it, but don't you, Master, have another room where you could place the Torah scroll? He said to him: Indeed, that did not enter my mind.

³³² We learned in the mishna: And, how far must one distance himself from urine and from feces in order to recite Shema? Four cubits. Rava said that Rav Sehora said that Rav Huna said: They only taught that it is sufficient to distance oneself four cubits when the feces are behind him, but if they are before him he must distance himself to the point that it is no longer within his range of vision; and the halakha is the same for prayer.

³³³ The Gemara challenges this: Is that so? Didn't Rafram bar Pappa say that Rav Hisda said: One may stand opposite a bathroom and pray. The Gemara resolves this contradiction: With what are we dealing here? With a bathroom that has no feces, and therefore there is no need to distance himself to that extent.

³³⁴ The Gemara asks again: Is that so? Didn't Rav Yosef bar Hanina say: The bathroom to which the Sages referred in all of the halakhot of distancing oneself was even one in which there were no feces, and the bathhouse to which the Sages referred in all of the halakhot of uttering sacred matters, was even one in which there was no naked person. Rather, with what are we dealing here? We are dealing with a new structure, built as a bathroom but not yet used for that purpose.

³³⁵ The Gemara asks: Wasn't this already raised as a dilemma by Ravina: One who designated the structure for use as a bathroom, what is its legal status? Is designation effective or is designation not effective? The Gemara replies: When Ravina raised the dilemma, it was whether or not one may stand and pray inside it, but he had no dilemma whether or not one may pray opposite it.

³³⁶ Rava said: These Persian bathrooms, even though they contain feces, they are considered as sealed, as they are constructed on an incline so the feces will roll out of the bathroom underground.

³³⁷ MISHNA: Continuing the earlier discussion of the halakhot of immersion for Torah study and prayer for one who experienced a seminal emission, the mishna discusses a case where individuals who were already impure with a severe form of ritual impurity are exposed to the impurity of a seminal emission as well. They are required to immerse themselves and purify themselves of the impurity of the seminal emission even though they remain impure due to the more severe impurity. Consequently, even a zav, whose impurity lasts at least seven days, who experienced a seminal emission, for which, were he not a zav, he would be impure for only one day; a menstruating woman who discharged semen, despite the fact that she is already impure with a severe impurity unaffected by her immersion; and a woman who engaged in conjugal relations with her husband and later saw menstrual blood, all require immersion. And Rabbi Yehuda exempts them from immersion.

³³⁸ GEMARA: A dilemma was raised before the students of the yeshiva: One who experienced a seminal emission and was therefore required to immerse himself, who later saw a discharge that rendered him a zav; according to Rabbi Yehuda, what is his legal status? The Gemara explains the sides of the dilemma: When, in our mishna, Rabbi Yehuda exempted a zav who saw a seminal emission from immersion, that was because from the outset he was not fit for immersion, as the immersion would not be effective in purifying him from the impurity of a zav; however, one who experienced a seminal emission, who later saw a discharge that rendered him a zav, who was fit for immersion and only later became impure with the severe impurity of a zav, would Rabbi Yehuda require immersion? Or perhaps there is no difference and he is exempt from immersion in both cases?

³³⁹ In order to resolve this dilemma, come and hear the last case of the mishna: A woman who engaged in conjugal relations with her husband and later saw menstrual blood requires immersion. And Rabbi Yehuda exempts them from immersion. Isn't the woman who engaged in conjugal relations with her husband and later saw menstrual blood like one who experienced a seminal emission, who later saw a discharge that rendered him a zav, as in both cases there is a less severe ritual impurity followed by a more severe impurity; and nevertheless, Rabbi Yehuda exempts. Conclude from this that Rabbi Yehuda does not distinguish between the cases. And indeed, Rabbi Hiyya explicitly taught: One who experienced a seminal emission who later saw a discharge that rendered him a zav requires immersion, and Rabbi Yehuda exempts.

Chapter 4

¹ MISHNA: This mishna determines the times beyond which the different prayers may not be recited. According to the Rabbis, the morning prayer may be recited until noon. Rabbi Yehuda says: It may be recited only until four hours after sunrise. According to the Rabbis, the afternoon prayer may be recited until the evening. Rabbi Yehuda says: It may be recited only until the midpoint of the afternoon [pelag haminḥa], i.e., the midpoint of the period that begins with the sacrifice of the daily afternoon offering and ends at nightfall, which is the end of the afternoon.

² The evening prayer may be recited throughout the night and is not fixed to a specific hour. According to the Rabbis, the additional prayer may be recited all day. Rabbi Yehuda says: It may be recited only until seven hours after sunrise.

³ GEMARA: We learned in the mishna that the morning prayer may be recited only until a few hours into the day. The Gemara raises a contradiction based on what was taught in a baraita: The mitzva is to recite the morning Shema with sunrise so that he will juxtapose redemption, which is mentioned in the blessings following Shema, to the Amida prayer, which is recited immediately after sunrise, and find himself praying in the daytime. Clearly, the time to recite the morning prayer is immediately after sunrise.

⁴ The Gemara responds: This baraita does not establish a binding halakha. Rather, it taught that rule specifically with regard to those who are scrupulous in fulfillment of mitzvot [vatikin]. As Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Vatikin would finish reciting the morning Shema with sunrise, but those who are not vatikin may recite their prayers later.

⁵ The Gemara asks: Does everyone hold that one may recite the morning prayer only until noon and no later? Didn't Rav Mari, son of Rav Huna, son of Rabbi Yirmeya bar Abba, say that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One who erred and did not recite the evening prayer, prays in the morning prayer two Amida prayers; one who erred and did not recite the morning prayer, prays in the afternoon prayer two Amida prayers? Apparently, the morning prayer may be recited until the evening, at least in the event that he forgot to recite it in the morning.

⁶ The Gemara answers: Indeed, one may continue praying for the entire day. However, if he prayed until noon, they give him a reward for reciting the prayer at its appointed time. If he prayed from there on, they give him a reward for reciting the prayer. They do not give him a reward for reciting the prayer at its appointed time.

⁷ On the topic of one who forgot to pray and seeks to compensate for the prayer that he missed, a dilemma was raised before them in the study hall: One who erred and did not recite the afternoon prayer, what is the ruling? May he recite in the evening prayer two Amida prayers? The Gemara articulates the sides of the dilemma: If you say that one who erred and did not pray the evening prayer prays in the morning prayer two Amida prayers, perhaps that is because the evening and the morning are both part of one day, as it is written: “And there was evening and there was morning, one day” (Genesis 1:5); the evening and the following morning constitute a single unit. But here, in the case under discussion, perhaps prayer is in place of sacrifice. Since in the case of sacrifice we say, since its day passed, its sacrifice is invalid and there is no way to compensate for the missed opportunity, the same should be true for prayer. Or, perhaps, since prayer is supplication, any time that one wishes, he may continue to pray?

⁸ Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma from that which Rav Huna bar Yehuda said that Rabbi Yitzhak said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One who erred and did not recite the afternoon prayer, prays in the evening prayer two Amida prayers and there is no element of: Its day passed, its sacrifice is invalid.

⁹ With regard to the possibility to compensate for a prayer that he failed to recite at its appointed time, the Gemara raises an objection based on what was taught in a baraita. The meaning of the verse: “That which is crooked cannot be made straight; and that which is wanting cannot be numbered” (Ecclesiastes 1:15), is as follows: That which is crooked cannot be made straight refers to one who omitted the evening Shema and the morning Shema, or the evening prayer, or the morning prayer. And that which is wanting cannot be numbered [lehimanot] refers to one whose friends reached a consensus [nimnu] to perform a mitzva and he was not part of their consensus [nimnu] and, consequently, he missed his opportunity to join them in performance of the mitzva. This baraita clearly states that there is no way to compensate for a missed prayer.

¹⁰ To resolve this difficulty, Rabbi Yitzhak said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: With what are we dealing here in this baraita? We are dealing with a case where one intentionally failed to recite the prayer. Only then he has no remedy. However, one who failed to pray due to error can compensate for the missed prayer by reciting the next prayer twice.

¹¹ Rav Ashi said: The language of the baraita is also precise as it teaches omitted and did not teach erred. This indicates that the halakha is different in the case of error. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this.

¹² On a similar note, the Sages taught in a baraita: One who erred and did not recite the afternoon prayer on the eve of Shabbat, prays in the evening prayer two Amida prayers on Shabbat evening. One who erred and did not recite the afternoon prayer on Shabbat, recites two weekday Amida prayers in the evening prayer at the conclusion of Shabbat. He recites havdala [the prayer of distinction] between the sanctity of Shabbat and the profanity of the week by reciting: You have graced us, etc., in the fourth blessing of the Amida, which is: Who graciously grants knowledge, in the first prayer, as it is the actual evening prayer, but he does not recite havdala in the second prayer, which is in place of the afternoon prayer. Moreover, if he recited havdala in the second prayer and did not recite havdala in the first, the second prayer fulfilled his obligation, the first one did not fulfill his obligation.

¹³ The Gemara comments: Is that to say that since he did not recite havdala in the first prayer, he is as one who did not pray and we require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it? If so, the conclusion is that one who fails to recite havdala in the prayer must repeat that prayer.

¹⁴ The Gemara raises a contradiction to the above conclusion from the Tosefta: One who erred and did not mention the might of the rains: He makes the wind blow and rain fall in the second blessing of the Amida, the blessing on the revival of the dead, and one who erred and failed to recite the request for rain in the ninth blessing of the Amida, the blessing of the years, we require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it. However, one who erred and failed to recite havdala in the blessing: Who graciously grants knowledge, we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, as he can recite havdala over the cup of wine, independent of his prayer. This contradiction was not resolved and remains difficult.

¹⁵ The dispute between the Rabbis and Rabbi Yehuda with regard to the times beyond which the different prayers may not be recited is rooted in a profound disagreement, also manifest in a later amoraic dispute. It was stated: Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: The practice of praying three times daily is ancient, albeit not in its present form; prayers were instituted by the Patriarchs. However, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said that the prayers were instituted based on the daily offerings sacrificed in the Holy Temple, and the prayers parallel the offerings, in terms of both time and characteristics.

¹⁶ The Gemara comments: It was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, and it was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. The Gemara elaborates: It was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina: Abraham instituted the morning prayer, as it is stated when Abraham came to look out over Sodom the day after he had prayed on its behalf: “And Abraham rose early in the morning to the place where he had stood before the Lord” (Genesis 19:27), and from the context as well as the language utilized in the verse, the verb standing means nothing other than prayer, as this language is used to describe Pinehas’ prayer after the plague, as it is stated: “And Pinehas stood up and prayed and the plague ended” (Psalms 106:30). Clearly, Abraham was accustomed to stand in prayer in the morning.

¹⁷ Isaac instituted the afternoon prayer, as it is stated: “And Isaac went out to converse [lasuah] in the field toward evening” (Genesis 24:63), and conversation means nothing other than prayer, as it is stated: “A prayer of the afflicted when he is faint and pours out his complaint [siḥo] before the Lord” (Psalms 102:1). Obviously, Isaac was the first to pray as evening approached, at the time of the afternoon prayer.

¹⁸ Jacob instituted the evening prayer, as it is stated: “And he encountered [vayifga] the place and he slept there for the sun had set” (Genesis 28:11). The word encounter means nothing other than prayer, as it is stated when God spoke to Jeremiah: “And you, do not pray on behalf of this nation and do not raise on their behalf song and prayer, and do not encounter [tifga] Me for I do not hear you” (Jeremiah 7:16). Jacob prayed during the evening, after the sun had set.

¹⁹ And it was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi that the laws of prayer are based on the laws of the daily offerings: Why did the Rabbis say that the morning prayer may be recited until noon? Because, although the daily morning offering is typically brought early in the morning, it may be sacrificed until noon. And Rabbi Yehuda says: My opinion, that the

morning prayer may be recited until four hours into the day, is because the daily morning offering is sacrificed until four hours.

²⁰ And why did the Rabbis say that the afternoon prayer may be recited until the evening? Because the daily afternoon offering is sacrificed until the evening. Rabbi Yehuda says that the afternoon prayer may be recited only until the midpoint of the afternoon because, according to his opinion, the daily afternoon offering is sacrificed until the midpoint of the afternoon.

²¹ And why did they say that the evening prayer is not fixed? Because the burning of the limbs and fats of the offerings that were not consumed by the fire on the altar until the evening. They remained on the altar and were offered continuously throughout the entire night.

²² And why did the Rabbis say that the additional prayer may be recited all day? Because the additional offering is brought throughout the entire day. However, Rabbi Yehuda says that the additional prayer may be recited until the seventh hour of the day, because the additional offering is sacrificed until the seventh hour.

²³ The baraita continues and states that there are two times for the afternoon prayer. Greater, earlier minḥa [minḥa gedola] and lesser, later minḥa [minḥa ketana]. The Gemara clarifies the difference between them: Which is minḥa gedola? From six-and-a-half hours after sunrise and on, which is a half an hour after noon and on. It is the earliest time that the daily afternoon offering may be sacrificed, as in the case on the eve of Passover that occurs on Shabbat. Which is minḥa ketana? From nine-and-a-half hours and on, which is the standard time that the daily afternoon offering is sacrificed.

²⁴ On that note, a dilemma was raised before them: Rabbi Yehuda, who holds that the afternoon prayer may be recited only until the midpoint of the afternoon, does he say the midpoint of the first minḥa, minḥa gedola? Or, does he say the midpoint of the last minḥa? Come and hear an explicit resolution to this dilemma: As it was taught in a baraita, Rabbi Yehuda says: They said the midpoint of the last minḥa, and that is eleven hours minus a quarter of an hour after sunrise, i.e., an hour-and-a-quarter hours before sunset.

²⁵ In any case, it is clear that according to this baraita the halakhot of prayer are based on the Temple offerings. The Gemara suggests: Let us say that this is a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, who held that the forefathers instituted the prayers. Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, could have said to you: Actually, I will say to you that the Patriarchs instituted the prayers and the Sages based the times and characteristics of prayer on the Temple offerings, even though they do not stem from the same source. As, if you do not say so, that even Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, would agree that the laws of offerings and those of prayers are related, then, according to Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, who instituted the additional prayer? It is not one of the prayers instituted by the forefathers. Rather, even according to Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, the prayers were instituted by the Patriarchs and the Sages based them on the laws of the offerings.

²⁶ We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says: The morning prayer may be recited until four hours of the day. A dilemma was raised before the yeshiva students: When Rabbi Yehuda says until, does he mean until and including the fourth hour, or, perhaps when he says “until” he means until and not including, in which case one may not pray during the fourth hour? Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma based on the mishna. Rabbi Yehuda says: The afternoon prayer may be recited only until the midpoint of the afternoon. Now, granted, if you say that until means until and

not including, then there is a difference between the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda and the opinion of the Rabbis. However, if you say that until means until and including, then the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda²⁷ is identical to the opinion of the Rabbis, as the end of the period that begins with the midpoint of the afternoon is sunset.

²⁸ The Gemara immediately rejects this proof: Rather, what is the alternative? That until means until and not including? It remains problematic. Say the latter clause of the mishna: The additional prayer may be recited all day. Rabbi Yehuda says: It may be recited until the seven hours. And it was taught in a baraita: If the obligation to recite two prayers was before him, one the additional prayer and one the afternoon prayer, he prays the afternoon prayer first and the additional prayer thereafter, because this, the afternoon prayer, is recited on a frequent basis, and that, the additional prayer, is recited on a relatively infrequent basis as it is only recited on Shabbat, the New Moon, and Festivals. The principle states: When a frequent practice and an infrequent practice clash, the frequent practice takes precedence over the infrequent practice. Rabbi Yehuda says: He recites the additional prayer first and the afternoon prayer thereafter, because the time to recite this, the additional prayer, will soon elapse, and this, the time to recite the afternoon prayer, will not soon elapse, as one may recite it until the midpoint of the afternoon.

²⁹ The relevant point is: Granted, if you say that until means until and including, that is how you can find a situation where the times to recite two prayers, the afternoon prayer and the additional prayer, overlap. But if you say that until means until and not including, and that until seven hours means until the beginning of the seventh hour, noon, then how can you find a situation where the times to recite two prayers overlap? Once the time to recite the afternoon prayer, a half hour past noon, has arrived, the time to recite the additional prayer is already gone?

³⁰ Rather, what is the alternative? That until means until and including? Then the first clause of the mishna is difficult, as explained above with regard to the midpoint of the afternoon: What is the halakhic difference between the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda and the opinion of the Rabbis? The Gemara answers: Do you think that when this midpoint of the afternoon was mentioned it was speaking of the period following the midpoint, the last part of the afternoon, from an hour-and-a-quarter before sunset until sunset? This was not the intention. Rather, it was speaking of the period prior to the midpoint, the first part of the afternoon, which, as explained above, is from nine-and-a-half hours after sunrise until an hour-and-a-quarter before sunset. Consequently, until the midpoint of the afternoon means until the end of the first half of that afternoon period. And this is what he is saying: When does the first half leave and the second half enter? From when eleven hours minus a quarter have passed since sunrise. Rabbi Yehuda's use of the term until always means until and including.

³¹ Practically speaking, this means that, according to Rabbi Yehuda, it is permissible to recite the morning prayer until the end of the fourth hour. In support of this Rav Nahman said: We, too, learned this in a mishna:

³² Rabbi Yehuda ben Bava testified about five matters of halakha: When an orphan girl, who was married off by her mother or brother before reaching the age of majority, reaches the age of majority, she may refuse to continue living with her husband and thereby retroactively annul their marriage. Normally, marriage refusals are discouraged. However, in specific instances where it is clear that if the marriage were to remain in effect it would engender problems related to levirate marriage and

ḥalitza, Rabbi Yehuda ben Bava testified that one may persuade the minor girl to refuse to continue living with her husband, thereby resolving the complications involved in this case. And he testified that one may allow a woman who, after hearing of her husband's death, seeks to remarry, to marry based on the testimony of one witness, as opposed to the two witnesses required for other testimonies of the Torah. And he testified about a rooster that was stoned to death in Jerusalem for killing a person, in order to teach that the Torah law (Exodus 21:28) which requires the stoning of an ox that killed a person, applies to other animals as well. And he testified about forty-day-old wine that was used for libation on the altar. And he testified about the daily morning offering that was sacrificed at four hours of the day.

³³ Learn from this final testimony, which is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, that until means until and including. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this.

³⁴ Based on this mishna, Rav Kahana said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda since we learned in a mishna in the preferred tractate, Eduyyot, in accordance with his opinion. Since the halakha is ruled in accordance with all of the mishnayot in Eduyyot, the opinion of a tanna who rules in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda in that mishna means that the halakha is in accordance with that opinion.

³⁵ And about the daily morning offering that was sacrificed at four hours. Based on this, the Gemara attempts to identify the tanna who taught that which we learned in the mishna about the manna that fell for the children of Israel in the desert: "And they gathered it morning by morning, each according to what he eats, and when the sun grew hot it melted" (Exodus 16:21); that took place four hours into the day.

³⁶ The baraita continues: Do you say that the time when the sun grew hot was at four hours, or perhaps it was only at six hours of the day? When the verse says: "In the heat of the day" (Genesis 18:1), six hours is already mentioned in the Torah as the heat of the day. How, then, do I establish the verse: "And when the sun grew hot it melted"? This must refer to an earlier time, at four hours. The Gemara asks: Who is the tanna of this mishna? It is neither Rabbi Yehuda nor the Sages. If it was in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, until four hours is also considered morning, as he holds that the daily morning offering may still be sacrificed then, while here it says that in the morning the manna was gathered and it melted after the morning. If it was in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, until noon is also considered morning, since, according to the Sages, the daily morning offering could be sacrificed until noon. Apparently, this is an entirely new position.

³⁷ The Gemara responds: If you wish, say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and if you wish, say instead that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. The Gemara explains: If you wish, say in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. The verse states: Morning by morning, divide it into two mornings. Morning, according to the Rabbis, lasts until noon. The repetition of the term morning in the Torah indicates that the period when the manna was gathered ended at the conclusion of the first half of the morning, i.e., the end of the third hour. And if you wish, say instead in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who would say that: This extra morning in the phrase morning by morning comes to make the end of the period when the manna was gathered an hour earlier. In any event, everyone agrees that the verse, And when the sun grew hot it melted, refers to four hours of the day.

³⁸ The Gemara asks: From where is the inference drawn that this is the meaning of the verse? Rabbi Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: The verse states: "When the sun grew hot it melted." Which is the hour that the sun is hot but the shade remains cool, before the heat of the day, when even the shade is hot? You must say at four hours.

³⁹ We learned in the mishna: The Rabbis hold that the afternoon prayer may be recited until the evening. Rabbi Yehuda says: It may be recited only until the midpoint of the afternoon. Rav Ḥisda said to Rav Yitzḥak: There, with regard to the morning prayer, Rav Kahana said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, since we learned in a mishna in the preferred tractate, Eduyyot, in accordance with his opinion. Here, what is the ruling? He was silent and said nothing to him, as he was familiar with no established ruling in this matter. Rav Ḥisda said: Let us see and try to resolve this ourselves from the fact that Rav prayed the Shabbat prayers on the eve of Shabbat while it was still day. Learn from this that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and the time for the afternoon prayer ends at the midpoint of the afternoon, after which time one may recite the evening prayer.

⁴⁰ The Gemara immediately rejects the proof based on Rav's practice: On the contrary, from the fact that Rav Huna and the Sages, students of Rav, would not pray until evening, learn from that that the halakha is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. The Gemara concludes: Now that the halakha was stated neither in accordance with the opinion of this Sage nor in accordance with the opinion of that Sage, one who acted in accordance with the opinion of this Sage has acted legitimately, and one who acted in accordance with the opinion of that Sage has acted legitimately, as this halakha is left to the decision of each individual.

⁴¹ The Gemara relates: Rav happened by the house of the Sage, Geniva, and he prayed the Shabbat prayer on the eve of Shabbat before nightfall. Rabbi Yirmeya bar Abba was praying behind Rav, and Rav finished his prayer but did not take three steps back and interrupt the prayer of Rabbi Yirmeya. Derive from this incident three halakhot: Derive from this that one may pray the Shabbat prayer on the eve of Shabbat before nightfall. And derive from this that a student may pray behind his rabbi. And derive from this that it is prohibited to pass before those who are praying.

⁴² The Gemara responds: This supports the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, as Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: It is prohibited to pass before those who are praying. The Gemara asks: Is that so? Didn't Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi pass before those who were praying? The Gemara responds: Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi were beyond four cubits from those who were praying when they passed.

⁴³ One particular detail was surprising: How did Rabbi Yirmeya act that way and pray behind Rav? Didn't Rav Yehuda say that Rav said: A person should never pray

⁴⁴ directly next to his rabbi, presumptuously indicating that he is his rabbi's equal, and behind his rabbi as it creates the impression that he is bowing to him (Tosafot)?

⁴⁵ And it was taught in a baraita, in a more extreme manner, as Rabbi Eliezer says: One who prays behind his rabbi and one who greets his rabbi without waiting for his rabbi to greet him first, one who returns his rabbi's greeting without saying: Greetings to you, rabbi, one who rivals his rabbi's yeshiva, i.e., establishes a yeshiva of his own and teaches during his rabbi's lifetime without his consent (Rambam), and one who says something in the name of his rabbi which he did not hear directly from his rabbi, causes the Divine Presence to withdraw from Israel.

⁴⁶ With regard to Rabbi Yirmeya's conduct, the Gemara explains that Rabbi Yirmeya bar Abba is different, as he was not a mere student of Rav. Rather, he was a disciple-colleague and was, therefore, permitted to act that way. And that is why on one occasion, when Rav prayed the Shabbat prayer early, Rabbi Yirmeya bar Abba asked him: Did you distance yourself from labor and accept the sanctity of Shabbat? Rav said to him: Yes, I distanced myself. And Rabbi Yirmeya did not say to him: Did the Master distance himself, as would have been appropriate had he merely been Rav's student.

⁴⁷ Although Rav replied that he distanced himself from labor, did he indeed need to distance himself from labor? Didn't Rabbi Avin say: Once Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi prayed the Shabbat prayer on the eve of Shabbat before nightfall. He then entered the bathhouse and emerged and taught us our chapters that we had learned, and it was not yet dark. Rava said: That is a case where he had entered the bathhouse to perspire, and it was before the Sages issued a decree prohibiting perspiring in a bathhouse on Shabbat.

⁴⁸ The Gemara asks: Is that so, that he was required to refrain from labor? Didn't Abaye permit Rav Dimi bar Liva'ei to fumigate baskets with sulfur even though he had already recited the Shabbat prayer, indicating that it is permitted to perform labor even after the Shabbat prayer?

⁴⁹ The Gemara responds: That was an error, as Rav Dimi did not intend to begin Shabbat early. It was a cloudy day and he mistakenly thought that the sun had set and that was why he prayed. Consequently, even though he prayed, the Shabbat prayer did not obligate him to conduct himself in accordance with the sanctity of Shabbat and he was allowed to perform labor even after his prayer.

⁵⁰ The Gemara goes on to ask: Can a mistake be reversed, enabling one to conduct himself as if he had not prayed? Didn't Avidan, a student of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, say: Once the sky became overcast, leading the people to think that it was the dark of night; they entered the synagogue and recited the evening prayer of the conclusion of Shabbat on Shabbat. And later, the clouds cleared and the sun shone, indicating that it was still day.

⁵¹ And they came and asked Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi what they should do, and he said: Since they have prayed, they have prayed, and they need not pray again. Although they prayed erroneously, their mistake is not reversible and what was done remains. The Gemara responds: A community is different in that we do not burden them to pray again.

⁵² The Gemara continues to discuss the possibility of reciting the evening prayer early, even on Shabbat. Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Avin said: Rav prayed the Shabbat prayer on the eve of Shabbat before nightfall. Rabbi Yoshiya would pray the evening prayer of the conclusion of Shabbat on Shabbat. With regard to the fact that Rav prayed the Shabbat prayer on the eve of Shabbat before nightfall, the dilemma is raised: In those cases, did he recite kiddush over the cup of wine, or did he not recite kiddush over the cup of wine before the stars emerged? Come and hear a resolution to this, as Rav Nahman said that Shmuel said: One prays the Shabbat prayer on the eve of Shabbat before nightfall and recites kiddush over the cup of wine. And the halakha is in accordance with his ruling.

⁵³ A similar dilemma was raised concerning the fact that Rabbi Yoshiya would pray the evening prayer of the conclusion of Shabbat on Shabbat: After praying, while it is still Shabbat, does he recite havdala over the cup of wine or does one not recite havdala over the cup of wine? Come and hear a resolution to this, as Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: One prays the evening prayer of the conclusion of Shabbat on Shabbat and recites havdala over the cup of wine.

⁵⁴ Rabbi Zeira said that Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Ḥanina said that Rav said: Alongside this specific pillar before me, Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yosei, prayed the Shabbat prayer on the eve of Shabbat before nightfall.

⁵⁵ But when Ulla came from the Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he related a different version of this story. He said that he had heard: This transpired beside a palm tree, not beside a pillar, and it was not Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yosei, but it was Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Yosei, and it was not the Shabbat prayer on Shabbat eve before nightfall, rather it was the prayer of the conclusion of Shabbat on Shabbat.

⁵⁶ We learned in the mishna: The evening prayer may be recited throughout the night and is not fixed to a specific hour. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of is not fixed? If you say that if one wishes, he may pray throughout the night, then let the mishna teach: The evening prayer may be recited throughout the night. Rather, what is the meaning of not fixed?

⁵⁷ It is in accordance with the opinion of the one who said: The evening prayer is optional. As Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said with regard to the evening prayer. Rabban Gamliel says: It is obligatory. Rabbi Yehoshua says: It is optional. Abaye said: The halakha is in accordance with the statement of the one who said: The evening prayer is obligatory. Rava said: The halakha is in accordance with the statement of the one who said: The evening prayer is optional.

⁵⁸ The Sages taught: There was an incident involving a student, who came before Rabbi Yehoshua. The student said to him: Is the evening prayer optional or obligatory? Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: Optional.

⁵⁹ The same student came before Rabban Gamliel and said to him: Is the evening prayer optional or obligatory? Rabban Gamliel said to him: Obligatory. The student said to Rabban Gamliel: But didn't Rabbi Yehoshua tell me that the evening prayer is optional? Rabban Gamliel said to the student: Wait until the "masters of the shields," a reference to the Torah scholars who battle in the war of Torah, enter the study hall, at which point we will discuss this issue.

⁶⁰ When the masters of the shields entered, the questioner stood before everyone present and asked: Is the evening prayer optional or obligatory? Rabban Gamliel said to him: Obligatory. In order to ascertain whether or not Rabbi Yehoshua still maintained his opinion, Rabban Gamliel said to the Sages: Is there any person who disputes this matter? Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: No, no one disagrees. In deference to the Nasi, he did not wish to argue with him publicly (Tziyyun LeNefesh Ḥayya). Rabban Gamliel said to Rabbi Yehoshua: But was it not in your name that they told me that the evening prayer is optional?

⁶¹ Rabban Gamliel said to Rabbi Yehoshua: Yehoshua, stand on your feet and they will testify against you. Rabbi Yehoshua stood on his feet and said: If I were alive and the student were dead, the living can contradict the dead, and I could deny issuing that ruling. Now that I am alive and he is alive, how can the living contradict the living? I have no choice but to admit that I said it.

⁶² In the meantime, Rabban Gamliel, as the Nasi, was sitting and lecturing, and Rabbi Yehoshua all the while was standing on his feet, because Rabban Gamliel did not instruct him to sit. He remained standing in deference to the Nasi. This continued for some time, until it aroused great resentment against Rabban Gamliel, and all of the people assembled began murmuring and said to Ḥutzpit the disseminator: Stop conveying Rabban Gamliel's lecture. And he stopped.

⁶³ The Gemara relates that in their murmuring they said: How long will Rabban Gamliel continue afflicting him? Last year on Rosh HaShana, he afflicted him; Rabban Gamliel ordered Rabbi Yehoshua to come to him carrying his staff and bag, on the day on which Yom Kippur occurred, according to Rabbi Yehoshua's calculations. Regarding the firstborn, in the incident involving the question of Rabbi Tzadok, he afflicted him just as he did now, and forced him to remain standing as punishment for his failure to defend his differing opinion. Here too, he is afflicting him. Let us remove him from his position as Nasi.

⁶⁴ It was so agreed, but the question arose: Whom shall we establish in his place? Shall we establish Rabbi Yehoshua in his place? The Sages rejected that option because Rabbi Yehoshua was party to the incident for which Rabban Gamliel was deposed. Appointing him would be extremely upsetting for Rabban Gamliel. Shall we establish Rabbi Akiva in his place? The Sages rejected that option because Rabbi Akiva, who descended from a family of converts, would be vulnerable. Perhaps due to Rabban Gamliel's resentment he would cause him to be divinely punished as he lacks the merit of his ancestors to protect him.

⁶⁵ Rather, suggested the Sages, let us establish Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya in his place, his outstanding characteristics set him apart from the other candidates. He is wise, rich, and a tenth generation descendant of Ezra. The Gemara explains: He is wise, so if Rabban Gamliel raises a challenge in matters of Torah, he will answer it and not be embarrassed. And he is rich, so if the need arises to pay homage to the Caesar's court and serve as a representative of Israel to lobby and negotiate, he has sufficient wealth to cover the costs of the long journeys, taxes, and gifts, so he too is able to go and pay homage. And he is a tenth generation descendant of Ezra, so he has the merit of his ancestors, and Rabban Gamliel will be unable to cause him to be punished. They came and said to him: Would the Master consent to being the Head of the Yeshiva? He said to them: I will go and consult with my household. He went and consulted with his wife. She said to him:

⁶⁶ There is room for concern. Perhaps they will remove you from office just as they removed Rabban Gamliel. He said to her, based on the folk saying: Let a person use an expensive goblet one day and let it break tomorrow. In other words, one should take advantage of an opportunity that presents itself and he need not concern himself whether or not it will last. She said to him: You have no white hair, and it is inappropriate for one so young to head the Sages. The Gemara relates: That day, he was eighteen years old, a miracle transpired for him and eighteen rows of hair turned white. The Gemara comments: That explains that which Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya said: I am as one who is seventy years old and he did not say: I am seventy years old, because he looked older than he actually was.

⁶⁷ It was taught: On that day that they removed Rabban Gamliel from his position and appointed Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya in his place, there was also a fundamental change in the general approach of the study hall as they dismissed the guard at the door and permission was granted to the students to enter. Instead of Rabban Gamliel's selective approach that asserted that the students must be screened before accepting them into the study hall, the new approach asserted that anyone who seeks to study should be given opportunity to do so. As Rabban Gamliel would proclaim and say: Any student whose inside, his thoughts and feelings, are not like his outside, i.e., his conduct and his character traits are lacking, will not enter the study hall.

⁶⁸ The Gemara relates: On that day several benches were added to the study hall to accommodate the numerous students. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Abba Yosef ben Dostai and the Rabbis disputed this matter.

One said: Four hundred benches were added to the study hall. And one said: Seven hundred benches were added to the study hall. When he saw the tremendous growth in the number of students, Rabban Gamliel was disheartened. He said: Perhaps, Heaven forbid, I prevented Israel from engaging in Torah study. They showed him in his dream white jugs filled with ashes alluding to the fact that the additional students were worthless idlers. The Gemara comments: That is not the case, but that dream was shown to him to ease his mind so that he would not feel bad.

⁶⁹ It was taught: There is a tradition that tractate Eduyyot was taught that day. And everywhere in the Mishna or in a baraita that they say: On that day, it is referring to that day. There was no halakha whose ruling was pending in the study hall that they did not explain and arrive at a practical halakhic conclusion. And even Rabban Gamliel did not avoid the study hall for even one moment, as he held no grudge against those who removed him from office and he participated in the halakhic discourse in the study hall as one of the Sages.

⁷⁰ As we learned in a mishna: On that day, Yehuda, the Ammonite convert, came before the students in the study hall and he said to them: What is my legal status in terms of entering into the congregation of Israel, i.e., to marry a Jewish woman?

⁷¹ Rabban Gamliel said to him: You are forbidden to enter into the congregation. Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: You are permitted to enter into the congregation. Rabban Gamliel said to Rabbi Yehoshua: Wasn't it already stated: "An Ammonite and a Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to the tenth generation shall none of them enter into the congregation of the Lord forever" (Deuteronomy 23:4)? How can you permit him to enter the congregation? Rabbi Yehoshua said to Rabban Gamliel: Do Ammon and Moab reside in their place? Sennacherib already came and, through his policy of population transfer, scrambled all the nations and settled other nations in place of Ammon. Consequently, the current residents of Ammon and Moab are not ethnic Ammonites and Moabites, as it is stated in reference to Sennacherib: "I have removed the bounds of the peoples, and have robbed their treasures, and have brought down as one mighty the inhabitants" (Isaiah 10:13). And although it is conceivable that this particular convert is an ethnic Ammonite, nevertheless, there is no need for concern due to the halakhic principle: Anything that parts from a group parts from the majority, and the assumption is that he is from the majority of nations whose members are permitted to enter the congregation.

⁷² Rabban Gamliel said to Rabbi Yehoshua: But wasn't it already stated: "But afterward I will bring back the captivity of the children of Ammon, says the Lord" (Jeremiah 49:6) and they have already returned to their land? Therefore, he is an ethnic Ammonite and he may not convert.

⁷³ Rabbi Yehoshua said to Rabban Gamliel: That is no proof. Wasn't it already stated in another prophecy: "And I will turn the captivity of My people Israel and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them" (Amos 9:14), and they have not yet returned? In rendering the ruling, only proven facts may be taken into consideration. They immediately permitted him to enter the congregation. This proves that Rabban Gamliel did not absent himself from the study hall that day and participated in the halakhic discourse.

⁷⁴ Rabban Gamliel said to himself: Since this is the situation, that the people are following Rabbi Yehoshua, apparently he was right. Therefore, it would be appropriate for me to go and appease Rabbi Yehoshua. When he reached Rabbi Yehoshua's house, he saw that the walls of his house were

black. Rabban Gamliel said to Rabbi Yehoshua in wonderment: From the walls of your house it is apparent that you are a blacksmith, as until then he had no idea that Rabbi Yehoshua was forced to engage in that arduous trade in order to make a living. Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: Woe unto a generation that you are its leader as you are unaware of the difficulties of Torah scholars, how they make a living and how they feed themselves.

⁷⁵ Rabban Gamliel said to him: I insulted you, forgive me. Rabbi Yehoshua paid him no attention and did not forgive him. He asked him again: Do it in deference to my father, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, who was one of the leaders of Israel at the time of the destruction of the Temple. He was appeased.

⁷⁶ Now that Rabbi Yehoshua was no longer offended, it was only natural that Rabban Gamliel would be restored to his position. They said: Who will go and inform the Sages? Apparently, they were not eager to carry out the mission that would undo the previous actions and remove Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya from his position as Nasi. This launderer said to them: I will go. Rabbi Yehoshua sent to the Sages to the study hall: The one who wears the uniform will continue to wear the uniform, the original Nasi will remain in his position so that the one who did not wear the uniform will not say to the one who wears the uniform, remove your uniform and I will wear it. Apparently, the Sages believed that this emissary was dispatched at the initiative of Rabban Gamliel and they ignored him. Rabbi Akiva said to the Sages: Lock the gates so that Rabban Gamliel's servants will not come and disturb the Sages.

⁷⁷ When he heard what happened, Rabbi Yehoshua said: It is best if I go to them. He came and knocked on the door. He said to them with a slight variation: One who sprinkles pure water on those who are ritually impure, son of one who sprinkles water shall continue to sprinkle water. And it is inappropriate that he who is neither one who sprinkles nor son of one who sprinkles will say to one who sprinkles son of one who sprinkles: Your water is cave water and not the running water required to purify one exposed to ritual impurity imparted by a corpse and your ashes are burnt ashes and not the ashes of a red heifer. Rabbi Akiva said to him: Rabbi Yehoshua, have you been appeased? Everything we did was to defend your honor. If you have forgiven him, none of us is opposed. Early tomorrow you and I will go to Rabban Gamliel's doorway and offer to restore him to his position as Nasi.

⁷⁸ The question arose what to do with Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya? They said: What shall we do? Remove him from his position. That is inappropriate as we learned a halakha through tradition: One elevates to a higher level of sanctity and does not downgrade. Therefore, one who was the Nasi of the Sanhedrin cannot be demoted. Let one Sage lecture one week and the other Sage one week, they will come to be jealous one of another, as they will be forced to appoint one as the acting head of the Sanhedrin. Rather, Rabban Gamliel will lecture three weeks and Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya will lecture as head of the yeshiva one week. That arrangement was adopted and that is the explanation of the exchange in tractate Hagiga: Whose week was it? It was the week of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya. One final detail: That student who asked the original question that sparked this entire incident was Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai.

⁷⁹ We learned in the mishna: And the additional prayer may be recited all day. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Nevertheless, one who postpones his prayer excessively is called negligent.

⁸⁰ The Rabbis taught in a baraita: If the obligation to recite two prayers was before him, one, the afternoon prayer and one, the additional prayer, he recites the afternoon prayer first and the additional prayer thereafter, because this, the afternoon prayer, is recited on a frequent basis, and this one, the additional prayer, is recited on a relatively infrequent basis. Rabbi Yehuda says: He recites the additional prayer first and the afternoon prayer thereafter, because this, the additional prayer, is a mitzva whose time soon elapses, as it may only be recited until the seventh hour and this, the afternoon prayer, is a mitzva whose time does not soon elapse as one may recite it until the midpoint of the afternoon. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The halakha is that he recites the afternoon prayer first and the additional prayer thereafter, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis.

⁸¹ The Gemara cites additional sources relating to this issue: When Rabbi Zeira would tire of his studies, he would go and sit in the doorway of Rabbi Natan bar Tovi's study hall. He said to himself: When the entering and exiting Sages pass, I will rise before them and be rewarded for the mitzva of honoring Torah scholars. Rabbi Natan bar Tovi himself emerged and came to where Rabbi Zeira was seated. Rabbi Zeira said to him: Who just stated a halakha in the study hall? Rabbi Natan bar Tovi said to him: Rabbi Yoḥanan just said as follows: The halakha is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda who said: He recites the additional prayer first and the afternoon prayer thereafter.

⁸² Rabbi Zeira said to him: Did Rabbi Yoḥanan himself say this halakha? Rabbi Natan said to him: Yes. He learned this statement from him forty times, etching it into his memory. Rabbi Natan said to him: Is this halakha so dear to you because it is singular for you, as it is the only halakha that you learned in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan, or is it new to you, as you were previously unaware of this ruling? Rabbi Zeira said to him: It is somewhat new to me, as I was uncertain whether this halakha was said in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan or in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. Now it is clear to me that this halakha is in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan.

⁸³ Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: With regard to anyone who recites the additional prayer after seven hours of the day, according to Rabbi Yehuda, the verse states: "Those who are destroyed [nugei] far from the Festivals, I shall gather from you, they who carried for you the burden of insult" (Zephaniah 3:18). From where may it be inferred that nugei is an expression of destruction? As Rav Yosef translated the verse into Aramaic: Destruction comes upon the enemies of the house of Israel, a euphemism for Israel itself, for they have delayed the times of the Festivals in Jerusalem. This proves both that nugei means destruction and that destruction comes upon those who fail to fulfill a mitzva at its appointed time.

⁸⁴ Similarly, Rabbi Elazar said: Regarding anyone who recites the morning prayer after four hours of the day, according to Rabbi Yehuda, the verse states: "Those who are in sorrow [nugei] far from the Festivals, I shall gather from you, they who carried for you the burden of insult" (Zephaniah 3:18). From where may it be inferred that nugei is an expression of sorrow? As it is written: "My soul drips in sorrow [tuga]" (Psalms 119:28). Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: The proof that nugei indicates suffering is from here: "Her virgins are sorrowed [nugot] and she is embittered" (Lamentations 1:4).

⁸⁵ After mentioning until when the additional prayer may be recited, the Gemara relates: Rav Avya was ill and did not come to Rav Yosef's Shabbat lecture. When Rav Avya came the following day, Abaye sought to placate Rav Yosef, and through a series of questions and answers sought to make clear to him that Rav Avya's failure to attend the lecture was not a display of contempt for Rav Yosef. To this end, he asked him: Why did the Master not attend the Shabbat lecture? Rav Avya said to him:

Because my heart was faint and I was unable to attend. Abaye said to him: Why did you not eat something and come? Rav Avya said to him: Does the Master not hold in accordance with that statement of Rav Huna? As Rav Huna said: A person may not taste anything before he recites the additional prayer. Abaye said to him: My Master should have recited the additional prayer individually, eaten something, and then come to the lecture. Rav Avya said to him: Does my Master not hold in accordance with that statement of Rabbi Yoḥanan: A person may not recite his individual prayer prior to the communal prayer? Abaye said to him: Was it not stated regarding this halakha, Rabbi Abba said: They taught this in a communal setting? In other words, only one who is part of a congregation is prohibited from praying alone prior to the prayer of the congregation. Even though Rav Avya was incorrect, the reason for his failure to attend the lecture was clarified through this discussion.

⁸⁶ And the Gemara summarizes: The halakha is neither in accordance with the statement of Rav Huna nor in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. The Gemara explains: It is not in accordance with the statement of Rav Huna, as we said above with regard to the prohibition to eat prior to the additional prayer. It is not in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, as Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Once the time to recite the afternoon prayer has arrived, a person may not taste anything before he recites the afternoon prayer.

⁸⁷ MISHNA: In addition to the halakhot relating to the fixed prayers, the Gemara relates: Rabbi Neḥunya ben Hakana would recite a brief prayer upon his entrance into the study hall and upon his exit. They said to him: The study hall is not a dangerous place that would warrant a prayer when entering and exiting, so what room is there for this prayer? He said to them: Upon my entrance, I pray that no mishap will transpire caused by me in the study hall. And upon my exit, I give thanks for my portion.

⁸⁸ GEMARA: The Sages taught in a baraita the complete formula of Rabbi Neḥunya ben Hakana's prayer: Upon his entrance, what does he say? May it be Your will, Lord my God, that no mishap in determining the halakha transpires caused by me, and that I not fail in any matter of halakha, and that my colleagues, who together with me engage in clarifying the halakha, will rejoice in me. He specified: And that I will neither declare pure that which is impure, nor declare impure that which is pure and that my colleagues will not fail in any matter of halakha, and that I will rejoice in them.

⁸⁹ Upon his exit, what did he say? I give thanks before You, Lord my God, that You have placed my lot among those who sit in the study hall, and that you have not given me my portion among those who sit idly on street corners. I rise early, and they rise early. I rise early to pursue matters of Torah, and they rise early to pursue frivolous matters. I toil and they toil. I toil and receive a reward, and they toil and do not receive a reward. I run and they run. I run to the life of the World-to-Come and they run to the pit of destruction.

⁹⁰ On a similar note, the Gemara recounts related stories with different approaches. The Sages taught: When Rabbi Eliezer fell ill, his students entered to visit him. They said to him: Teach us paths of life, guidelines by which to live, and we will thereby merit the life of the World-to-Come.

⁹¹ He said to them: Be vigilant in the honor of your counterparts, and prevent your children from logic when studying verses that tend toward heresy (ge'onim), and place your children, while they are still young, between the knees of Torah scholars, and when you pray, know before Whom you stand. For doing that, you will merit the life of the World-to-Come.

⁹² A similar story is told about Rabbi Eliezer's mentor, Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai: When Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Zakkai fell ill his students entered to visit him. When he saw them, he began to cry. His students said to him: Lamp of Israel, the right pillar, the mighty hammer, the man whose life's work is the foundation of the future of the Jewish people, for what reason are you crying? With a life as complete as yours, what is upsetting you?

⁹³ He said to them: I cry in fear of heavenly judgment, as the judgment of the heavenly court is unlike the judgment of man. If they were leading me before a flesh and blood king whose life is temporal, who is here today and dead in the grave tomorrow; if he is angry with me, his anger is not eternal and, consequently, his punishment is not eternal; if he incarcerates me, his incarceration is not an eternal incarceration, as I might maintain my hope that I would ultimately be freed. If he kills me, his killing is not for eternity, as there is life after any death that he might decree. Moreover, I am able to appease him with words and even bribe him with money, and even so I would cry when standing before royal judgment. Now that they are leading me before the supreme King of Kings, the Holy One, Blessed be He, Who lives and endures forever and all time; if He is angry with me, His anger is eternal; if He incarcerates me, His incarceration is an eternal incarceration; and if He kills me, His killing is for eternity. I am unable to appease Him with words and bribe him with money. Moreover, but I have two paths before me, one of the Garden of Eden and one of Gehenna, and I do not know on which they are leading me; and will I not cry?

⁹⁴ His students said to him: Our teacher, bless us. He said to them: May it be His will that the fear of Heaven shall be upon you like the fear of flesh and blood. His students were puzzled and said: To that point and not beyond? Shouldn't one fear God more? He said to them: Would that a person achieve that level of fear. Know that when one commits a transgression, he says to himself: I hope that no man will see me. If one is as concerned about avoiding shame before God as he is before man, he will never sin.

⁹⁵ The Gemara relates that at the time of his death, immediately beforehand, he said to them: Remove the vessels from the house and take them outside due to the ritual impurity that will be imparted by my corpse, which they would otherwise contract. And prepare a chair for Hezekiah, the King of Judea, who is coming from the upper world to accompany me.

⁹⁶ MISHNA: The mishna cites a dispute with regard to the obligation to recite the Amida prayer, also known as Shemoneh Esreh, the prayer of eighteen blessings, or simply as tefilla, prayer. Rabban Gamliel says: Each and every day a person recites the prayer of eighteen blessings. Rabbi Yehoshua says: A short prayer is sufficient, and one only recites an abridged version of the prayer of eighteen blessings. Rabbi Akiva says an intermediate opinion: If he is fluent in his prayer, he recites the prayer of eighteen blessings, and if not, he need only recite an abridged version of the prayer of eighteen blessings.

⁹⁷ Rabbi Eliezer says: One whose prayer is fixed, his prayer is not supplication and is flawed. The Gemara will clarify the halakhic implications of this flaw.

⁹⁸ Rabbi Yehoshua says: One who cannot recite a complete prayer because he is walking in a place of danger, recites a brief prayer and says: Redeem, Lord, Your people, the remnant of Israel, at every transition [parashat ha'ibur], the meaning of which will be discussed in the Gemara. May their needs be before You. Blessed are You, Lord, Who listens to prayer.

⁹⁹ While praying, one must face toward the direction of the Holy Temple. One who was riding on a donkey should dismount and pray calmly. If he is unable to dismount, he should turn his face toward the direction of the Temple. If he is unable to turn his face, it is sufficient that he focus his heart opposite the Holy of Holies. Similarly, one who was traveling in a ship or on a raft [asda] and is unable to turn and face in the direction of Jerusalem, should focus his heart opposite the Holy of Holies.

¹⁰⁰ GEMARA: Since the mishna deals with the fundamental obligation to recite the Amida prayer, the Gemara seeks to resolve fundamental problems pertaining to this prayer. Corresponding to what were these eighteen blessings instituted? When the Shemoneh Esreh was instituted by the Sages, on what did they base the number of blessings?

¹⁰¹ Rabbi Hillel, son of Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani, said: Corresponding to the eighteen mentions of God's name that King David said in the psalm: "Give unto the Lord, O you sons of might" (Psalms 29). Rav Yosef said: Corresponding to the eighteen mentions of God's name in Shema. Rabbi Tanḥum said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Corresponding to the eighteen vertebrae in the spine beneath the ribs.

¹⁰² Since Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi's opinion based the Amida prayer on the spinal vertebrae, the Gemara cites another statement of his that connects the two: Rabbi Tanḥum said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: In those blessings where one is required to bow, one who prays must bow until all the vertebrae in the spine protrude.

¹⁰³ Establishing a different indicator to determine when he has bowed sufficiently, Ulla said: Until he can see a small coin [issar], on the ground before him opposite his heart (Rav Hai Gaon). Rabbi Ḥanina said: There is room for leniency; once he moves his head forward, he need not bow any further. Rava said: But that applies only if he is exerting himself when doing so, and he appears like one who is bowing. However, if he is able, he should bow further.

¹⁰⁴ Until now, the prayer of eighteen blessings has been discussed as if it was axiomatic. The Gemara wonders: Are these eighteen blessings? They are nineteen.

¹⁰⁵ Rabbi Levi said: The blessing of the heretics, which curses informers, was instituted in Yavne and is not included in the original tally of blessings. Nevertheless, since the number of blessings corresponds to various allusions, the Gemara attempts to clarify: Corresponding to what was this nineteenth blessing instituted?

¹⁰⁶ Rabbi Levi said: According to Rabbi Hillel, son of Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani, who said that the eighteen blessings correspond to the eighteen mentions of God's name that King David said in the psalm, the nineteenth blessing corresponds to a reference to God in that psalm, where a name other than the tetragrammaton was used: "The God of glory thunders" (Psalms 29:3). According to Rav Yosef, who said that the eighteen blessings correspond to the eighteen mentions of God's name in Shema, the additional blessing corresponds to the word one that is in Shema. Although it is not the tetragrammaton, it expresses the essence of faith in God. According to what Rabbi Tanḥum said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said, that the eighteen blessings correspond to the eighteen vertebrae in the spine, the additional blessing corresponds to the small vertebra that is at the bottom of the spine.

¹⁰⁷ In light of the previous mention of the blessing of the heretics, the Gemara explains how this blessing was instituted: The Sages taught: Shimon HaPakuli arranged the eighteen blessings, already

extant during the period of the Great Assembly, before Rabban Gamliel, the Nasi of the Sanhedrin, in order in Yavne. Due to prevailing circumstances, there was a need to institute a new blessing directed against the heretics. Rabban Gamliel said to the Sages: Is there any person who knows to institute the blessing of the heretics, a blessing directed against the Sadducees? Shmuel HaKatan, who was one of the most pious men of that generation, stood and instituted it.

¹⁰⁸ The Gemara relates: The next year, when Shmuel HaKatan served as the prayer leader, he forgot that blessing,

¹⁰⁹ and scrutinized it, in an attempt to remember the blessing for two or three hours, and they did not remove him from serving as prayer leader.

¹¹⁰ The Gemara asks: Why did they not remove him? Didn't Rav Yehuda say that Rav said: One who was serving as the prayer leader before the congregation and erred in reciting any of the blessings, they do not remove him from serving as the prayer leader. However, one who erred while reciting the blessing of the heretics they remove him, as we suspect that perhaps he is a heretic and intentionally omitted the blessing to avoid cursing himself. Why, then, did they not remove Shmuel HaKatan?

¹¹¹ The Gemara answers: Shmuel HaKatan is different because he instituted this blessing and there is no suspicion of him.

¹¹² The Gemara continues: Let us suspect that perhaps he reconsidered and, although he had been righteous, he had a change of heart? Abaye said: We learned through tradition that a good person does not become wicked.

¹¹³ The Gemara challenges this: And does he not become wicked? Isn't it explicitly written: "And when the righteous one returns from his righteousness and does wicked like all of the abominations that the wicked one has done, will he live? All of the righteous deeds that he has done will not be remembered given the treachery that he has carried out, and in his sin that he has transgressed, for these he shall die" (Ezekiel 18:24)? Abaye responds: That verse refers to a righteous individual who was initially wicked and repented, but ultimately returned to his evil ways. However, one who is initially righteous does not become wicked.

¹¹⁴ The Gemara asks: And does he not become wicked? Didn't we learn in a mishna: Do not be sure of yourself until the day you die, as Yoḥanan the High Priest served in the High Priesthood for eighty years and ultimately became a Sadducee. Even one who is outstanding in his righteousness can become a heretic.

¹¹⁵ Abaye responded: He is Yannai he is Yoḥanan. In other words, from its inception, the entire Hasmonean dynasty had the same positive attitude toward the Sadducees, and there was no distinction between Yoḥanan Hyrcanus and Alexander Yannai. Yoḥanan the High Priest had Sadducee leanings from the outset. Rava said: Yannai is distinct and Yoḥanan is distinct. They did not share the same position in this regard. Yannai was wicked from the outset and Yoḥanan was righteous from the outset. If so, it works out well according to Abaye's opinion; however, according to Rava's opinion, it is difficult. How could Yoḥanan, a righteous individual, have changed and turned wicked?

¹¹⁶ The Gemara responds: Rava could have said to you: There is also room for concern that one who is righteous from the outset will perhaps reconsider and turn wicked, as was the case with Yoḥanan the High Priest. If so, the original question is difficult: Why did they not remove Shmuel HaKatan from serving as the prayer leader?

¹¹⁷ The Gemara answers: The case of Shmuel HaKatan is different, as he began reciting the blessing of the heretics and while reciting it he became confused and forgot the end of the blessing. Consequently, he was not suspected of heretical leanings. Indeed, Rav Yehuda said that Rav, and some say that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, said: They only taught that one who errs while reciting the blessing of the heretics is removed in a case where he did not begin reciting it. But if he began reciting it, then we allow him to collect his thoughts and finish reciting it.

¹¹⁸ To this point, the Gemara discussed allusions to the nineteen blessings that constitute the weekday Amida prayer. The Gemara asks: Corresponding to what were these seven blessings of the Shabbat Amida prayer instituted? The Gemara answers: Rabbi Halafta ben Shaul said: Corresponding to the seven “voices” which David mentioned on the waters; in other words, the seven times that “the voice of God” is mentioned in Psalms 29, which served as the source for the weekday prayer.

¹¹⁹ The Gemara asks further: Corresponding to what were these nine blessings of the Rosh HaShana additional prayer instituted? Rabbi Yitzhak of Kartagnin said: They correspond to the nine mentions of God’s name that Hannah said in her prayer (I Samuel 2:10). The connection between Hannah’s prayer and Rosh HaShana is based on what the Master said: On Rosh HaShana, Sarah, Rachel, and Hannah were remembered and the divine decree that they would conceive their sons was issued.

¹²⁰ The Gemara continues: Corresponding to what were these twenty-four blessings of the Amida prayer of the fast days instituted? Rabbi Helbo said: They correspond to the twenty-four “songs” that Solomon said when he brought the ark into the Holy of Holies during the dedication of the Temple, as there are twenty-four expressions of song, prayer, and supplication there (I Kings 8). The Gemara asks: If so, then let us say these twenty-four blessing every day. The Gemara answers: When did Solomon say them? On a day of supplication for mercy. We, too, say them on a day of supplication for mercy.

¹²¹ We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehoshua says that each day one recites an abridged version of the prayer of eighteen blessings. The Gemara asks: What is the abridged version of the prayer of eighteen blessings? There are different opinions. Rav said: One recites an abridged version of each and every blessing. Shmuel said: An abridged version of the prayer of eighteen blessings refers to a blessing composed specifically to be recited in place of the thirteen middle blessings. It contains references to each of the thirteen middle blessings. The formula for that blessing is: Grant us understanding, Lord our God, to know Your ways, and sensitize our hearts so that we may revere You, and forgive us so that we may be redeemed, and keep us far from our suffering, and satisfy us with the pastures of Your land, and gather our scattered people from the four corners of the earth, and those who go astray shall be judged according to Your will, and raise Your hand against the wicked, and may the righteous rejoice in the rebuilding of Your city, and the restoration of Your Sanctuary, and in the flourishing of Your servant David, and in establishing a light for Your Messiah, son of Yishai. Before we call, may You answer. Blessed are You, Lord, Who listens to prayer.”

¹²² Although Shmuel mentioned this abridged prayer, Abaye would curse anyone who recited the prayer: Grant us understanding, as he held that one may recite it only in exigent circumstances (Rabbi Hananel, Me’iri).

¹²³ The Gemara further restricts the occasions when one may recite the abridged prayer. Rav Nahman said that Shmuel said: One may recite: Grant us understanding throughout the entire year,

except for in the evening prayer at the conclusion of Shabbat and at the conclusion of Festivals, because he must recite the prayer of distinction [havdala] in the blessing: Who graciously grants knowledge.

¹²⁴ Rabba bar Shmuel strongly objects to this: After reciting the three initial blessings, let us say havdala as an independent fourth blessing, and afterwards recite the prayer of Grant us understanding. This is feasible. Didn't we learn in a mishna that Rabbi Akiva says: He says havdala as an independent fourth blessing? Rabbi Eliezer says: He says havdala in the blessing of thanksgiving.

¹²⁵ The Gemara responds: Do we practice in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva throughout the entire year regarding this issue, that we will also practice this way now? Throughout the entire year, what is the reason that we do not practice in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva? Because they instituted eighteen blessings, they did not institute nineteen. Here too, they instituted seven blessings, they did not institute eight. Therefore, the possibility to recite havdala as an independent fourth blessing is rejected.

¹²⁶ Mar Zutra strongly objects to this: Let us include havdala in the framework of the abridged blessing: Grant us understanding, Lord our God, Who distinguishes between sacred and profane. No response was offered to this objection, and it remains difficult.

¹²⁷ Rav Beivai bar Abaye said: There is an additional restriction that applies to the abridged prayer. One may recite Grant us understanding throughout the entire year, except during the rainy season, because he must recite the request for rain in the blessing of the years. Mar Zutra strongly objects to this: Let us include the request for rain in the framework of the abridged blessing: And satisfy us with the pastures of Your land, and grant dew and rain.

¹²⁸ The Gemara responds: That is unfeasible, as he will become confused by introducing a new element to the standard formula of the blessing. The Gemara asks: If so, by introducing havdala in the framework of the abridged blessing in the section alluding to the blessing, Who graciously grants knowledge, he will also become confused. Why did the Gemara fail to respond to Mar Zutra's strong objection with regard to havdala in that manner?

¹²⁹ The Gemara answers: They say that these cases are different: There, regarding havdala, since the introduction of the new element comes at the beginning of the prayer, he will not become confused. Here, since the request for rain comes in the middle of the prayer, he will become confused.

¹³⁰ Rav Ashi strongly objects to this: If so, let us say the request for rain in the framework of the abridged blessing in the section alluding to the blessing Who listens to prayer. As Rabbi Tanḥum said that Rav Asi said: One who erred and did not mention the might of the rains in the blessing on the revival of the dead, we require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it. However, one who erred and failed to recite the request for rain in the ninth blessing of the Amida, the blessing of the years, we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it because he can recite it in the blessing Who listens to prayer. And one who erred and failed to recite havdala in the blessing Who graciously grants knowledge, we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, as he can recite havdala over the cup of wine. One can ask for rain in the blessing Who listens to prayer, and, consequently, can introduce it at the end of the abridged blessing without becoming confused. The Gemara responds: One who erred is different, and only then does he

have the option to ask for rain in the blessing Who listens to prayer. Ab initio, the request for rain may not be inserted there.

¹³¹ The statement that Rabbi Tanḥum said that Rav Asi said was incidental to the previous discussion. The Gemara attempts to understand the matter itself. Rabbi Tanḥum said that Rav Asi said: One who erred and did not mention the might of the rains in the blessing on the revival of the dead, we require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it. However, one who erred and failed to recite the request for rain in the blessing of the years, we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it because he can recite it in the blessing Who listens to prayer. And one who erred and failed to recite havdala in the blessing Who graciously grants knowledge, we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, as he can recite havdala over the cup of wine.

¹³² The Gemara raised an objection based on what was taught in the Tosefta: One who erred and did not mention the might of the rains in the blessing on the revival of the dead, we require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it. One who erred and failed to recite the request for rain in the blessing of the years, we require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it. However, one who erred and failed to recite havdala in the blessing Who graciously grants knowledge, we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, as he can recite havdala over the cup of wine. The Tosefta contradicts the statement of Rabbi Tanḥum with regard to one who erred and failed to recite the request for rain in the blessing of the years.

¹³³ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult. This case, where we require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, refers to a situation where he is praying as an individual. While that case, where we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, refers to a situation where he is praying as part of a congregation.

¹³⁴ The Gemara raises a difficulty: When praying as part of a congregation, what is the reason that he need not return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it? Because he can fulfill his obligation when he hears it from the communal prayer leader in the repetition of the Amida prayer. If so, Rabbi Tanḥum's formulation is imprecise. That which he said that he need not return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it because he can recite it in the blessing: Who listens to prayer, should have been: Because he hears it from the communal prayer leader. This proves that the attempt to rebuff the challenge from the Tosefta to Rabbi Tanḥum was incorrect.

¹³⁵ Rather, both this statement of Rabbi Tanḥum and that statement in the Tosefta refer to one praying as an individual, and it is, nevertheless, not difficult. This case, where we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, refers to a case where he recalls his error before he reaches the blessing: Who listens to prayer, in which case he can ask for rain in that blessing.

¹³⁶ This case, where we require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, refers to a situation where he recalls his error after he reaches the blessing: Who listens to prayer, in which case the option of asking for rain in that blessing no longer exists and he must return to the beginning of the prayer.

¹³⁷ On a similar note, the Gemara cites an additional statement of Rabbi Tanḥum. Rabbi Tanḥum said that Rav Asi said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One who erred and did not mention the New Moon, the addition: May there rise and come [ya'aleh veyavo] in the blessing of Temple service, the seventeenth blessing in the Amida prayer, he returns to the blessing of Temple service. So too, if he

remembers during the blessing of thanksgiving, he returns to the blessing of Temple service. If he remembers in the blessing: Grant peace, he returns to the blessing of Temple service. If he remembers after he completed the Amida prayer, he returns to the beginning of the prayer.

¹³⁸ Rav Pappa son of Rav Aḥa bar Adda said: That which we said that if he already finished the Amida prayer he returns to the beginning, we only said that in a case where he already moved his feet from where he stood in prayer. However, if he did not yet move his feet, he need only return to the blessing of Temple service, and include the addition for the New Moon therein.

¹³⁹ He said to him: From where do you derive this halakha? He said to him: My father my teacher told it to me and my father my teacher heard it from Rav.

¹⁴⁰ On a similar note, Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: That which we said that if he already moved his feet he returns to the beginning, we only said that in a case where he is unaccustomed to reciting additional supplications after his prayer. However, if he is accustomed to reciting supplications after his prayer, and while reciting them he remembers that he omitted mention of the New Moon from his prayer, he need only return to the blessing of Temple service, and he includes the addition for the New Moon therein.

¹⁴¹ Some say, Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: That which we said that if he did not yet move his feet, he need only return to the blessing of Temple service, we only said that in a case where he is accustomed to reciting additional supplications after his prayer. However, if he is unaccustomed to reciting supplications after his prayer, he must return to the beginning of the prayer, as it is considered as if he already completed it.

¹⁴² We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Eliezer says: One whose prayer is fixed, his prayer is not supplication. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of fixed in this context? Rabbi Ya'akov bar Idi said that Rabbi Oshaya said: It means anyone for whom his prayer is like a burden upon him, from which he seeks to be quickly unburdened. The Rabbis say: This refers to anyone who does not recite prayer in the language of supplication, but as a standardized recitation without emotion. Rabba and Rav Yosef both said: It refers to anyone unable to introduce a novel element, i.e., something personal reflecting his personal needs, to his prayer, and only recites the standard formula.

¹⁴³ Rabbi Zeira said: I could introduce a novel element in every prayer, but I am afraid that perhaps I will become confused. Consequently, there is no room to require the masses to introduce a novel element into their prayers.

¹⁴⁴ The brothers, Abaye bar Avin and Rabbi Ḥanina bar Avin, both said: One whose prayer is fixed refers to anyone who does not make the effort to pray with the reddening of the sun, just after sunrise and just before sunset, which are auspicious times for prayer. As Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: It is a mitzva to pray with the reddening of the sun. And Rabbi Zeira said: What is the verse that alludes to this? "Let them fear You with the sun and before the moon, generation after generation" (Psalms 72:5). Prayer, the manifestation of the fear of God, should be undertaken adjacent to sunrise and sunset. Nevertheless, in the West, Eretz Yisrael, they cursed one who prays with the reddening of the sun, adjacent to sunset. What is the reason? Perhaps, due to preoccupation, he will become confused about the hour and the time for prayer will pass.

¹⁴⁵ We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehoshua says: One who is walking in a place of danger, recites a brief prayer...at parashat ha'ibur. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of parashat

ha'ibur? Rav H̥isda said that Mar Ukva said: This can be interpreted in a manner underscoring two connotations of the term ibur: Even at a time when You are as filled with anger [evra], towards them, as a pregnant woman [ubara], may all of their needs be before You. Some say a different version of what Rav H̥isda said that Mar Ukva said: Even when they violate [ovrim] the commandments of the Torah, may all of their needs be before You.

¹⁴⁶ One formula for the prayer recited in places of danger is cited in the mishna. Additional formulas are cited in the Tosefta. The Sages taught: One who walks in a place where there are groups of wild beasts and robbers recites an abbreviated prayer. Which is an abbreviated prayer? Rabbi Eliezer says, "Carry out Your will in the heavens above, and give peace of mind to those who fear You below, and perform that which is good in Your eyes. Blessed are You, Lord, Who listens to prayer."

¹⁴⁷ Rabbi Yehoshua says that he recites: Hear the cry of Your nation, Israel, and quickly fulfill their request. Blessed are You, Lord, Who listens to prayer.

¹⁴⁸ Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Tzadok says that he recites: Hear the shout of Your nation, Israel, and quickly fulfill their request. Blessed are You, Lord, Who listens to prayer.

¹⁴⁹ Aḥerim say that he recites: The needs of Your nation, Israel, are many and their intelligence is limited, and, consequently, they are unable to effectively articulate their thoughts in prayer (Maharsha). So may it be Your will, Lord our God, to provide each and every one with his necessary sustenance, and to each and every body all that it lacks. Blessed are You, Lord, Who listens to prayer.

¹⁵⁰ Rav Huna said: The halakha with regard to the version of the prayer recited in a place of danger is in accordance with the opinion of Aḥerim.

¹⁵¹ On the topic of prayers recited while traveling and in times of danger, the Gemara discusses the traveler's prayer. When he appeared to him, Elijah the Prophet said to Rav Yehuda brother of Rav Sala Ḥasida: Do not get angry and you will not sin. Do not get drunk and you will not sin. And when you set out on a journey, consult with your Creator, and then set out. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of: Consult with your Creator, and then set out? Rabbi Ya'akov said that Rav H̥isda said: That is the traveler's prayer. And Rabbi Ya'akov said that Rav H̥isda said: It is not only good advice, but established halakha that anyone who sets out on a journey must recite the traveler's prayer prior to embarking on his journey.

¹⁵² The Gemara asks: What is the formula for the traveler's prayer? The Gemara answers: May it be Your will, Lord my God, to lead me to peace, direct my steps to peace, and guide me to peace, and rescue me from the hands of any enemy or ambush along the way, and send blessing to the work of my hands, and let me find grace, kindness, and compassion in Your eyes and in the eyes of all who see me. Blessed are You, Lord, Who hears prayer.

¹⁵³ Abaye said: At all times

¹⁵⁴ a person should associate himself with the congregation and should not pray for himself alone. How should he say it? May it be Your will, Lord our God, that You lead us to peace, etc., in the plural.

¹⁵⁵ The Gemara discusses specific details pertaining to this prayer. When does one pray? Rabbi Ya'akov said that Rav H̥isda said: From when one sets out on his journey, and not before. How long must one's planned journey be in order to require him to recite this prayer (Ba'al Halakhot Gedolot)?

Rabbi Ya'akov said that Rav H̥isda said: At least a parasang. How does he recite this prayer? Rav H̥isda said: Only while standing in one place. Rav Sheshet said: Even walking or sitting.

¹⁵⁶ The Gemara relates: Rav H̥isda and Rav Sheshet were walking along the path, Rav H̥isda stood and recited the traveler's prayer. Since he was blind and did not see his colleague, Rav Sheshet asked his servant: What is Rav H̥isda doing now? His servant said to him: He is standing and praying. Rav Sheshet said to his servant: Stand me up as well and I will pray. Even though Rav Sheshet held that there is no need to stand during this prayer, nevertheless: From being good, do not be called wicked. In other words, one should do better if he is able. Rav Sheshet said that one is not required to stop and stand. He did not say that it is preferable to walk or sit. Since standing in this case required no special effort on his part, as Rav H̥isda had stopped to stand and pray anyway, why insist on sitting?

¹⁵⁷ The mishna mentioned both a brief prayer recited in times of danger and an abridged prayer, with regard to which there was a dispute between the tanna'im. The Gemara asks: What is the practical halakhic difference between the abridged prayer: Grant us understanding and the brief prayer recited in times of danger? The Gemara answers: One who recites: Grant us understanding is required to recite the first three blessings and the last three blessings of the Amida prayer, and when he reaches his home, he need not pray again. One who recites the brief prayer, however, need recite neither the first three blessings nor the last three blessings of the Amida prayer. However, when he reaches his home, he must pray again. Grant us understanding has the legal status of the Amida prayer, despite its brevity, while the brief prayer is merely recited in place of the Amida prayer in exigent circumstances.

¹⁵⁸ The halakha is: Grant us understanding, as mentioned above, has the legal status of the Amida prayer, and must therefore be recited while standing. The brief prayer, since it does not have that status, may be recited whether one is standing or whether one is walking.

¹⁵⁹ We learned in the mishna: One who was riding on a donkey should dismount and pray. Only in exigent circumstances may he pray while riding, focusing his heart toward Jerusalem and the Holy of Holies. The Sages taught in a Tosefta: One who was riding on a donkey and the time for prayer arrived, if he has someone to hold onto the donkey, he should dismount and pray. If not, he should sit in his place atop the donkey and pray. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: In any case, whether or not there is someone to hold onto the donkey, he should sit in his place atop the donkey and pray, as his mind will not be calm. Since he is hurrying to arrive at his destination, the need to dismount the donkey, stand in prayer, and remount the donkey would delay his journey, and the delay is likely to interfere with his concentration during prayer.

¹⁶⁰ Rava, and some say Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, said: The halakha here is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi.

¹⁶¹ The Sages taught in a Tosefta: A blind person and one who is unable to approximate the directions and, therefore, is unable to face Jerusalem in order to pray, may focus his heart towards his Father in Heaven, as it is stated: "And they shall pray to the Lord" (I Kings 8:44).

¹⁶² One who was standing in prayer in the Diaspora should focus his heart toward Eretz Yisrael, as it is stated: "And they shall pray to You by way of their land which You have given to their fathers" (I Kings 8:48). One who was standing in Eretz Yisrael should focus his heart toward Jerusalem, as it is stated: "And they shall pray to the Lord by way of the city that You have chosen" (I Kings 8:44). One who was standing in Jerusalem should focus his heart toward the Temple, as it is stated: "And they

shall pray toward this house” (II Chronicles 6:32). One who was standing in the Temple should focus his heart toward the Holy of Holies, as it is stated: “And they shall pray toward this place” (I Kings 8:35). One who was standing in the Holy of Holies should focus his heart toward the seat of the ark-cover [kapporet], atop the ark, the dwelling place of God’s glory. One who was standing behind the seat of the ark-cover should visualize himself as if standing before the ark-cover and turn toward it. Consequently, one standing in prayer in the East turns to face west, and one standing in the West turns to face east. One standing in the South turns to face north, and one standing in the North turns to face south; Consequently, all of the people of Israel focus themselves focusing their hearts toward one place, the Holy of Holies in the Temple.

¹⁶³ An allusion to this is found in what Rabbi Avin, and some say Rabbi Avina, said: What verse alludes to this? “Your neck is like the Tower of David, built with turrets [talpiyyot], one thousand shields hang from it, all of the armor of the mighty” (Song of Songs 4:4). He interprets the word talpiyyot as the hill [tel] toward which all mouths [piyyot] turn, i.e., the Temple Mount.

¹⁶⁴ With regard to prayer while traveling, the Gemara relates: When Shmuel’s father and Levi wanted to set out on a journey in the morning, they would pray early before sunrise. When, during their journey, the time to recite Shema would arrive, they recited it.

¹⁶⁵ The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion did they do this? In accordance with this tanna, as it was taught in the Tosefta: One who rose early to set out on his path before the time to recite Shema arrives, they bring him a shofar and he sounds it, if it was Rosh HaShana; a lulav and he takes it on Sukkot; a megilla, the Scroll of Esther, and he reads it on Purim; and when the time comes to recite Shema, he recites it. So too, one who rose early to sit in a wagon or in a boat prays, and when the time comes to recite Shema, he recites it.

¹⁶⁶ Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar, says: In either case, it is preferable to recite Shema and then pray the Amida prayer in the wagon so that he will juxtapose redemption and prayer.

¹⁶⁷ The Gemara explains: Regarding what do they disagree? The Gemara answers: This Sage, the first tanna, holds that prayer while standing is preferable. Therefore, one should pray earlier, at home, while standing. This Sage, Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar, holds that the juxtaposition of redemption and prayer is preferable, even if in doing so one is unable to stand while praying.

¹⁶⁸ On a similar note, the Gemara cites additional circumstances where Sages were forced to make exceptional arrangements to pray. Mareimar and Mar Zutra would gather ten people on the Shabbat of the festival and pray, and set out to deliver their lecture [pirka]. Due to the crowds that gathered to hear the lectures of the Sages on the festival, they were unable to pray at the proper time, so they were forced to pray earlier.

¹⁶⁹ In similar circumstances, Rav Ashi would pray with the congregation individually while seated, so that they would not notice that he was praying. Afterwards, when he would come to his house, he would pray again while standing in order to pray without distraction. The Sages said to him: The Master should do as Mareimar and Mar Zutra do, i.e., gather a prayer quorum at home to pray before the lecture. He said to them: It is burdensome to me to delay the lecture so much. The Sages said to him: The Master should do as Shmuel’s father and Levi did and pray before sunrise. He said to them: I have not seen Sages older than us do that, indicating that this is not the accepted halakha.

¹⁷⁰ MISHNA: Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya says: The additional prayer is only recited in a city where there is a quorum of ten [ḥever ir]. The Rabbis say: One may recite the additional prayer with a ḥever ir or without a ḥever ir. Rabbi Yehuda says another opinion in his name, the name of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya: Any place where there is a ḥever ir, an individual is completely exempt from reciting the additional prayer.

¹⁷¹ GEMARA: There is no apparent difference between the opinion of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya and the opinion cited in his name by Rabbi Yehuda. The Gemara asks: Rabbi Yehuda's opinion is identical to the opinion of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya cited by the first tanna. The Gemara answers: There is a practical halakhic difference between them: The case of an individual who is not in a place where there is a ḥever ir. In other words, in a place where there is not a prayer quorum of ten people, the first tanna holds that Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya's opinion is that the individual is exempt from reciting the additional prayer, as it was only instituted to be recited with a quorum. And Rabbi Yehuda holds that Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya's opinion is that the individual is obligated to recite the additional prayer, as he is only exempt in a place where there is a prayer quorum, and, therefore, a communal prayer leader fulfills his obligation.

¹⁷² Rav Huna bar Ḥinnana said that Ḥiyya bar Rav said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who said it in the name of his mentor, Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya. Rav Ḥiyya bar Avin said to him: You have spoken well, as proven by what Shmuel said: In all my days I have never prayed the additional prayer as an individual

¹⁷³ in Neharde'a, where there is always a prayer quorum, except for the day when the king's army [pulmusa] came to the city, and the Sages were preoccupied and did not pray communally, and I prayed as an individual, and I was an individual who was not praying in a prayer quorum. Shmuel's conduct was in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda in this matter.

¹⁷⁴ Yet this opinion was not universally accepted. The Gemara relates: Rabbi Ḥanina Kara, the Bible expert, sat before Rabbi Yannai, and he sat and he said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda who said it in the name of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya. Rabbi Yannai said to him: Go and read your verses outside, as that halakha is not accepted by the Sages in the study hall, and it belongs outside, as the halakha is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda who said it in the name of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya.

¹⁷⁵ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: I saw Rabbi Yannai, who prayed and then prayed again. Presumably, his first prayer was the morning prayer and his second prayer was the additional prayer. Apparently, he does not hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya. Rather, he holds that even when not part of a prayer quorum, an individual must recite the additional prayer. Later on, when this story was related in the study hall, Rabbi Yirmeya said to his teacher, Rabbi Zeira: What proof is there that the second prayer was the additional prayer? Perhaps initially he did not focus his mind on his prayer and ultimately he focused his mind, i.e., he repeated the morning prayer in order to do so with proper concentration. Rabbi Zeira said to him: Look at who the great man is who is testifying about him. Rabbi Yoḥanan certainly observed carefully before relating what he witnessed.

¹⁷⁶ Regarding prayers of the Sages, the Gemara further relates that, although there were thirteen synagogues in Tiberias, Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi would only pray between the columns where they studied, as prayer is beloved in the eyes of God, specifically in a place of Torah.

¹⁷⁷ It was stated: Rav Yitzḥak bar Avdimi in the name of Rabbeinu, Rav, said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda who said it in the name of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya. The Gemara relates: Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba prayed and then prayed again. Rav Zeira said to him: Why did the Master do this? If you say because the Master did not focus his mind the first time, didn't Rabbi Eliezer say: One must always evaluate himself before he prays? If he is able to focus his heart on prayer, he should pray, but if not, if he is unable to do so, he should not pray. Apparently, that was not the reason that he prayed twice. Rather, because my Master did not mention the New Moon in his prayer, so he prayed again.

¹⁷⁸ The Gemara asks: Wasn't it taught in a baraita: One who erred and did not mention the New Moon in the evening prayer, we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, because he can recite it in the morning prayer. One who erred and did not mention the New Moon in the morning prayer, we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, because he can recite it in the additional prayer. One who erred and did not mention the New Moon in the additional prayer, we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, because he can recite it in the afternoon prayer? Omitting mention of the New Moon does not require one to repeat the Amida prayer. Consequently, that was not the reason that Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba prayed a second time.

¹⁷⁹ Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said to him: Wasn't it stated about that baraita that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: They taught this baraita specifically with regard to prayer in a communal framework? However, an individual who fails to mention the New Moon is required to pray again? That is why Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba prayed twice.

¹⁸⁰ Stemming from the discussion about individuals who recite two prayers consecutively, the Gemara asks: How long should one wait between the first prayer and the second prayer? Rav Huna and Rav Ḥisda agreed about this in principle, but they formulated their opinions differently (Rashi). One said that an individual must wait long enough so that his mind will be in a pleading mode [tiṭḥonen], enabling him to recite the second prayer as a plea. One of them said: Long enough so that his mind will be in a beseeching mode [tiṭḥolel], enabling him to beseech God in his second prayer.

¹⁸¹ The Gemara points out that both Rav Huna and Rav Ḥisda based their positions on the prayers of Moses. The one who said: So that his mind will be in a pleading mode [tiṭḥonen], as it is written: "And I pleaded [va'ethanan] before the Lord" (Deuteronomy 3:23). And the one who said: So that his mind will be in a beseeching mode [tiṭḥolel] as it is written: "And Moses besought [vayeḥal] the Lord" (Exodus 32:11).

¹⁸² The Gemara resumes the above discussion with regard to omission of the mention of the New Moon in the Amida prayer. Rav Anan said that Rav said: One who erred and did not mention the New Moon in the evening prayer, we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, because the court only sanctifies the new month by day, and the prayer of the New Moon, which parallels the court's sanctification of the new month, belongs in the daytime prayer.

¹⁸³ Ameimar said: Rav's statement is reasonable in a full month, i.e., a month in which there are two potential days of the New Moon, the thirtieth day of the previous month and the first day of the new month. If one neglected to mention the New Moon on the night of the thirtieth, we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, because he can mention it the next night, which is the night of the first of the new month, which is the primary day of the New Moon. But in a short

month of twenty-nine days, followed by one day of the New Moon, we require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, even in the evening prayer.

¹⁸⁴ Rav Ashi said to Ameimar: Since Rav states a reason for his statement, what difference is there to me if the month is short, and what difference is there to me if it is full? Rather, there is no difference. Rav based his opinion on the parallel drawn between the sanctification of the month and the mention of the New Moon in the Amida prayer; the sanctification of the month is not relevant at night.

Chapter 5

¹ MISHNA: One may only stand and begin to pray from an approach of gravity and submission. There is a tradition that the early generations of pious men would wait one hour, in order to reach the solemn frame of mind appropriate for prayer, and then pray, so that they would focus their hearts toward their Father in Heaven. Standing in prayer is standing before God and, as such, even if the king greets him, he should not respond to him; and even if a snake is wrapped on his heel, he should not interrupt his prayer.

² GEMARA: We learned in the mishna that prayer should be undertaken in an atmosphere of gravity. The Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived? Rabbi Elazar said: They are derived from the verses describing the prayer of Hannah, mother of Samuel, as the verse states: “And she felt bitterness of soul, and she prayed to the Lord and she wept and wept” (I Samuel 1:10).

³ The Gemara rejects this proof: From what does that conclusion ensue? Perhaps Hannah is different, as her heart was extremely embittered, her prayer was embittered as well. This does not prove that everyone must pray in that frame of mind.

⁴ Rather, Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said, it can be proved from here, as David said: “But as for me, by Your abundant loving-kindness I will enter Your house, at Your Holy Temple I will bow in reverence for You” (Psalms 5:8). Entering into prayer like entering the Holy Temple must be performed reverentially.

⁵ The Gemara rejects this proof as well: From what does that conclusion ensue? Perhaps David is different, as he would excessively afflict himself in prayer in order to atone for his transgression with Bathsheba. Consequently, his cannot serve as a paradigm for proper conduct in prayer. Rather, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said, it can be derived from here, from this verse that David said, not about his own worship, but about worship of God in general: “Give, unto the Lord, the honor of His name, bow to the Lord in the beauty of holiness [behadrat kodesh]” (Psalms 29:2). Do not read: In the beauty of [behadrat] holiness. Rather read: In trembling of [beherdat] holiness; one must enter into prayer from an atmosphere of gravity engendered by sanctity.

⁶ The Gemara rejects this too: From what does that conclusion ensue? Perhaps, actually I would say to you that it should be read as it is written: Specifically, “in the beauty,” and it means that one should pray in beautiful clothing, as in the case of Rav Yehuda who would adorn himself and then pray. Rav Yehuda believed that one who comes before the King must wear his most beautiful clothing. The Gemara has yet to find a source for the halakha that one must approach prayer from an atmosphere of gravity. Rather, Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said it can be derived from here, from this verse: “Serve the Lord in fear and rejoice with trembling” (Psalms 2:11).

⁷ Having cited this verse from Psalms, the Gemara asks: What is the meaning of rejoice with trembling? Rav Adda bar Mattana said that Rabba said: One may not experience unbridled joy; even where there is rejoicing, there should be trembling.

⁸ On that note, the Gemara relates: Abaye was sitting before his teacher Rabba, and Rabba saw that he was excessively joyful. He said to Abaye: It is written: Rejoice with trembling, one's joy should not be unrestrained.

⁹ Abaye said to him: It is permissible for me because I am donning phylacteries now and as long as they are upon me they ensure that the fear of God is upon me.

¹⁰ Similarly, the Gemara relates that Rabbi Yirmeya was sitting before Rabbi Zeira. He saw that Rabbi Yirmeya was excessively joyful. He said to him: It is written: "In all sorrow there is profit" (Proverbs 14:23); sorrow is appropriate, not excessive joy.

¹¹ Rabbi Yirmeya said to him: It is permissible for me because I am donning phylacteries.

¹² On a similar note, the Gemara relates: Mar, son of Ravina, made a wedding feast for his son and he saw the Sages, who were excessively joyous.

¹³ He brought a valuable cup worth four hundred zuz and broke it before them and they became sad.

¹⁴ The Gemara also relates: Rav Ashi made a wedding feast for his son and he saw the Sages, who were excessively joyous. He brought a cup of extremely valuable white glass and broke it before them, and they became sad.

¹⁵ Similarly, the Gemara relates: The Sages said to Rav Hamnuna Zuti at the wedding feast of Mar, son of Ravina: Let the Master sing for us. Since he believed that the merriment had become excessive, he said to them, singing: Woe unto us, for we shall die, woe unto us, for we shall die. They said to him: What shall we respond after you? What is the chorus of the song? He said to them, you should respond: Where is Torah and where is mitzva that protect us?

¹⁶ In a similar vein, Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: One is forbidden to fill his mouth with mirth in this world, as long as we are in exile (ge'onim), as it is stated: "When the Lord returns the captivity of Zion we will be as dreamers" (Psalms 126:1). Only "then will our mouths fill with laughter and our lips with song" (Psalms 126:2). When will that joyous era arrive? When "they will say among nations, the Lord has done great things with these" (Psalms 126:2). They said about Reish Lakish that throughout his life he did not fill his mouth with laughter in this world once he heard this statement from his teacher, Rabbi Yoḥanan.

¹⁷ We learned in the mishna that it is appropriate to stand and begin to pray from an atmosphere of gravity. Regarding this, the Sages taught: One may neither stand and begin to pray, directly from involvement in judgment nor directly from deliberation over the ruling in a matter of halakha, as his preoccupation with the judgment or the halakhic ruling will distract him from prayer. Rather it is appropriate to pray directly from involvement in the study of a universally accepted conclusive halakha that leaves no room for further deliberation and will not distract him during prayer.

¹⁸ And the Gemara asks: What is an example of a conclusive halakha?

¹⁹ The Gemara offers several examples: Abaye said: One like this halakha of Rabbi Zeira, as Rabbi Zeira said: The daughters of Israel were stringent with themselves; to the extent that even if they see a drop of blood corresponding to the size of a mustard seed she sits seven clean days for it. By Torah law, a woman who witnesses the emission of blood during the eleven days following her fixed

menstrual period is not considered a menstruating woman; rather she immerses herself and is purified the next day. However, the women of Israel accepted the stringency upon themselves that if they see any blood whatsoever, they act as if it were the blood of a zava, which obligates her to count seven more clean days before becoming ritually pure (see Leviticus 15:25).

²⁰ Citing an additional example of a conclusive halakha, Rava said: One like this halakha of Rav Hoshaya, as Rav Hoshaya said: A person may employ artifice to circumvent obligations incumbent upon him in dealing with his grain and bring it into the courtyard in its chaff so that his animal will eat from it, and the grain is exempt from tithes. Halakha dictates that one is obligated to tithe grain that has been threshed and piled, regardless of the ultimate purpose for which the grain was intended. By Torah law, one is exempt from tithing grain that was not threshed and is therefore still in its chaff. By rabbinic law, one is prohibited from eating this grain in the framework of a meal. Feeding animals is permitted without first tithing that grain.

²¹ And if you wish, say instead yet another example of a conclusive halakha, which is the recommended prelude to prayer. One like this halakha of Rav Huna, as Rav Huna said that Rabbi Zeira said: One who lets blood from a consecrated animal that was consecrated as a sacrifice; deriving benefit from that blood is prohibited. Although blood of an offering that was sprinkled on the altar is not considered Temple property, nevertheless, deriving benefit from the blood of a living, consecrated animal is considered prohibited use of Temple property. In so doing, one misuses property consecrated to the Temple, and as in any other case of misusing Temple property, if he did so unwittingly, he is liable to bring a guilt-offering.

²² It is related that the Sages acted in accordance with the opinion of our mishna and rose to pray from an atmosphere of gravity; Rav Ashi acted in accordance with the opinion of the baraita and preceded his prayer with a conclusive halakha.

²³ On the topic of proper preparation for prayer, the Sages taught: One may neither stand to pray from an atmosphere of sorrow nor from an atmosphere of laziness, nor from an atmosphere of laughter, nor from an atmosphere of conversation, nor from an atmosphere of frivolity, nor from an atmosphere of purposeless matters. Rather, one should approach prayer from an atmosphere imbued with the joy of a mitzva.

²⁴ Similarly, a person should neither take leave of another from an atmosphere of conversation, nor from an atmosphere of laughter, nor from an atmosphere of frivolity, nor from an atmosphere of purposeless matters. Rather, one should take leave of another from involvement in a matter of halakha. As we found in the books of the Bible dealing with the early prophets, that they would conclude their talks with words of praise and consolation.

²⁵ And so Mari, the grandson of Rav Huna, son of Rabbi Yirmeya bar Abba, taught in a baraita: One should only take leave of another from involvement in a matter of halakha, so that, consequently, he will remember him; whenever he recalls the one from whom he took leave, he will think well of him because of the new halakha that he taught him (Eliyahu Zuta).

²⁶ As in the incident related by the Gemara that Rav Kahana accompanied Rav Shimi bar Ashi from the town of Pum Nahara to the palm grove in Babylonia. When he arrived there, Rav Kahana said to Rav Shimi bar Ashi: Master, what is meant by that which people say: These palm trees of Babylonia have been in this place from the time of Adam the first man until now?

²⁷ Rav Shimi bar Ashi said to him: You reminded me of something that Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said, as Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “In a land through which no man has passed and where no person [adam] has settled” (Jeremiah 2:6)? This verse is difficult; since it is a land through which no person has passed, how could anyone have settled there permanently? The statement that “no person has settled there” is redundant. Rather, this verse comes to teach that every land through which Adam the first man passed and decreed that it would be settled was settled, and every land through which Adam passed and decreed that it would not be settled was not settled. Based on this, what people say is true, and the palm trees of Babylonia are from the time of Adam, meaning that from the time of Adam this land was decreed to be suitable for growing palm trees (Me’iri). The Gemara cited an example of how one who parts from another with Torah learns something new.

²⁸ Having mentioned the mitzva for a student to accompany his Rabbi, the Gemara relates that Rav Mordekhai accompanied his mentor, Rav Shimi bar Ashi, a great distance, from the city of Hagronya to Bei Keifei; and some say that he accompanied from Hagronya to Bei Dura.

²⁹ Returning to the topic of preparation for prayer, the Sages taught in the Tosefta: One who prays must focus his heart toward Heaven. Abba Shaul says: An indication of the importance of this matter is stated in the verse: “The desire of the humble You have heard, Lord; direct their hearts, Your ear will listen” (Psalms 10:17). In other words, if one focuses his heart in prayer as a result of God directing his heart, his prayer will be accepted as God’s ear will listen.

³⁰ With regard to one’s intent during prayer, it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda said: This was the custom of Rabbi Akiva, when he would pray with the congregation he would shorten his prayer and go up, due to his desire to avoid being an encumbrance on the congregation by making them wait for him to finish his prayer. But when he prayed by himself he would extend his prayers to an extent that a person would leave Rabbi Akiva alone in one corner of the study hall and later find him still praying in another corner. And why would Rabbi Akiva move about so much? Because of his bows and prostrations. Rabbi Akiva’s enthusiasm in prayer was so great, that as a result of his bows and prostrations, he would unwittingly move from one corner to the other (Rav Hai Gaon).

³¹ Many halakhot are derived from evoking the prayers of biblical characters. Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said: One should always pray in a house with windows, as it is stated regarding Daniel: “And when Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went to his house. In his attic there were open windows facing Jerusalem, and three times a day he knelt upon his knees and prayed and gave thanks before his God, just as he had done before” (Daniel 6:11).

³² In the Tosefta, additional halakhot were derived from Daniel’s prayer. I might have thought that one could pray as many times as he wishes throughout the entire day; it has already been articulated by Daniel, with regard to whom it is stated: “And three times a day he knelt upon his knees and prayed.” This teaches that there are fixed prayers.

³³ I might have thought that this practice of fixed prayer began only when he came to the Babylonian exile; it was stated: “Just as he had done before.”

³⁴ Further, I might have thought that one may pray facing any direction he wishes; the verse states: The appropriate direction for prayer is “facing Jerusalem.”

³⁵ Daniel does not describe how these three prayers are distributed during the day. I might have thought that one may include all three prayers at one time; it has already been articulated by David that one may not do so, as it is written: “Evening and morning and noon, I pray and cry aloud and He hears my voice” (Psalms 55:18).

³⁶ Furthermore, I might have thought that one may make his voice heard in his Amida prayer; it has already been articulated by Hannah in her prayer, as it is stated: “And Hannah spoke in her heart, only her lips moved and her voice could not be heard” (I Samuel 1:13).

³⁷ Halakhot regarding the order of the prayers were also learned from the prayers of biblical characters. I might have thought that one should request his own needs first, and afterwards recite prayers of thanksgiving and praise; it has already been articulated by Solomon that this is not so, as in Solomon’s prayer at the dedication of the Holy Temple it is stated: “To hear the song and the prayer that Your servant prays before You today” (I Kings 8:28). In this verse, song is prayer in the sense of thanks and praise, and prayer is one’s request of his personal needs. Therefore, one who is praying does not speak matters of request after he began to recite *emet veyatziv* prior to the Amida prayer, which is the essence of prayer. Rather, he begins with praise in the first three blessings of the Amida prayer, and only thereafter does he include requests for his needs. But after the Amida prayer there is no limit. If he desires to recite even the equivalent of the order of the confession of Yom Kippur, he may recite it.

³⁸ This was also stated by an amora; Rav Hiyya bar Ashi said that Rav said: Although the Sages said that one requests his personal needs in the blessing: Who listens to prayer, that is with regard to one who wishes to do so as part of the Amida prayer. If he comes to add and recite additional requests after completing his Amida prayer, even if his personal requests are the equivalent of the order of the confession of Yom Kippur, he may recite them.

³⁹ Rav Hamnuna said: How many significant halakhot can be derived from these verses of the prayer of Hannah? As it says: “And Hannah spoke in her heart, only her lips moved and her voice could not be heard, so Eli thought her to be drunk” (I Samuel 1:13). The Gemara elaborates: From that which is stated here: “And Hannah spoke in her heart,” the halakha that one who prays must focus his heart on his prayer is derived. And from that which is stated here: “Only her lips moved,” the halakha that one who prays must enunciate the words with his lips, not only contemplate them in his heart, is derived. From that which is written here: “And her voice could not be heard,” the halakha that one is forbidden to raise his voice in his Amida prayer as it must be recited silently. From the continuation of the verse here: “So Eli thought her to be drunk,” the halakha that a drunk person is forbidden to pray. That is why he rebuked her.

⁴⁰ On the subject of Eli’s rebuke of Hannah, as it is stated: “And Eli said to her: How long will you remain drunk? Remove your wine from yourself” (I Samuel 1:14); Rabbi Elazar said: From here the halakha that one who sees in another

⁴¹ an unseemly matter, he must reprimand him, is derived. “And Hannah answered and she said no, my master, I am a woman of sorrowful spirit, and I have drunk neither wine nor liquor, but I pour out my soul before the Lord” (I Samuel 1:15). Regarding the words: “No, my master,” Ulla, and some say Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi H̥anina, said that she said to him, in an allusion: With regard to this matter, you are not a master, and the Divine Spirit does not rest upon you, as you falsely suspect me of this.

⁴² Some say another version of her response. She said to him, questioning: Aren't you a master? Aren't the Divine Presence and Divine Spirit with you that you judged me to be guilty, and you did not judge me to be innocent? Didn't you know that I am a woman of distressed spirit?

⁴³ With regard to Hannah's explanation that "I have drunk neither wine nor liquor," Rabbi Elazar said: From here the halakha is derived that one who is suspected of something of which he is not guilty cannot suffice merely with the personal knowledge of his innocence, but must inform the one who suspects him that he is innocent and clear himself of suspicion.

⁴⁴ "Do not take your maidservant as a wicked woman [bat beliya'al] for out of the abundance of my complaint and anger have I spoken until now" (I Samuel 1:16). Rabbi Elazar said: From here the halakha that when a drunk person prays it is as if he engaged in idol worship is derived as it is written here that Hannah, suspected of praying while drunk, defends herself and says: "Do not take your maidservant as a bat beliya'al"; and it is written there, with regard to a city that has been instigated to engage in idol worship: "Benei beliya'al have gone out from your midst and have lured the inhabitants of their city, saying let us go and serve other gods which we have not known" (Deuteronomy 13:14). By means of this verbal analogy it is derived: Just as there, in the case of the idolatrous city, the term beliya'al indicates idol worship, so too here, in the case of one who prays drunk, beliya'al indicates idol worship.

⁴⁵ The verse continues: "And Eli answered and said: May you go in peace" (I Samuel 1:17). Rabbi Elazar said: From here the halakha is derived that one who suspects another of something that he has not done, he must appease him. Moreover, the one who suspected him must bless him, as Eli continued and offered Hannah a blessing, as it is stated: "And may the God of Israel grant your request that you have asked of Him" (I Samuel 1:17).

⁴⁶ Incidental to this discussion of Hannah's prayer, the Gemara explores related topics. In her prayer, Hannah said: "And she swore an oath and said, Lord of Hosts [Tzeva'ot] if You will indeed look upon the affliction of Your maidservant and remember me, and not forget Your maidservant and will give Your maidservant a male child, I will give him to the Lord all the days of his life, and there shall be no razor come upon his head" (I Samuel 1:11). Rabbi Elazar said: From the day that the Holy One, Blessed be He, created His world, there was no person who called the Holy One, Blessed be He, Lord of Hosts until Hannah came and called Him Lord of Hosts. This is the first time in the Bible that God is referred to by this name.

⁴⁷ Rabbi Elazar explains that Hannah said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, are You not the Lord of the Hosts, and of all of the hosts and hosts of creations that You created in Your world, is it difficult in Your eyes to grant me one son?

⁴⁸ The Gemara suggests a parable: To what is this similar? It is similar to a flesh and blood king who made a feast for his servants. A poor person came and stood at the door. He said to them: Give me one slice of bread! And they paid him no attention. He pushed and entered before the king. He said to him: My lord, the King, from this entire feast that you have prepared, is it so difficult in your eyes to give me a single slice of bread?

⁴⁹ As for the double language in the verse, "if you will look upon [im ra'o tireh]," Rabbi Elazar said: Hannah said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, if You will look upon [ra'o] me now, fine, and if not, in any case You will see [tireh].

⁵⁰ What was Hannah threatening? She said: I will go and seclude myself with another man before Elkana, my husband. Since I secluded myself, they will force me to drink the sota water to determine whether or not I have committed adultery. I will be found innocent, and since You will not make Your Torah false [pelaster], I will bear children. With regards to a woman who is falsely suspected of adultery and drank the sota water, the Torah says: “And if the woman was not defiled, but was pure, then she shall be acquitted and she shall conceive” (Numbers 5:28).

⁵¹ However, Rabbi Elazar’s opinion works out well according to the one who said that the verse means: If she were barren, she will be remembered by God and granted children. That works out well. But according to the one who said that the verse means that childbearing will be easier and more successful, i.e., if she had previously given birth with pain, she now gives birth with ease, or if she had previously given birth to daughters, she now gives birth to sons, or if she had previously given birth to black children, considered to be unattractive, she now gives birth to fair children, or if she had previously given birth to short, weak children, she gives birth to tall, strong children, what can be said?

⁵² As it was taught in a baraita that the tanna’im disputed the interpretation of the verse in Numbers: “Then she shall be acquitted and she shall conceive” teaches that if she was barren, she will be remembered by God and granted children; this is the statement of Rabbi Yishmael. Rabbi Akiva said to him: If so, all barren women will go and seclude themselves with men who are not their husbands, and any woman who did not commit the sin of adultery will be remembered by God and granted children. Rather, the verse teaches that this is merely a promise for greater ease in childbirth; if she has previously given birth with pain, she now gives birth with ease, if she has previously given birth to short children, she gives birth to tall children, if she has previously given birth to black children, she now gives birth to fair children, if she has previously given birth to one child, she now gives birth to two children.

⁵³ According to Rabbi Akiva’s explanation, what is derived from the double language uttered by Hannah: Im ra’o tireh? The Torah spoke in the language of men, meaning that this double language is not extraordinary and nothing may be derived from it. It is common biblical vernacular.

⁵⁴ In the oathprayer uttered by Hannah, she refers to herself as “Your servant” [amatekha] three times: “The affliction of Your maidservant...and not forget Your maidservant and will give Your maidservant” (I Samuel 1:11).

⁵⁵ Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: Why are these three maidservants [amatot] cited in the verse? They are cited to teach that Hannah said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, You have created three crucibles potentially leading to death in a woman, where she is particularly vulnerable. Alternatively, some say: Master of the Universe, You have created three accelerants of death in a woman. They are mitzvot that, as a rule, pertain to women: Observing the halakhot of a menstruating woman, separating ḥalla from dough, and lighting Shabbat candles. Have I ever violated one of them? Hannah attests to her status as God’s maidservant [ama]. The reference to these three mitzvot is drawn from the etymological similarity between amatekha, your maidservant, and mita, death.

⁵⁶ Later in her prayer, Hannah says: “And You will grant Your servant an offspring of men.”

⁵⁷ The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of “an offspring of men”? Rav said: Hannah prayed for a man among men, a son who would be outstanding and exceptional. And Shmuel said: This

expression means an offspring who will anoint two men to royalty. And who were they? Saul and David. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Hannah prayed that she would bear an offspring who would be the equivalent of two of the world's greatest men. And who were they? Moses and Aaron. As it is stated: "Moses and Aaron among His priests, and Samuel among those who call His name" (Psalms 99:6). In this verse, Hannah's son, Samuel, is equated to Moses and Aaron. And the Rabbis say: "An offspring of men": Hannah prayed for an offspring who would be inconspicuous among men, that he would not stand out in any way.

⁵⁸ The Gemara relates: When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said in explanation: Hannah prayed that her son would not be conspicuous among men; neither too tall nor too short; neither too small nor too fat; neither too white nor too red; neither too smart nor too stupid.

⁵⁹ When Hannah came to the Temple with her son Samuel, she told Eli: "My lord, as your soul lives, my lord, I am the woman who stood here with you to pray to the Lord" (I Samuel 1:26). Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: From here the halakha that it is forbidden to sit within four cubits of one who is praying is derived. As the verse says: "Who stood here with you," indicating that Eli stood alongside Hannah because she was praying.

⁶⁰ Additionally, Hannah's emphasis in speaking to Eli, "for this youth I prayed" (I Samuel 1:27), indicates that she came to protect him from danger. As Rabbi Elazar said: Samuel was one who taught halakha in the presence of his teacher. Hannah wanted to pray that he not be punished by death at the hand of Heaven for his transgression, as it is stated: "And they slaughtered the cow and they brought the youth to Eli" (I Samuel 1:25). This verse is puzzling. Because they slaughtered the cow, therefore, they brought the youth to Eli? What does one have to do with the next?

⁶¹ Rather, this is what happened: Eli said to those who brought the offering: Call a priest; he will come and slaughter the offering. Samuel saw them looking for a priest to slaughter the animal. He said to them: Why do you need to look for a priest to slaughter it? Slaughter of an offering performed by a non-priest is valid. They brought him before Eli to clarify his statement. Eli said to him: How do you know this? Samuel said to him: Is it written in the Torah: And the priest shall slaughter indicating that the offering may only be slaughtered by a priest? It is written: "And the priests shall offer," only from the stage of receiving the blood in the bowls and onward is it a mitzva incumbent upon priests alone. From here the halakha that slaughter by a non-priest is acceptable is derived.

⁶² Eli said to Samuel: You have spoken well and your statement is correct, but nevertheless, you are one who issued a halakhic ruling in the presence of your teacher, and anyone who issues a halakhic ruling in the presence of his teacher, even if the particular halakha is correct, is liable for death at the hand of Heaven for showing contempt for his teacher. Hannah came and shouted before him: "I am the woman who stood here with you to pray to the Lord;" do not punish the child who was born of my prayers. He said to her: Let me punish him, and I will pray for mercy, that the Holy One, Blessed be He, will grant you a son who will be greater than this one. She said to him: "For this youth I prayed" and I want no other.

⁶³ The Gemara continues to deal with Hannah's prayer. It is said: "And Hannah spoke on her heart." Several interpretations are offered to explain her use of the phrase "on her heart" instead of the common phrase to her heart (Maharsha). Rabbi Elazar said in the name of Rabbi Yosei ben Zimra: Hannah spoke to God concerning matters of her heart. She said before Him: Master of the Universe, of all the organs You created in a woman, You have not created one in vain. Every organ fulfills its

purpose; eyes to see, ears to hear, a nose to smell, a mouth to speak, hands with which to perform labor, feet with which to walk, breasts with which to nurse. If so, these breasts that You placed upon my heart, to what purpose did You place them? Was it not in order to nurse with them? Grant me a son and I will nurse with them.

⁶⁴ Tangentially, the Gemara also cites an additional statement that Rabbi Elazar said in the name of Rabbi Yosei ben Zimra: Anyone who sits in observance of a fast on Shabbat, his merit is great and they tear up and repeal his sentence of seventy years; because everyone is enjoying himself and a feast is prepared, it is more difficult to fast on Shabbat than on any other day. Nevertheless, they then hold him accountable for failing to fulfill the halakha of delight of Shabbat.

⁶⁵ The Gemara asks: What is his remedy to atone and avoid punishment? Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: He must sit in observance of another fast on a weekday to atone for the fast on Shabbat.

⁶⁶ After explaining the uncommon expression, on her heart, the Gemara cites an additional statement in the matter of Hannah. And Rabbi Elazar said: Hannah spoke impertinently toward God on High. As it is stated: “And she prayed onto the Lord,” as opposed to the common phrase: To the Lord. This teaches that she spoke impertinently toward on High.

⁶⁷ And on a similar note, Rabbi Elazar said that Elijah spoke impertinently toward God on High as well in his prayer at Mount Carmel, as it is stated: “Answer me, Lord, answer me, that this people will know that You are the Lord, God, and You have turned their hearts backward” (I Kings 18:37), claiming that God caused Israel to sin. On this topic, Rabbi Shmuel bar Rabbi Yitzḥak said: From where do we know that the Holy One, Blessed be He, ultimately conceded to Elijah that he was correct?

⁶⁸ As it is written in a future prophecy: “In that day, says the Lord, I will assemble the lame, and I will gather those who are abandoned and those with whom I have dealt in wickedness” (Micah 4:6). God states that He caused Israel to act wickedly.

⁶⁹ Similarly, Rabbi Ḥama, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: Had it not been for these three verses, the legs of the enemies of Israel, a euphemism for Israel itself, would have collapsed, as Israel would have been unable to withstand God’s judgment.

⁷⁰ One is the verse just mentioned in which it is written: “Those whom I have dealt in wickedness.” And one is the verse in which it is written: “Behold, like clay in the potter’s hand, so are you in My hand, house of Israel” (Jeremiah 18:6). And one is the verse in which it is written: “And I will give you a new heart and a new spirit I will place within you, and I will remove the heart of stone from your flesh and I will give you a heart of flesh” (Ezekiel 36:26). These three verses indicate that God influences a person’s decisions, and therefore one does not have sole responsibility for his actions.

⁷¹ Rav Pappa said there is a clearer proof from here: “And I will place My spirit within you and I will cause you to walk in My statutes, and you will observe My decrees and do them” (Ezekiel 36:27).

⁷² And Rabbi Elazar said: Moses also spoke impertinently toward God on High, as it is stated in the verse following the sin of those who murmured against God in the desert: “And Moses prayed to the Lord and the fire subsided” (Numbers 11:2), and this verse is interpreted homiletically: Do not read to [el] the Lord, but rather onto [al] the Lord, which indicates that he spoke impertinently.

⁷³ The Gemara explains the basis for this interpretation: As the Sages of the school of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov would indiscriminately read *ales* as *ayin* and *ayin* as *ales* and in this case transforming *el* into *al*.

⁷⁴ The Sages of the school of Rabbi Yannai, however, say proof that Moses spoke impertinently toward God on High is derived from here, Moses' rebuke at the beginning of Deuteronomy: "And Di Zahav" (Deuteronomy 1:1). This is an entry in a list of places where Moses had spoken to Israel. As there was no place encountered by that name, it is interpreted as an allusion to another matter.

⁷⁵ We must clarify: What is the meaning of *and Di Zahav*? The Sages of the school of Rabbi Yannai said that Moses said the following before the Holy One, Blessed be He, to atone for Israel after the sin of the Golden Calf: Master of the Universe, because of the gold and silver that you lavished upon Israel during the exodus from Egypt until they said enough [*dai*]; it was this wealth that caused Israel to make the Golden Calf.

⁷⁶ Establishing a general moral principle, the Sages the school of Rabbi Yannai said: A lion does not roar standing over a basket of straw from which he derives no pleasure, but he roars standing over a basket of meat, as he only roars when satiated.

⁷⁷ Similarly, Rabbi Oshaya said: This is comparable to a person who had a lean, but large-limbed cow. At one point, he fed it lupines, a choice food, and soon thereafter the cow was kicking him. He said to the cow: Who caused you to begin kicking me if not the lupines I fed you? Here, too, the sin was caused by an abundance of good.

⁷⁸ The Gemara offers another analogy: Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: This is comparable to a person who had a son; he bathed him and anointed him with oil, fed him and gave him drink, and hung a purse of money around his neck. Then, he brought his son to the entrance of a brothel. What could the son do to avoid sinning?

⁷⁹ On a similar note, Rav Aḥa, son of Rav Huna, said that Rav Sheshet said: That is what people say in a popular maxim: Filling his stomach is a type of sin, as it is stated: "When they were fed and became full they were sated, and their hearts were lifted and they have forgotten Me" (Hosea 13:6). Rav Naḥman said: This principle is derived not from the verse in Hosea, but from here: "And your heart is lifted and you forget the Lord" (Deuteronomy 8:14). And the Rabbis say that this principle is derived from here: "And they will have eaten and been sated and fattened, and they will turn to other gods" (Deuteronomy 31:20).

⁸⁰ And if you wish, say instead that it is derived from here: "And Jeshurun grew fat and kicked" (Deuteronomy 32:15). Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: From where in the Torah is it derived that the Holy One, Blessed be He, ultimately conceded to Moses that the reason for the sin of the Golden Calf was indeed the riches lavished upon Israel? As it is stated: "And I gave them an abundance of silver and gold, which they used for the Ba'al" (Hosea 2:10).

⁸¹ The Gemara elaborates upon additional aspects of the sin of the Golden Calf. It is stated: "And the Lord said to Moses: Go and descend, for your people whom you have lifted out of the land of Egypt have been corrupted" (Exodus 32:7). What is the meaning of "go and descend"? Rabbi Elazar said: The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Moses: Moses, descend from your greatness. Isn't it only for the sake of Israel, so that you may serve as an emissary, that I granted you prominence; and now that Israel has sinned, why do I need you? There is no need for an emissary. Immediately, Moses' strength

waned and he was powerless to speak in defense of Israel. And once God said to Moses: “Leave Me be, that I may destroy them” (Deuteronomy 9:14), Moses said to himself: If God is telling me to let Him be, it must be because this matter is dependent upon me. Immediately Moses stood and was strengthened in prayer, and asked that God have mercy on the nation of Israel and forgive them for their transgression.

⁸² The Gemara says: This is comparable to a king who became angry at his son who had sinned against him, and beat him, administering a severe beating. At that moment, a well-wisher of the king was sitting before him and witnessed the entire event, and was afraid to say anything to the king about the excessive beating. Meanwhile, the king said to his son: Were it not for this well-wisher of mine who is sitting before me, I would have killed you. Upon hearing this, the king’s friend said to himself: This is clearly a sign that this matter, rescuing the son from the hands of his father, is dependent upon me. Immediately he stood and rescued him from the king.

⁸³ In an additional aspect of the sin of the Golden Calf, God told Moses: “Now leave Me be, that My wrath will be enraged against them and I will consume them; and I will make of you a great nation” (Exodus 32:10). Explaining this verse, Rabbi Abbahu said: Were the verse not written in this manner, it would be impossible to utter it, in deference to God. The phrase: Leave Me be, teaches that Moses grabbed the Holy One, Blessed be He, as a person who grabs his friend by his garment would, and he said before Him: Master of the Universe, I will not leave You be until You forgive and pardon them.

⁸⁴ In the same verse, God promised Moses: “And I will make of you a great nation.” What was Moses’ response? Rabbi Elazar said: Moses said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, if a chair with three legs, the collective merit of the three forefathers, is unable to stand before You in Your moment of wrath, all the more so that a chair with one leg, my merit alone, will be unable to withstand your wrath.

⁸⁵ Moreover, but I have a sense of shame before my forefathers. Now they will say: See this leader that God placed over Israel. He requested greatness for himself but did not pray for God to have mercy upon them in their troubled time.

⁸⁶ The Torah continues: “And Moses beseeched [vayḥal] before the Lord” (Exodus 32:11). Many interpretations were given for this uncommon term, vayḥal: Rabbi Elazar said: It teaches that Moses stood in prayer before the Holy One, Blessed be He, until it made him ill [heḥelahu] from overexertion. And Rava said: Moses stood in prayer until he nullified His vow, as the term vayḥal alludes to nullification of an oath. Here it is written vayḥal, and there referring to vows, it is written: “He shall not nullify [lo yaḥel] his word” (Numbers 30:3). And with regard to vows, the Master said: He who vowed cannot nullify his vow, but others, the court, can nullify his vow for him. Here, it is as if Moses nullified the Lord’s vow to destroy Israel.

⁸⁷ And Shmuel said: The term vayḥal teaches that Moses gave his life, from the term ḥalal, a dead person, for Israel, as it is stated: “And if not, erase me, please, from Your book” (Exodus 32:32).

⁸⁸ Rava, also interpreting this verse, said that Rav Yitzḥak said: The term vayḥal teaches that he caused the Divine Attribute of Mercy to take effect [heḥela] upon them.

⁸⁹ And the Rabbis say that this term constitutes the essence of Moses’ claim: It teaches that Moses said before the Holy One Blessed be He: Master of the Universe! It is a sacrilege [ḥullin] for You to do something like this.

⁹⁰ And another interpretation of the verse, “And Moses beseeched [vayḥal] before the Lord.” It was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Eliezer the Great says: This term teaches that Moses stood in prayer before the Holy One, Blessed be He, until he was overcome by aḥilu. Even the Sages were unfamiliar with this term. Therefore, the Gemara asks: What is the meaning of aḥilu? Rabbi Elazar, an amora of Eretz Yisrael, said that aḥilu is fire in the bones. However, this expression was familiar in Eretz Yisrael but not in Babylonia. They asked in Babylonia: What is the disease that they called fire of the bones? Abaye said that is a disease known in Babylonia as eshta degarmeī, which in Aramaic means fire of the bones; in other words, a fever.

⁹¹ As Moses continues his prayer, he says: “Remember Abraham, Isaac and Israel Your servants, to whom You swore in Your name” (Exodus 32:13). What is the meaning of in Your name? Rabbi Elazar said: Moses said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, had You sworn to them by the heavens and the earth, I would say: Just as the heavens and the earth will ultimately be no more, so too Your oath will be null and void. Now that You swore to them by Your great name, just as Your name lives and stands for all eternity, so too does Your oath live and stand for all eternity.

⁹² In this verse, Moses continues: “And You said to them: I will make your offspring as numerous as the stars of heaven, and all this land of which I have spoken I will give to your offspring that they shall inherit it forever.” The Gemara clarifies a puzzling phrase in this verse. That phrase of which I have spoken, it should have said: Of which You have spoken, as Moses is referring to God’s promise to the forefathers.

⁹³ Rabbi Elazar said: To this point, the verse cites the words of the student, Moses; from this point, and all this land of which I have spoken, the verse cites the words of the Master, God. And Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said: These and those are the words of the student; Moses spoke the entire verse. Rather, Moses said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, those matters which You told me to go and say to Israel in My name, I went and told it to them in Your name. I have already told Israel of God’s promise to the forefathers. Now what do I say to them?

⁹⁴ The Gemara moves to a discussion of additional prayers offered by Moses. Moses said that if God fails to bring the Jewish people into Eretz Yisrael, the nations of the world will say: “The Lord did not have the ability [yekholet] to bring this people into the land which He swore to them, and He killed them in the desert” (Numbers 14:16). The Gemara examines this verse closely: The verse should not have utilized the term yekholet, an abstract feminine noun, but rather, it should have said: “The Lord was not able [yakhol],” a masculine verb.

⁹⁵ Rabbi Elazar said: Moses phrased it that way because he said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, now the nations of the world will say that His strength weakened like a female and He is unable to rescue the nation of Israel. The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Moses: And did the nations of the world not already see the miracles and the mighty acts that I performed on behalf of Israel at the Red Sea? Moses said before Him: Master of the Universe, they can still say: The Lord can stand up to a single king like Pharaoh and defeat him, but He is unable to stand up to the thirty-one kings in the land of Canaan.

⁹⁶ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: From where is it derived that the Holy One, Blessed be He, ultimately conceded to Moses? As it is said: “And the Lord said: I have forgiven according to your word”

(Numbers 14:20). The Sages of the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: According to your word, it will be, as indeed in the future the nations of the world will say this.

⁹⁷ The Gemara concludes: Happy is the student whose teacher concedes to him as the Lord conceded to Moses.

⁹⁸ Explaining the next verse, “Nevertheless, as I live, and the glory of the Lord fills the entire world” (Numbers 14:21), Rava said that Rav Yitzḥak said: This teaches that the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Moses: Moses, you have given Me life with your words. I am happy that on account of your arguments, I will forgive Israel.

⁹⁹ Based on Moses’ prayers, Rabbi Simlai taught: One should always set forth praise of the Holy One, Blessed be He, and then pray for his own needs. From where do we derive that one should conduct himself in this manner? From Moses, as it is written in his prayer: “And I beseeched the Lord at that time” (Deuteronomy 3:23). And immediately afterward in his prayer, it is written: “Lord, God, You have begun to show Your servant Your greatness and Your strong hand, for what God is there in the heavens or on earth who can perform deeds such as Yours and Your might” (Deuteronomy 3:24)? Here, Moses began with praise of God, and it is only thereafter that it is written: “Please, let me pass over and see the good land that is beyond the Jordan, that good hill country and the Lebanon” (Deuteronomy 3:25). Only after his praise did Moses make his personal request.

¹⁰⁰ The Gemara prefates the next discourse with a mnemonic symbol: Deeds, charity, offering, priest, fast, shoe, iron.

¹⁰¹ Rabbi Elazar said: This story proves that prayer is greater than good deeds without prayer (Tosafot), as there was none greater in the performance of good deeds than Moses our teacher; nevertheless, his request was granted, albeit in a limited manner, in his request to enter Eretz Yisrael, only through prayer, when God permitted him to climb the mountain and look out over the land. As, initially it is stated: “Speak no more to Me,” juxtaposed to which is: “Go up to the summit of the mountain.”

¹⁰² After comparing and contrasting prayer and good deeds, the Gemara explores another comparison. Rabbi Elazar said: A fast is greater than charity. What is the reason that fasting is greater? Because a fast is a mitzva performed with one’s body as he afflicts himself, while charity is performed only with one’s money.

¹⁰³ In another comparison, Rabbi Elazar said: Prayer is greater than sacrifices, as it is stated: “To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices to Me, says the Lord. I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts; I do not desire the blood of bulls and sheep and goats” (Isaiah 1:11). And several verses later it is written: “And when you spread forth your hands I will hide My eyes from you, and even if you increase your prayer, I will not hear; your hands are full of blood” (Isaiah 1:15). Not only Israel’s sacrifices, but even their prayers, which are on a higher spiritual level, will not be accepted.

¹⁰⁴ Speaking of that verse in Isaiah, the Gemara cites that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Any priest who killed a person may not lift his hands in the Priestly Blessing as it is stated: “And when you spread forth your hands I will hide My eyes from you...your hands are full of blood.” Here we see that the

Priestly Blessing, performed with hands spread forth, is not accepted when performed by priests whose “hands are full of blood.”

¹⁰⁵ On the subject of prayer, Rabbi Elazar also said: Since the day the Temple was destroyed the gates of prayer were locked and prayer is not accepted as it once was, as it is said in lamentation of the Temple’s destruction: “Though I plead and call out, He shuts out my prayer” (Lamentations 3:8). Yet, despite the fact that the gates of prayer were locked with the destruction of the Temple, the gates of tears were not locked, and one who cries before God may rest assured that his prayers will be answered, as it is stated: “Hear my prayer, Lord, and give ear to my pleading, keep not silence at my tears” (Psalms 39:13). Since this prayer is a request that God should pay heed to the tears of one who is praying, he is certain that at least the gates of tears are not locked.

¹⁰⁶ With regard to the locking of the gates of prayer, the Gemara relates that Rava did not decree a fast on a cloudy day because it is stated: “You have covered Yourself in a cloud, through which prayer cannot pass” (Lamentations 3:44). The verse indicates that clouds are a bad omen, indicating that God has averted His face (Rav Hai Gaon).

¹⁰⁷ And Rabbi Elazar said: Since the day the Temple was destroyed an iron wall separates Israel from their Father in heaven, as it is stated to the prophet Ezekiel, instructing him to symbolize that separation: “And take for yourself an iron griddle, and set it as an iron wall between yourself and the city...it will be a sign for the house of Israel” (Ezekiel 4:3).

¹⁰⁸ The Gemara cites other statements in praise of prayer: Rabbi Ḥanin said that Rabbi Ḥanina said: Anyone who prolongs his prayer is assured that his prayer does not return unanswered; it will surely be accepted. From where do we derive this? From Moses our teacher, as it is stated that Moses said: “So I fell down before the Lord the forty days and forty nights that I fell down; and I prayed to the Lord” (Deuteronomy 9:26–27), and it is written thereafter: “And the Lord heard me that time as well, the Lord would not destroy you” (Deuteronomy 10:10).

¹⁰⁹ The Gemara raises an objection: Is that so? Didn’t Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba say that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Anyone who prolongs his prayer and expects it to be answered, will ultimately come to heartache, as it will not be answered. As it is stated: “Hope deferred makes the heart sick” (Proverbs 13:12). And what is the remedy for one afflicted with that illness? He should engage in Torah study, as it is stated: “But desire fulfilled is the tree of life” (Proverbs 13:12), and tree of life is nothing other than Torah, as it is stated: “It is a tree of life to those who hold fast to it, and those who support it are joyous” (Proverbs 3:18). This is not difficult. This, Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba’s statement that one will suffer heartache refers to one who prolongs his prayer and expects it to be answered; that, Rabbi Ḥanin’s statement that one who prolongs his prayer is praiseworthy refers to one who prolongs his prayer and does not expect it to be answered.

¹¹⁰ On a similar note, Rabbi Ḥama, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: A person who prayed and saw that he was not answered should pray again, as it is stated: “Hope in the Lord, strengthen yourself, let your heart take courage, and hope in the Lord” (Psalms 27:14). One should turn to God with hope, and if necessary turn to God again with hope.

¹¹¹ Connected to the emphasis on the need to bolster one’s effort in prayer, the Gemara notes that the Sages taught in a baraita: Four things require bolstering, constant effort to improve, and they are: Torah, good deeds, prayer, and occupation.

¹¹² For each of these, a biblical proof is cited: From where is it derived that Torah and good deeds require bolstering? As it is stated in the instruction to Joshua: “Only be strong and be extremely courageous, observe and do all of the Torah that Moses My servant commanded you; do not deviate to the right or to the left, that you may succeed wherever you go” (Joshua 1:7). In this verse, observe refers to Torah study and do refers to good deeds (Maharsha); the apparently repetitive language is not extraneous. The Gemara derives: Be strong in Torah and be courageous in good deeds.

¹¹³ From where is it derived that prayer requires bolstering? As it is said: “Hope in the Lord, strengthen yourself, let your heart take courage, and hope in the Lord.”

¹¹⁴ From where is it derived that occupation requires bolstering? As it is stated: “Be strong and we will be strong for the sake of our nation and for the cities of our God” (II Samuel 10:12). All of one’s labor requires bolstering.

¹¹⁵ The Gemara cites a midrash on the following verse from Isaiah, relating to the sin of the Golden Calf and Moses’ supplication for forgiveness: “But Zion said: The Lord has forsaken me and the Lord has forgotten me. Can a woman forget her suckling baby, that she would not have compassion for the child of her womb? These may forget, but you I will not forget” (Isaiah 49:14–15). The Gemara seeks to clarify: Forsaken is the same as forgotten. They are synonymous; why repeat the same idea twice? Reish Lakish said: The community of Israel said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, even when a man marries a second wife after his first wife, he certainly recalls the deeds of his first wife. Yet You have not only forsaken me, but You have forgotten me as well.

¹¹⁶ The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Israel: My daughter, I created twelve constellations in the firmament, and for each and every constellation I have created thirty armies, and for each and every army I have created thirty legions [ligyon], and for each and every legion I have created thirty infantry division leaders [rahaton], and for each and every infantry division leader I have created thirty military camp leaders [karton], and for each and every military camp leader I have created thirty leaders of forts [gastera], and on each and every leader of a fort I have hung three hundred and sixty-five thousand stars corresponding to the days of the solar year. And all of them I have created only for your sake; and you said the Lord has forsaken me and the Lord has forgotten me?

¹¹⁷ The verse goes on to say: “Can a woman forget her suckling baby, that she would not have compassion for the child of her womb? These may forget, but you I will not forget.” The meaning of this verse is that the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to the community of Israel: Have I forgotten the ram offerings and firstborn animals that you offered before Me in the desert? The community of Israel replied to Him: Master of the Universe, since there is no forgetfulness before the Throne of Your Glory, perhaps you will not forget my sin of the Golden Calf? God responded to Israel: “These [eleh] too shall be forgotten.” “These” is a reference to the sin of the Golden Calf, regarding which Israel said: “These [eleh] are your gods.”

¹¹⁸ The community of Israel said before Him: Master of the Universe, since there is forgetfulness before the Throne of Your Glory, perhaps You will also forget the events revolving around the revelation at Sinai? God said to Israel: I [anokhi] will not forget you the revelation at Sinai, which began with: “I [anokhi] am the Lord your God.”

¹¹⁹ The Gemara notes: That is what Rabbi Elazar said that Rav Oshaya said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “These too will be forgotten”? That is the sin of the Golden Calf. And what is the meaning of I will not forget you? Those are the events that transpired at Sinai.

¹²⁰ We learned in the mishna that the early generations of pious men would wait one hour in order to achieve the solemn frame of mind appropriate for prayer.

¹²¹ The Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived? Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: This is alluded to when the verse states: “Happy are those who dwell in Your House” (Psalms 84:5), immediately after which it is said: “They will yet praise You, Selah.”

¹²² And Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One who prays must also wait one hour after his prayer, as it is stated: “Surely the righteous will give thanks unto Your name, the upright will sit before You” (Psalms 140:14), meaning that after thanking God through prayer, one should stay and sit before Him.

¹²³ That opinion was also taught in a baraita: One who prays must wait one hour before his prayer and one hour after his prayer. From where is it derived that one must wait one hour before his prayer? As it is stated: “Happy are those who dwell in Your House.” And from where is it derived that one must stay one hour after his prayer? As it is written: “Surely the righteous will give thanks unto Your name, the upright will sit before You.”

¹²⁴ The Sages taught in a baraita with regard to waiting before and after prayer: The early generations of pious men would wait one hour, pray one hour, then wait one hour again. This raises the question: Since the early pious men would spend nine hours per day engaged either in prayer or the requisite waiting periods before and after prayer, three hours each for the morning, afternoon, and evening prayers, how is their Torah preserved? There was little time remaining to review their studies. And how was their work accomplished?

¹²⁵ The Gemara answers: Rather, because they were pious they merited that their Torah is preserved and their work is blessed.

¹²⁶ Additionally, we learned in the mishna: Even if the king greets him while he is praying, he should not respond to him as one may not interrupt his prayer.

¹²⁷ In limiting application of this principle, Rav Yosef said: They only taught this mishna with regard to kings of Israel, as a Jewish king would understand that the individual did not fail to respond to his greeting due to disrespect for the king. However, with regard to kings of the nations of the world, he interrupts his prayer and responds to their greeting due to the potential danger.

¹²⁸ The Gemara raised an objection to Rav Yosef’s statement: One who is praying and saw a violent person, feared by all, coming toward him, or a carriage coming toward him and he is in the way, he should not stop his prayer but rather abridge it and move out of the way.

¹²⁹ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult. Rather, this that teaches to abridge one’s prayer rather than stopping, refers to a case where it is possible to abridge his prayer and complete it in time, in which case he should abridge it. And if it is not a situation where he can abridge his prayer, he interrupts his prayer.

¹³⁰ The Sages taught: There was a related incident, involving a particular pious man who was praying while traveling along his path when an officer [hegmon] came and greeted him. The pious man did not pause from his prayer and did not respond with a greeting. The officer waited for him

until he finished his prayer. After he finished his prayer, the officer said to him: You good for nothing. You endangered yourself; I could have killed you. Isn't it written in your Torah: "Take utmost care and guard yourself diligently" (Deuteronomy 4:9)? And it is also written: "Take therefore good heed unto yourselves" (Deuteronomy 4:15)? Why did you ignore the danger to your life? When I greeted you, why did you not respond with a greeting? Were I to sever your head with a sword, who would hold me accountable for your spilled blood?

¹³¹ The pious man said to him: Wait for me until I will appease you with my words. He said to him: Had you been standing before a flesh and blood king and your friend came and greeted you, would you return his greeting?

¹³² The officer said to him: No. The pious man continued: And if you would greet him, what would they do to you? The officer said to him: They would cut off my head with a sword. The pious man said to him: Isn't this matter an a fortiori inference? You who were standing before a king of flesh and blood, of whom your fear is limited because today he is here but tomorrow he is in the grave, would have reacted in that way; I, who was standing and praying before the Supreme King of kings, the Holy One, Blessed be He, Who lives and endures for all eternity, all the more so that I could not pause to respond to someone's greeting.

¹³³ When he heard this, the officer was immediately appeased and the pious man returned home in peace.

¹³⁴ We learned in the mishna that even if a snake is wrapped around his heel, he may not interrupt his prayer. In limiting application of this principle, Rav Sheshet said: They only taught this mishna with regard to a snake, as if one does not attack the snake it will not bite him. But if a scorpion approaches an individual while he is praying, he stops, as the scorpion is liable to sting him even if he does not disturb it.

¹³⁵ The Gemara raises an objection based on what was taught in a Tosefta: Those who saw one fall into a lions' den but did not see what happened to him thereafter, do not testify that he died. Their testimony is not accepted by the court as proof that he has died as it is possible that the lions did not eat him. However, those who saw one fall into a pit of snakes and scorpions, testify that he died as surely the snakes bit him.

¹³⁶ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult. There, in the case of one who falls into a pit of snakes, it is different, as due to the pressure of his falling on top of them, the snakes will harm him, but a snake who is not touched will not bite.

¹³⁷ The Gemara cites another halakha stating that he must interrupt his prayer in a case of certain danger. Rabbi Yitzhak said: One who saw oxen coming toward him, he interrupts his prayer, as Rav Hoshaya taught: One distances himself fifty cubits from an innocuous ox [shor tam], an ox with no history of causing damage with the intent to injure, and from a forewarned ox [shor muad], an ox whose owner was forewarned because his ox has gored three times already, one distances himself until it is beyond eyeshot.

¹³⁸ It was taught in the name of Rabbi Meir: While the head of the ox is still in the basket and he is busy eating, go up on the roof and kick the ladder out from underneath you. Shmuel said: This applies only with regard to a black ox, and during the days of Nisan, because that species of ox is particularly dangerous, and during that time of year Satan dances between its horns.

¹³⁹ With regard to the praise for one who prays and need not fear even a snake, the Sages taught: There was an incident in one place where an arvad was harming the people. They came and told Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa and asked for his help. He told them: Show me the hole of the arvad. They showed him its hole. He placed his heel over the mouth of the hole and the arvad came out and bit him, and died.

¹⁴⁰ Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa placed the arvad over his shoulder and brought it to the study hall. He said to those assembled there: See, my sons, it is not the arvad that kills a person, rather transgression kills a person. The arvad has no power over one who is free of transgression.

¹⁴¹ At that moment the Sages said: Woe unto the person who was attacked by an arvad and woe unto the arvad that was attacked by Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa.

¹⁴² MISHNA: This mishna speaks of additions to the standard formula of the Amida prayer and the blessings in which they are incorporated. One mentions the might of the rains and recites: He makes the wind blow and the rain fall, in the second blessing of the Amida prayer, the blessing of the revival of the dead. And the request for rain: And grant dew and rain as a blessing, in the ninth blessing of the Amida prayer, the blessing of the years. And the prayer of distinction [havdala], between the holy and the profane recited in the evening prayer following Shabbat and festivals, in the fourth blessing of the Amida prayer: Who graciously grants knowledge. Rabbi Akiva says: Havdala is recited as an independent fourth blessing. Rabbi Eliezer says that it is recited in the seventeenth blessing of the Amida prayer, the blessing of thanksgiving.

¹⁴³ GEMARA: We learned in the mishna that one mentions the might of the rains in the second blessing of the Amida prayer, the blessing of the revival of the dead. The Gemara asks: What is the reason that the might of the rains is mentioned specifically in that blessing?

¹⁴⁴ Rav Yosef said: Because the might of the rains is equivalent to the resurrection of the dead, as rain revives new life in the plant world (Jerusalem Talmud), therefore it was inserted in the blessing of the revival of the dead.

¹⁴⁵ And we also learned in the mishna that the request for rain is added to the blessing of the years. Here, too, the Gemara asks: What is the reason that the request for rain is recited specifically in that blessing?

¹⁴⁶ Rav Yosef said: Because rain is a component of sustenance, therefore it was inserted in the blessing of sustenance as part of our request for bountiful sustenance.

¹⁴⁷ We also learned in the mishna that havdala, distinguishing between Shabbat and the weekdays, is added in the blessing of: Who graciously grants knowledge. Here too the Gemara asks: What is the reason that havdala is recited specifically in that blessing?

¹⁴⁸ Rav Yosef said: Havdala is recited in that blessing because it requires wisdom to distinguish between two entities, they established it in the blessing of wisdom. The Rabbis say a different reason: Because havdala is the distinction between the sacred and the profane, the Sages established it in the blessing of weekdays. The first three blessings of the Amida prayer are recited both on weekdays and on Shabbat and Festivals. The blessing: Who graciously grants knowledge, is the first of the blessings recited exclusively during the week.

¹⁴⁹ Having mentioned the blessing of wisdom, the Gemara cites that which Rav Ami said with regard to knowledge: Great is knowledge that was placed at the beginning of the weekday blessings; an indication of its significance.

¹⁵⁰ And Rav Ami said in praise of knowledge: Great is knowledge that was placed between two letters, two names of God, as it is stated: “For God of knowledge is the Lord” (I Samuel 2:3). And since knowledge is regarded so highly, anyone without knowledge, it is forbidden to have compassion upon him, as it is stated: “For they are a people of no wisdom, so their Creator will have no compassion upon them and their Creator will not be gracious unto them” (Isaiah 27:11). If God shows no mercy for those who lack wisdom, all the more so should people refrain from doing so.

¹⁵¹ Similarly, Rabbi Elazar said: Great is the Holy Temple, as it too was placed between two letters, two names of God, as it is stated: “The place in which to dwell which You have made, Lord, the Temple, Lord, which Your hands have prepared” (Exodus 15:17).

¹⁵² Noting the parallel between these two ideas, Rabbi Elazar added and said: Anyone with knowledge, it is as if the Holy Temple was built in his days; knowledge was placed between two letters and the Temple was placed between two letters, signifying that they stand together.

¹⁵³ Rav Aḥa Karḥina’a strongly objects to this approach that being placed between two names of God accords significance: However, if so, the same should hold true for vengeance. Great is revenge that was placed between two letters, as it is stated: “God of vengeance, Lord, God of vengeance shine forth” (Psalms 94:1).

¹⁵⁴ He said to him: Yes. At least in its place, in the appropriate context, it is great. At times it is necessary. That is that which Ulla said: Why are these two vengeance mentioned in a single verse? One for good and one for evil. Vengeance for good, as it is written: “He shined forth from Mount Paran” (Deuteronomy 33:2) with regard to God’s vengeance against the wicked; vengeance for evil, as it is written: “God of vengeance, Lord, God of vengeance shine forth” with regard to the punishment of Israel.

¹⁵⁵ A tannaitic dispute is cited in the mishna with regard to the appropriate blessing in which to recite havdala within the Amida prayer. Rabbi Akiva says: Havdala is recited as an independent fourth blessing. Rabbi Eliezer says that it is recited in the seventeenth blessing of the Amida prayer, the blessing of thanksgiving. The first tanna says that it is recited in the fourth blessing of the Amida prayer: Who graciously grants knowledge.

¹⁵⁶ Regarding this, Rav Shemen, Shimon, bar Abba said to Rabbi Yoḥanan: Now, since the eighteen blessings of the Amida prayer and the other prayer formulas for prayer were instituted for Israel by the members of the Great Assembly just like all the other blessings and prayers, sanctifications and havdalot; let us see where in the Amida prayer the members of the Great Assembly instituted to recite havdala.

¹⁵⁷ Rabbi Yoḥanan replied that that would be impossible, as the customs associated with havdala went through several stages. He said to him: Initially, during the difficult, early years of the Second Temple, they established that havdala is to be recited in the Amida prayer. Subsequently, when the people became wealthy, they established that havdala is to be recited over the cup of wine. When the people became impoverished, they again established that it was to be recited in the Amida prayer. And they said: One who recites havdala in the Amida prayer must, if he is able (Shitta Mekubbetzet,

Me'iri), recite havdala over the cup of wine as well. Due to all these changes, it was not clear when exactly havdala was to be recited.

¹⁵⁸ It was also stated: Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The members of the Great Assembly established for Israel blessings and prayers, sanctifications and havdalot. Initially, they established that havdala is to be recited in the Amida prayer. Subsequently, when the people became wealthy, they established that havdala is to be recited over the cup of wine. When the people again became impoverished, they established that it was to be recited in the Amida prayer. And they said: One who recites havdala in the Amida prayer must recite havdala over the cup of wine as well.

¹⁵⁹ It was also stated: Rabba and Rav Yosef who both said: One who recites havdala in the Amida prayer must recite havdala over the cup of wine as well.

¹⁶⁰ Rava said: We raise an objection to our halakha based on what was taught in a Tosefta: One who erred and did not mention the might of the rains in the second blessing in the Amida, the blessing on the revival of the dead, and one who erred and failed to recite the request for rain in the ninth blessing of the Amida, the blessing of the years, we require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it. However, one who erred and failed to recite havdala in the blessing: Who graciously grants knowledge, we do not require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it, as he can recite havdala over the cup of wine. Apparently, havdala over the cup of wine is optional, not obligatory, at it says because he can recite and not that he must.

¹⁶¹ The Gemara answers: Do not say as it appears in the Tosefta: Because he can recite havdala over the cup of wine. Rather, say: Because he recites havdala over the cup of wine.

¹⁶² Proof that one must recite havdala over the cup of wine as well as in the Amida prayer was also stated: Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefet said that Rabbi Yosei asked Rabbi Yoḥanan in Sidon, and some say that Rabbi Shimon ben Ya'akov from the city of Tyre asked Rabbi Yoḥanan, and I, Binyamin bar Yefet, heard: One who already recited havdala in the Amida prayer, must he recite havdala over the cup of wine or not? And Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: He must recite havdala over the cup.

¹⁶³ Having clarified the question whether one who recited havdala during the Amida prayer must also recite havdala over the cup of wine, a dilemma was raised before the Sages: One who already recited havdala over the cup of wine, what is the ruling as far as his obligation to recite havdala in the Amida prayer is concerned?

¹⁶⁴ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: This can be derived a fortiori from the established halakha regarding havdala in the Amida prayer. Just as havdala in the Amida prayer, which is where the principal ordinance to recite havdala was instituted, the Sages said that it is not sufficient and one who recited havdala in the Amida prayer must recite havdala over the cup of wine as well, all the more so that one who recited havdala over the cup of wine, which is not where the principal ordinance to recite havdala was instituted, but was merely a later addition, did not fulfill his obligation and must recite havdala in the Amida prayer.

¹⁶⁵ Rabbi Aḥa Arikha, the tall, taught a baraita before Rav Ḥinnana: One who recited havdala in the Amida prayer is more praiseworthy than one who recites it over the cup of wine, and if he recited havdala in this, the Amida prayer, and that, over the cup of wine, may blessings rest upon his head.

¹⁶⁶ This baraita is apparently self-contradictory. On the one hand, you said that one who recites havdala in the Amida prayer is more praiseworthy than one who recites havdala over the cup of wine,

indicating that reciting havdala in the Amida prayer alone is sufficient. And then it is taught: If one recited havdala in this, the Amida prayer, and that, over the cup of wine, may blessings rest upon his head. And since he fulfilled his obligation to recite havdala with one, he is exempt, and the additional recitation of havdala over the cup of wine is an unnecessary blessing. And Rav, and some say Reish Lakish, and still others say Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish both said: Anyone who recites an unnecessary blessing violates the biblical prohibition: “Do not take the name of the Lord your God in vain” (Exodus 20:7).

¹⁶⁷ Rather, emend this baraita and say as follows: If one recited havdala in this and not in that, may blessings rest upon his head.

¹⁶⁸ Rav Ḥisda asked Rav Sheshet with regard to these blessings: If one erred in havdala both in this and in that, what is the ruling? Rav Sheshet said to him: One who erred in this, the Amida prayer, and that, over the cup of wine, returns to the beginning of both the Amida prayer and the havdala over the cup of wine.

¹⁶⁹ There are conflicting opinions with regard to reciting havdala over the cup of wine after reciting it in the Amida prayer. One opinion holds that it is appropriate to recite havdala a second time, while the other holds that it is prohibited. Ravina said to Rava: What is the halakha? Rava said to him: The halakha in the case of havdala is like the halakha in the case of kiddush. Just as in the case of kiddush, although one recited kiddush in the Amida prayer he must, nevertheless, recite kiddush again over the cup of wine, so too with havdala, although one recited havdala in the Amida prayer he must recite havdala again over the cup of wine.

¹⁷⁰ The mishna states that Rabbi Eliezer says: It is recited in the seventeenth blessing of the Amida prayer, the blessing of thanksgiving.

¹⁷¹ The Gemara cites the conclusion with regard to this halakha by relating a story: Rabbi Zeira was riding a donkey while Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Avin was coming and walking after him. He said to him: Is it true that you said in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer in the case of a Festival that occurs directly after Shabbat? Since in that case, one cannot recite havdala in the blessing of Who graciously grants knowledge, as it is not included in the Amida prayer on the Festival, there is no alternative but to adopt Rabbi Eliezer’s ruling. He said to him: Yes.

¹⁷² The Gemara wonders: Saying that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, indicates that his peers dispute his opinion. Where do we find that dispute?

¹⁷³ The Gemara rejects this: And don’t they dispute his opinion? Don’t the Rabbis dispute his opinion, as, in their opinion the blessing of havdala is recited in the blessing: Who graciously grants knowledge?

¹⁷⁴ The Gemara replies: Say that the Rabbis dispute Rabbi Eliezer’s opinion during the rest of the days of the year, when the option to recite havdala in the blessing: Who graciously grants knowledge exists, but in the case of a Festival that occurs directly after Shabbat, do they dispute his opinion? The Rabbis would agree with him in that case.

¹⁷⁵ The Gemara continues: Doesn’t Rabbi Akiva dispute his opinion? He holds that havdala is recited as an independent fourth blessing, in which case there is a dispute.

¹⁷⁶ The Gemara responds: Is that to say that throughout the entire year we act in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva in this matter, so that now, on a Festival that occurs directly after Shabbat, we will stand and act in accordance with his opinion? What is the reason that throughout the whole, entire year, we do not act in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva? Because the Sages instituted eighteen blessings, they did not institute nineteen blessings. Here, too, the Sages instituted seven blessings, they did not institute eight blessings. Therefore, Rabbi Akiva's opinion is not taken into consideration in this case.

¹⁷⁷ In response to these questions, Rabbi Zeira said to him that it was not that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer that was stated in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan, from which one could infer that there was in fact a dispute; rather it was that one is inclined to favor the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer that was stated in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan.

¹⁷⁸ As indeed it was stated that there is a dispute among the Sages in this matter. Rav Yitzḥak bar Avdimi said in the name of Rabbeinu, Rav: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer. And some say this statement: One is inclined to favor the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer.

¹⁷⁹ Rabbi Yoḥanan said that there is no dispute here, and the Rabbis agree with Rabbi Eliezer. And Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that it was established that Rabbi Eliezer's opinion appears to be correct.

¹⁸⁰ With regard to this difference of opinion Rabbi Zeira said: Take this statement of Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba in your hand, as he is scrupulous and he learned the halakha well from the mouth of its originator, like the Sage Raḥava from the city Pumbedita. Raḥava was famous for the precision with which he would transmit material that he learned from his teacher.

¹⁸¹ The Gemara cites an example: Raḥava said that Rabbi Yehuda said: The Temple Mount was a double stav, and there was a stav within a stav. Here Raḥava used his Rabbi's language in describing the structure of the Temple and the rows of columns it contained, a row within a row; but he did not employ the common term *itzteba*, portico, but rather stav, as he heard it from his Rabbi.

¹⁸² Rav Yosef said the conclusive halakha on this topic: I don't know this and I don't know that, but I do know from the statements of Rav and Shmuel they have instituted a pearl for us in Babylonia. They established a version that combines the first blessing of the Festival with the formula of havdala, parallel to the opinion of the Rabbis who include havdala in the first blessing that follows the first three blessings. They instituted to recite:

¹⁸³ You have made known to us, Lord our God, Your righteous laws, and taught us to perform Your will's decrees. You have given us as our heritage seasons of joy and Festivals of voluntary offerings. You have given us as our heritage the holiness of Shabbat, the glory of the festival and the festive offerings of the Pilgrim Festivals. You have distinguished between the holiness of Shabbat and the holiness of the Festival, and have made the seventh day holy over the six days of work. You have distinguished and sanctified Your people Israel with Your holiness, And You have given us, etc.

¹⁸⁴ MISHNA: Concluding the laws of prayer in this tractate, the mishna raises several prayer-related matters. This mishna speaks of certain innovations in the prayer formula that warrant the silencing of a communal prayer leader who attempts to introduce them in his prayers, as their content tends toward heresy. One who recites in his supplication: Just as Your mercy is extended to a bird's nest, as You have commanded us to send away the mother before taking her chicks or eggs (Deuteronomy

22:6–7), so too extend Your mercy to us; and one who recites: May Your name be mentioned with the good or one who recites: We give thanks, we give thanks twice, they silence him.

¹⁸⁵ GEMARA: Our mishna cited three instances where the communal prayer leader is silenced. The Gemara clarifies: Granted, they silence one who repeats: We give thanks, we give thanks, as it appears like he is acknowledging and praying to two authorities. And granted that they also silence one who says: May Your name be mentioned with the good, as clearly he is thanking God only for the good and not for the bad, and we learned in a mishna: One is required to bless God for the bad just as he blesses Him for the good. However, in the case of one who recites: Just as Your mercy is extended to a bird's nest, why do they silence him?

¹⁸⁶ Two amora'im in Eretz Yisrael disputed this question; Rabbi Yosei bar Avin and Rabbi Yosei bar Zevida; one said that this was because he engenders jealousy among God's creations, as it appears as though he is protesting the fact that the Lord favored one creature over all others. And one said that this was because he transforms the attributes of the Holy One, Blessed be He, into expressions of mercy, when they are nothing but decrees of the King that must be fulfilled without inquiring into the reasons behind them.

¹⁸⁷ The Gemara relates that a particular individual descended before the ark as prayer leader in the presence of Rabba, and said in his prayers: You have shown mercy to the bird's nest, now have mercy and pity upon us. Rabba said: How much does this Torah scholar know to appease the Lord, his Master. Abaye said to him: Didn't we learn in a mishna that they silence him?

¹⁸⁸ The Gemara explains: And Rabba too held in accordance with this mishna but merely acted this way because he wanted to hone Abaye's intellect. Rabba did not make his statement to praise the scholar, but simply to test his nephew, Abaye, and to encourage him to articulate what he knows about that mishna.

¹⁸⁹ With regard to additions to prayers formulated by the Sages, The Gemara relates that a particular individual descended before the ark as prayer leader in the presence of Rabbi Ḥanina. He extended his prayer and said: God, the great, mighty, awesome, powerful, mighty, awe-inspiring, strong, fearless, steadfast and honored.

¹⁹⁰ Rabbi Ḥanina waited for him until he completed his prayer. When he finished, Rabbi Ḥanina asked him: Have you concluded all of the praises of your Master? Why do I need all of this superfluous praise? Even these three praises that we recite: The great, mighty and awesome, had Moses our teacher not said them in the Torah and had the members of the Great Assembly not come and incorporated them into the Amida prayer, we would not be permitted to recite them. And you went on and recited all of these. It is comparable to a king who possessed many thousands of golden dinars, yet they were praising him for silver ones. Isn't that deprecatory? All of the praises we could possibly lavish upon the Lord are nothing but a few silver dinars relative to many thousands of gold dinars. Reciting a litany of praise does not enhance God's honor.

¹⁹¹ Tangentially, the Gemara cites an additional statement by Rabbi Ḥanina concerning principles of faith. And Rabbi Ḥanina said: Everything is in the hands of Heaven, except for fear of Heaven. Man has free will to serve God or not, as it is stated: "And now Israel, what does the Lord your God ask of you other than to fear the Lord your God, to walk in all of His ways, to love Him and to serve the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul" (Deuteronomy 10:12). The Lord asks man to perform these matters because ultimately, the choice is in his hands.

¹⁹² The verse says: What does the Lord your God ask of you other than to fear the Lord your God. The Gemara asks: Is fear of Heaven a minor matter that it can be presented as if God is not asking anything significant? Didn't Rabbi Ḥanina say in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: The Holy One, Blessed be He, has nothing in his treasury other than a treasure of fear of Heaven, as it is stated: "Fear of the Lord is his treasure" (Isaiah 33:6). The Lord values and treasures fear of Heaven over all else.

¹⁹³ The Gemara responds: Indeed, for Moses fear of Heaven is a minor matter. As Rabbi Ḥanina stated: It is comparable to one who is asked for a large vessel and he has one, it seems to him like a small vessel because he owns it. However, one who is asked for just a small vessel and he does not have one, it seems to him like a large vessel. Therefore, Moses could say: What does the Lord your God ask of you other than to fear, because in his eyes it was a minor matter.

¹⁹⁴ We learned in the mishna if one repeats: We give thanks, we give thanks, they silence him.

¹⁹⁵ Rabbi Zeira said: One who repeats himself while reciting Shema and says: Listen Israel, Listen Israel is like one who says: We give thanks, we give thanks.

¹⁹⁶ The Gemara raises an objection: It was taught in a baraita: One who recites Shema and repeats it, it is reprehensible. One may infer: It is reprehensible, but they do not silence him.

¹⁹⁷ The Gemara answers: This is not difficult; this case, where although it is reprehensible when one repeats Shema, they do not silence him, is referring to one who recites and repeats each individual word as he says it. In so doing he ruins the recitation of Shema. However, this case, where Rabbi Zeira holds that one who repeats Shema they silence him, refers to one who recites and repeats an entire verse, as it appears that he is worshiping separate authorities.

¹⁹⁸ Rav Pappa said to Abaye with regard to this halakha: And perhaps initially he did not focus his attention on the recitation of Shema, so he repeated it and ultimately he focused his attention as he recited it the second time?

¹⁹⁹ Abaye said to him:

²⁰⁰ Can one have that degree of familiarity with Heaven, to the extent that he can take his words lightly and say them however he likes? If he did not focus his attention initially, we beat him with a blacksmith's hammer until he focuses his attention, as conduct of that sort is unacceptable.

²⁰¹ MISHNA: This mishna and the next one deal with the communal prayer leader. (If one says: "May the good bless You," this is a path of heresy.) One who is passing before the ark, as prayer leader, and erred, another should immediately pass in his place, and at that moment, this replacement should not refuse in the interest of courtesy. The Amida prayer was interrupted and he should replace him as quickly as possible. From where does the replacement commence? From the beginning of the blessing in which the former had erred.

²⁰² In order to prevent the prayer leader from erring in his prayer, it was said that one who passes before the ark should not respond amen after the blessing of the priests, because of potential confusion. Since the mishna is describing a situation in which he was praying without a prayer book, responding amen would interrupt the order of the prayer and potentially lead him to begin a different blessing. For this reason, even if there is no priest other than the communal prayer leader, he does not lift his hands to bless the people, lest he become confused. And, however, if he is certain that he can

lift his hands and resume his prayer without becoming confused, he is permitted to recite the blessing.

²⁰³ GEMARA: The mishna teaches that one who replaces a communal prayer leader who erred in the middle of the Amida prayer should not refuse when approached. The Gemara cites the general halakha with regard to proper conduct when one is approached to serve as prayer leader. The Sages taught in a baraita: One who is approached to pass before the ark to serve as prayer leader, for the sake of propriety should refuse, to avoid creating the impression that he is too eager. And if he does not refuse, but jumps at the opportunity, he is like cooked food without salt, which is to say that he acts in bad taste. However, if he refuses too much this is similarly inappropriate, as he is like cooked food that was ruined by too much salt. So how should he act? The appropriate conduct when approached to serve as communal prayer leader is as follows: When approached the first time, one should refuse; the second time, one should vacillate like a wick that has just begun to catch a flame but is not yet burning; and the third time, he should stretch his legs and descend before the ark.

²⁰⁴ On this note, the Gemara cites that which the Sages taught in a baraita: There are three things that are harmful in excess but are beneficial when used sparingly. They are: Leavening in dough, salt in a cooked dish and refusal for the sake of propriety.

²⁰⁵ The mishna states that when one replaces the communal prayer leader, he commences from the beginning of the blessing in which the former had erred. However that is not universally true, as Rav Huna said: One who erred in any of the first three blessings he must return to the beginning of the Amida prayer because the first three blessings comprise a single entity. Likewise, if one erred in any of the thirteen middle blessings, he returns to the blessing of: You grace humanity, the first of the middle blessings. If one erred in any of the three final blessings, he must return to the blessing of Temple service, which is the first of the final blessings.

²⁰⁶ And Rav Asi disputes one aspect of Rav Huna's opinion, as he said: The middle blessings have no set order. If one erred in any of them he may insert it at whatever point he becomes aware of his error.

²⁰⁷ Rav Sheshet raised an objection based on a baraita: From where does he commence repetition of the Amida prayer? He commences from the beginning of the blessing in which the former had erred. If so, this is a conclusive refutation of Rav Huna's opinion, as Rav Huna said that if one erred in one of the middle blessings, he returns to the beginning of the middle blessings, not to the beginning of that particular blessing.

²⁰⁸ Rav Huna could have said to you: The middle blessings are all considered one blessing; commencing from the beginning of the blessing means returning to the beginning of the middle blessings.

²⁰⁹ Rav Yehuda said: There is an additional distinction between the various sections of the Amida prayer: One must never request his own needs in the first three or in the last three blessings; rather, he should do so in the middle blessings. As Rabbi Ḥanina said: During the first three blessings, he is like a servant who arranges praise before his master; during the middle blessings, he is like a servant who requests a reward from his master; during the final three blessings, one is like a servant who already received a reward from his master and is taking his leave and departing.

²¹⁰ Continuing on the subject of prayer, the Sages taught: There was an incident where one student descended to serve as prayer leader before the ark in the presence of Rabbi Eliezer, and he was excessively prolonging his prayer. His students complained and said to him: How long-winded he is. He said to them: Is this student prolonging his prayer any more than Moses our teacher did? As about Moses it is written: “And I prostrated myself before the Lord for the forty days and forty nights that I prostrated myself” (Deuteronomy 9:25). There is no limit to the duration of a prayer.

²¹¹ There was again an incident where one student descended to serve as prayer leader before the ark in the presence of Rabbi Eliezer, and he was excessively abbreviating his prayer. His students protested and said to him: How brief is his prayer. He said to them: Is he abbreviating his prayer any more than Moses our teacher did? As it is written with regard to the prayer Moses recited imploring God to cure Miriam of her leprosy: “And Moses cried out to the Lord, saying: ‘Please, God, heal her, please’” (Numbers 12:13). This student’s prayer was certainly no briefer than the few words recited by Moses.

²¹² Having mentioned Moses’ prayer for Miriam, the Gemara cites what Rabbi Ya’akov said that Rav Hisda said: Anyone who requests mercy on behalf of another need not mention his name, as it is stated: “Please, God, heal her, please,” and he did not mention Miriam’s name.

²¹³ The Sages taught in a Tosefta: These are the blessings in the Amida prayer in which a person bows: In the first blessing, the blessing of the Patriarchs, one bows at the beginning and the end; in the blessing of thanksgiving, one bows at the beginning and the end; and if one seeks to bow at the end of each and every blessing and at the beginning of each and every blessing, they teach him not to bow so as not to go beyond the ordinance instituted by the Sages.

²¹⁴ Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said in the name of the tanna bar Kappara: An ordinary person [hedyot], conducts himself as we said; he bows at the beginning and the end of the blessings of Patriarchs and thanksgiving and is admonished if he seeks to bow at the beginning and end of the other blessings.

²¹⁵ It is appropriate, though, for a High Priest to bow at the end of each and every blessing; and for a king to bow at the beginning of each and every blessing and at the end of each and every blessing. This is because the more lofty one’s status, the more important it is to demonstrate his subservience to God.

²¹⁶ Rabbi Yitzḥak bar Naḥmani said: It was explained to me directly from Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi himself differently: An ordinary person, conducts himself as we said; a High Priest bows at the beginning of each and every blessing; the king, once he has bowed at the beginning of the first blessing, does not rise until he concludes the entire prayer, as it is stated: “And it was that when Solomon finished praying all of his prayer to the Lord, he rose from before the altar of the Lord, from kneeling upon his knees with his hands spread forth toward the heavens” (I Kings 8:54).

²¹⁷ Having mentioned Solomon bowing, the Gemara distinguishes between various types of bowing. The Sages taught in a baraita: The term kidda means bowing upon one’s face, with his face toward the ground, as it is stated: “Then Bathsheba bowed [vatikod] with her face to the ground” (I Kings 1:31). Keria means bowing upon one’s knees, as regarding Solomon it is stated: He finished praying and “he rose from before the altar of the Lord, from kneeling [mikkeroa] upon his knees.” Finally, hishtaḥava’a, that is bowing with one’s hands and legs spread in total submission, as it is stated in

Jacob's question to Joseph in response to his dream: "Shall we, I and your mother and your brothers, come and bow down [lehishtahavot] to you to the ground?" (Genesis 37:10).

²¹⁸ On the topic of bowing, Rav Ḥiyya, son of Rav Huna, said: I saw Abaye and Rava, who would lean their heads and not actually prostrate themselves on the ground.

²¹⁹ The Gemara asks: One baraita taught: One who bows in the blessing of thanksgiving, it is praiseworthy. And it was taught in another baraita: One who bows in the blessing of thanksgiving, it is reprehensible. These baraitot are contradictory.

²²⁰ The Gemara reconciles these two baraitot: This is not difficult; this baraita, which praises one who bows in the blessing of thanksgiving, refers to one who bows at the beginning of the blessing. This baraita, which condemns one who bows in the blessing of thanksgiving, refers to one who bows at the end of the blessing.

²²¹ Rava bowed in the blessing of thanksgiving, both beginning and end. The Sages said to him: Why does our master do this? He said to them: I saw Rav Nahman who bowed in the blessing of thanksgiving, and I saw Rav Sheshet who did so as well.

²²² But wasn't it taught in a baraita that one who bows in thanksgiving, it is reprehensible?

²²³ Rava explained: That baraita refers to one who bows in the thanksgiving that is in hallel, when one recites: Give thanks to the Lord. Then, bowing is inappropriate.

²²⁴ The Sages continue to question Rava's conduct: But wasn't it taught explicitly in a baraita: One who bows in thanksgiving or in thanksgiving of hallel, it is reprehensible? The term thanksgiving unqualified does not refer to thanksgiving of hallel; it obviously refers to the blessing of thanksgiving recited in the Amida prayer. One who bows in either, it is reprehensible.

²²⁵ The Gemara rejects this challenge as well: When that baraita was taught, it was in reference to the blessing of thanksgiving, the second blessing recited in Grace after Meals: We thank You.

²²⁶ MISHNA: Concluding its discussion of the halakhot of prayer, the mishna discusses less practical aspects of prayer. One who prays and realizes that he erred in his prayer, it is a bad omen for him; it indicates to him that his prayer was not accepted. And if he who erred is the communal prayer leader, it is a bad omen for those who sent him, because a person's agent has legal status equivalent to his own. On a similar note, they said about Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa that he would pray on behalf of the sick and immediately after his prayer he would say: This one shall recover from his illness and live and this one shall die. When they said to him: From where do you know? He said to them: If my prayer is fluent in my mouth as I recite it and there are no errors, I know that my prayer is accepted. And if not, I know that my prayer is rejected.

²²⁷ GEMARA: We learned in the mishna that if one errs in his prayer it is a bad omen. The Gemara asks: In which blessing is an error a bad omen?

²²⁸ Rabbi Ḥiyya said that Rav Safra said in the name of one of the Sages of the school of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi: An error is a bad omen in the first blessing of the Amida prayer, the blessing of Patriarchs."

²²⁹ Some teach that this statement was made on a baraita referring to another topic. It was taught in a baraita: One who prays must focus his heart in all of the blessings. And if he is unable to focus his heart in all of them, he should focus his heart at least in one.

²³⁰ Regarding this baraita, Rabbi Ḥiyya said that Rav Safra said in the name of one of the Sages of the school of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi: In one refers to the blessing of Patriarchs.

²³¹ We learned in the mishna: They said about Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa that the indication whether or not his prayer was accepted was whether the prayer was fluent in his mouth as he recited it. The Gemara asks: From where are these matters, that this is an accurate indication of whether or not his prayer was accepted, derived? Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: As the verse stated: “The Lord that creates the expression of the lips says, Peace, peace, to him that is far off and to him that is near; and I will heal him” (Isaiah 57:19). It can be inferred from this verse that if speech of the lips, fluent speech, is granted to one who prays, it indicates that his prayer on behalf of the ill has been accepted and I will heal him, that person will be healed.

²³² In conclusion of this discussion, the Gemara cites that which Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said with regard to the reward of the righteous: All the prophets only prophesied in their prophecies of consolation, with regard to one who values wisdom and therefore marries his daughter to a Torah scholar and to one who conducts business [perakmatya] on behalf of a Torah scholar as well as to one who utilizes his wealth to benefit a Torah scholar in some other way. However, the prophets did not describe the extent of the reward for Torah scholars themselves, whose reward is not quantifiable as it is stated: “And from of old they have not heard, they have not lent an ear, no eye has seen it, God, aside from You, who will do for those who await Him” (Isaiah 64:3).

²³³ And Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: All the prophets only prophesied with regard to the change in world order in the end of days with regard to the days of the Messiah. However, with regard to the World-to-Come, which exists on a higher level, it is stated: “No eye has seen it, God, aside from You.”

²³⁴ And the Gemara notes that this statement disagrees with the opinion of Shmuel, as Shmuel said: The only difference between this world and the days of the Messiah is with regard to servitude to foreign kingdoms alone. While in the days of the Messiah, Israel will be independent and free from enslavement to foreign powers, the world order will remain otherwise unchanged, as it is stated: “For the poor shall not cease from the land” (Deuteronomy 15:11), which indicates that the ways of the world are set and unchanging.

²³⁵ And Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: All of the prophets only prophesied their prophecies of consolation with regard to penitents but with regard to the full-fledged righteous it is stated: “No eye has seen it, God, aside from You.”

²³⁶ And the Gemara notes that this statement disagrees with the opinion of Rabbi Abbahu who holds that penitents are superior to the righteous. As Rabbi Abbahu said: In the place where penitents stand, even the full-fledged righteous do not stand, as it is stated: “Peace, peace upon him who is far and him who is near.” Peace and greeting is extended first to him who is far, the penitent, and only thereafter is peace extended to him who is near, the full-fledged righteous.

²³⁷ And Rabbi Yoḥanan could have said to you: What is the meaning of him who is far? This refers to the full-fledged righteous who was distant from an act of transgression from the outset, and to whom peace is extended first. What is meant by him who is near? This refers to the penitent who was close to an act of transgression but has now distanced himself from it, and to whom peace is extended only after it has been extended to him who has been righteous from the outset.

²³⁸ Earlier, Rabbi Yoḥanan said that there is a reward referred to in the verse: “No eye has seen it.” The Gemara asks: What is this reward about which it is said: “No eye has seen it”? Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: That is the wine that has been preserved in its grapes since the six days of creation and which no eye has ever seen. Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said: That is Eden, which no creature’s eye has ever surveyed.

²³⁹ Lest you will say: Where was Adam the first man? Wasn’t he there and didn’t he survey Eden? The Gemara responds: Adam was only in the Garden of Eden, not in Eden itself.

²⁴⁰ And lest you will say: It is the Garden and it is Eden; two names describing the same place. That is not the case, as the verse states: “And a river went out from Eden to water the Garden” (Genesis 2:10). Obviously, the Garden exists on its own and Eden exists on its own.

²⁴¹ Having mentioned Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa in our mishna, the Gemara proceeds to further praise the efficacy of his prayer: The Sages taught: There was an incident where Rabban Gamliel’s son fell ill. Rabban Gamliel dispatched two scholars to Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa to pray for mercy and healing on his behalf. When Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa saw them approaching, he went up to the attic on the roof of his house and prayed for mercy on his behalf. Upon his descent, he said to the messengers: You may go and return to Rabban Gamliel, as the fever has already left his son and he has been healed. The messengers asked him: How do you know? Are you a prophet? He replied to them: I am neither a prophet nor son of a prophet (see Amos 7:14), but I have received a tradition with regard to this indication: If my prayer is fluent in my mouth as I recite it and there are no errors, I know that my prayer is accepted. And if not, I know that my prayer is rejected. The Gemara relates that these messengers sat and wrote and approximated that precise moment when Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa told them this. When they came before Rabban Gamliel and related all that had happened and showed him what they had written, Rabban Gamliel said to them: I swear by the Temple service that in the time you wrote you were neither earlier or later; rather, this is how the event transpired: Precisely at that moment his fever broke and he asked us for water to drink.

²⁴² And there was another incident involving Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa, who went to study Torah before Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Zakkai, and Rabbi Yoḥanan’s son fell ill. He said to him: Ḥanina, my son, pray for mercy on behalf of my son so that he will live. Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa placed his head between his knees in order to meditate and prayed for mercy upon his behalf, and Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Zakkai’s son lived. Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Zakkai said about himself: Had ben Zakkai stuck his head between his knees throughout the entire day, they would have paid him no attention. His wife said to him: And is Ḥanina greater than you? He replied to her: No, but his prayer is better received than my own because he is like a servant before the King, and as such he is able to enter before the King and make various requests at all times. I, on the other hand, am like a minister before the King, and I can enter only when invited and can make requests only with regard to especially significant matters.

²⁴³ And on the topic of prayer, Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One may only pray in a house with windows, as then he can see the heavens and focus his heart, as it is stated with regard to Daniel’s prayer: “In his attic there were open windows facing Jerusalem” (Daniel 6:11).

²⁴⁴ With regard to the appropriate place to pray, Rav Kahana said: I consider impudent one who prays in a field.

²⁴⁵ Employing parallel language, Rav Kahana also said: I consider impudent one who specifies his transgression, as it is stated: “Happy is he whose iniquity is forgiven, whose transgression is covered

over” (Psalms 32:1); one who conceals his transgressions indicates that he is ashamed of them, and due to his shame he will be forgiven.

Chapter 6

¹ MISHNA: This mishna discusses the blessings recited over various foods. How does one recite a blessing over fruits? Over different fruits that grow on a tree one recites: Who creates fruit of the tree, with the exception of wine. Although wine is produced from fruit of the tree, due to its significance, its blessing differs from other fruits of the tree. Over wine one recites: Who creates fruit of the vine. Over fruits that grow from the earth, one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground, with the exception of bread. Bread, too, is significant and its blessing differs from other fruits of the ground, as over bread one recites: Who brings forth bread from the earth. Over herbs and leafy vegetables one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground. Rabbi Yehuda says that there is room to distinguish between fruits that grow from the earth, herbs, and leafy vegetables. Although they are all fruit of the ground, since they have different qualities, the blessing on the latter is: Who creates various kinds of herbs.

² GEMARA: Concerning the fundamental basis for blessings, the Gemara asks: From where are these matters, the obligation to recite a blessing before eating, derived? The Gemara answers: As the Sages taught in the Sifra: With regard to saplings, it is stated that in their fourth year their fruit will be: “...sanctified for praises before the Lord” (Leviticus 19:24). This verse teaches that they require praise of God in the form of a blessing both beforehand and thereafter, as the verse says praises in the plural. From here, Rabbi Akiva said: A person is forbidden to taste anything before he recites a blessing, as without reciting praise over food, it has the status of a consecrated item, from which one is forbidden to derive pleasure.

³ The Gemara asks: And did this verse: “Sanctified for praises,” come for that purpose? This verse is necessary to derive other matters. One being that the Merciful One said: Redeem it and then eat it. This midrash interprets hillul, praise, as ḥillul, redemption. And the other matter derived from this verse is: An object which is offered upon the altar and requires a song of praise when it is offered, as is the case with the libation of wine, requires redemption. And that which does not require a song of praise, all other fruits, does not require redemption. And this is in accordance with the opinion that Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said, as Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: From where is it derived that one only recites a song of praise in the Temple over the libation of wine on the altar? As it is stated: “And the vine replied: Should I leave my wine, which gladdens God and man, and go and wave above the trees?” (Judges 9:13). If wine gladdens people, in what way does it gladden God? Rather, derive from here that one only recites a song of praise over wine, as wine gladdens God when offered as part of the service in the Temple. In any case, other halakhot have been derived from this verse. From where, then, is the requirement to recite blessings derived?

⁴ Indeed, this works out well according to the one who taught, as a rule: A fourth-year sapling in the mishnayot dealing with the prohibition to eat fruits produced during the first three years of a tree’s existence and the sanctity of the fruit produced in its fourth year; as, in his opinion, fourth-year fruits that grow on all trees must be redeemed. However, according to the one who taught, as a rule: A

fourth-year grapevine, what can be said? Indeed, he derives the halakha that only wine that is accompanied by a song of praise requires redemption, from the interpretation of hillul as ḥillul. As it was stated: Rabbi Ḥiyya and Rabbi Shimon, son of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, one taught these mishnayot using the term: A fourth-year grapevine, and one taught using the term: A fourth-year sapling.

⁵ And according to the one who taught: A fourth year grapevine, this works out well if he derives this matter from a verbal analogy [gezera shava], and therefore need not derive this halakha from the term hillulim. As it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: It is stated here with regard to the laws of the prohibition of fruit for the tree's first three years: "But in the fifth year you may eat its fruit, so that it may increase your produce [tevuato]; I am the Lord your God" (Leviticus 19:25). And it is stated below, with regard to the laws of diverse kinds: "You shall not sow your vineyard with two kinds of seed, lest the growth of the seed that you have sown be forfeited with the produce [utevuat] of the vineyard" (Deuteronomy 22:9). Based on a verbal analogy, it can be derived: Just as below, with regard to the laws of diverse kinds, the produce is that which grows in vineyards; so too, here, with regard to the halakhot of the fruits of a sapling, the produce is that which grows in vineyards. Consequently, according to the one who holds this verbal analogy, one extra hillul remains from which to derive the blessing. Since he derives that the laws of fourth-year saplings apply only to grapes from the verbal analogy, he can derive the requirement to recite blessings before partaking of food from the word hillulim.

⁶ And if he does not derive this halakha by means of a verbal analogy, he must derive this halakha from the term hillulim, in which case, from where does he derive the mitzva to recite a blessing before partaking of food? And even if he derives this halakha by means of a verbal analogy, we found a source for the obligation to recite a blessing after eating, similar to the obligation stated in the verse: "And you will eat and be satisfied and then you shall bless." However, from where is it derived that there is an obligation to recite a blessing beforehand? From one hillul, the fundamental halakha of redemption of fourth-year saplings is derived.

⁷ The Gemara answers this: This is not difficult, as it may be derived by means of an a fortiori inference: If when he is satiated, after eating, he is obligated to recite a blessing over food, when he is hungry, before eating, all the more so that he is obligated to recite a blessing over food.

⁸ The Gemara comments: In that way, we found a source for the obligation to recite a blessing over the produce of vineyards, but from where is it derived with regard to other types of produce?

⁹ The Gemara responds: It is derived by means of the hermeneutic principle: What do we find, from the produce of a vineyard: Just as the fruit of the vineyard is an item from which one derives benefit and it requires a blessing, so too, any item from which one derives benefit, requires a blessing.

¹⁰ The Gemara rejects this proof: This derivation can be refuted, as a vineyard is unique: What is unique about a vineyard, that it is obligated in the mitzva requiring to give small, incomplete clusters of grapes [olelot] to the poor? That is a stringency that does not apply to other fruits. Perhaps the blessing is also a stringency that applies only to grapes.

¹¹ The Gemara answers: In that case, standing grain can prove that the halakha of olelot is not a factor in the obligation to recite a blessing. One is obligated by Torah law to recite a blessing after eating bread, even though the halakha of olelot does not apply to grain. The Gemara rejects this proof: What is unique about ripe grain, that it is obligated in the mitzva of separating ḥalla from the

dough? That is a stringency that does not apply to other foods. Perhaps the blessing is also a stringency that applies only to grain.

¹² The Gemara responds: In that regard, vineyards can prove that the halakha of ḥalla is not a factor in the obligation to recite a blessing. In summary: And the derivation has reverted to its starting point. However, at this point the halakha is derived from a combination of the two sources: The aspect of this is not like the aspect of that, and the aspect of that is not like the aspect of this; the common denominator is: Both are items from which one derives benefit and each requires a blessing. A general principle may be derived: So too, any item from which one derives benefit, requires a blessing.

¹³ Again, the Gemara objects: What is unique about the common denominator between grapes and grain that prevents utilizing it as a paradigm for other food items? Grapes and grain have an aspect of being offered upon the altar, and perhaps that is the reason that they require blessings. Based on that reasoning, although all other food items cannot be derived from the common denominator, an olive may also be derived as it too has an aspect of being offered upon the altar, as olive oil is one of the components of a meal offering.

¹⁴ The Gemara questions this point: Is an olive derived from the fact that it has an aspect of being offered upon the altar? Isn't it written explicitly with regard to the olive listed that the orchard in which it grows is called *kerem*; as it is written: "And burnt up from the shocks and the standing grain and the olive yards [*kerem zayit*]" (Judges 15:5)? Just as the orchard in which grapes grow is called *kerem*, and grapes require a blessing, the olive also grows in a *kerem* and should require a blessing. Rav Pappa said: Nevertheless, an analogy may not be drawn between the two; where the olive grows is called *kerem zayit*, it is not called *kerem* unmodified, which is a term reserved for grapevines.

¹⁵ The Gemara returns to the issue at hand, noting that in any case, it is difficult: What is unique about the common denominator between grapes and grain? That they possess an aspect of being offered upon the altar. Rather, it is derived from the obligation to recite a blessing upon the seven species. After the verse speaks of the seven species, it states: "And you will eat and be satisfied and then you shall bless." This is a paradigm for all other foods, that they too require a blessing: Just as the seven species are items from which one derives benefit and require a blessing, any item from which one derives benefit, requires a blessing.

¹⁶ Again, the Gemara rejects this: What is unique about the seven species? That one is obligated in the mitzva of first fruits. However, other produce with regard to which one is not obligated in the mitzva of first fruits, from where is it derived that they require a blessing? Furthermore, even if the seven species can serve as a paradigm, this works out well with regard to the blessing thereafter; but from where is the obligation to recite a blessing beforehand derived?

¹⁷ The Gemara responds to the question: This is not difficult, as it may be derived by means of an a fortiori inference: If when he is satiated, after eating, he is obligated to recite a blessing over food, when he is hungry, before eating, all the more so he is obligated to recite a blessing over food.

¹⁸ In any case, this is not an absolute proof. Furthermore, even according to the one who taught: A fourth-year sapling in all the relevant mishnayot, it works out well with regard to everything that can be planted, that one is obligated to recite a blessing. However, with regard to items that cannot be planted, such as meat, eggs, and fish, from where does he derive the halakha that one is obligated to recite a blessing? Rather, all previous attempts at deriving this halakha are rejected. The fundamental

obligation to recite a blessing over food is founded on reason: One is forbidden to derive benefit from this world without a blessing.

¹⁹ The Sages taught in a Tosefta: One is forbidden to derive benefit from this world, which is the property of God, without reciting a blessing beforehand. And anyone who derives benefit from this world without a blessing, it is as if he is guilty of misuse of a consecrated object. The Gemara adds: What is his remedy? He should go to a Sage.

²⁰ The Gemara is puzzled: He should go to a Sage; what will he do to him? How can the Sage help after he has already violated a prohibition? Rather, Rava said, this is how it should be understood: He should go to a Sage initially, in his youth, and the Sage will teach him blessings, so that he will not come to be guilty of this type of misuse of a consecrated object in the future.

²¹ Similarly, Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: One who derives benefit from this world without a blessing, it is as if he enjoyed objects consecrated to the heavens, as it is stated: “The earth and all it contains is the Lord’s, the world and all those who live in it” (Psalms 24:1). Rabbi Levi expressed this concept differently. Rabbi Levi raised a contradiction: It is written: “The earth and all it contains is the Lord’s,” and it is written elsewhere: “The heavens are the Lord’s and the earth He has given over to mankind” (Psalms 115:16). There is clearly a contradiction with regard to whom the earth belongs. He himself resolves the contradiction: This is not difficult. Here, the verse that says that the earth is the Lord’s refers to the situation before a blessing is recited,

²² and here, where it says that He gave the earth to mankind refers to after a blessing is recited.

²³ Rabbi Ḥanina bar Pappa said: Anyone who derives benefit from this world without a blessing, it is as if he stole from God and the community of Israel, as it is stated: “Whoever robs his father and his mother and says: It is no transgression, he is the companion of a destroyer” (Proverbs 28:24). The phrase, his father, refers to none other than God, as it is stated: “Is He not your Father Who created you, Who made you and established you” (Deuteronomy 32:6). The phrase his mother refers to none other than the community of Israel, as it is stated: “Hear, my son, the discipline of your father, and do not forsake the Torah of your mother” (Proverbs 1:8). The mention of the Torah as emanating from the mouth of the mother, apparently means that your mother is the community of Israel.

²⁴ What is the meaning of the continuation of the verse: He is the companion of a destroyer? Rabbi Ḥanina bar Pappa said: He is a companion of Jeroboam ben Nevat, who corrupted Israel before their Father in heaven by sinning and causing others to sin.

²⁵ On a similar note, the Gemara cites that Rabbi Ḥanina bar Pappa raised a contradiction: It is written, “I will take back My grain at its time and wine in its season” (Hosea 2:11), and it is written: “And you shall gather your grain, your wine and your oil” (Deuteronomy 11:14). To whom does the grain belong: To God, or to the people?

²⁶ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult. Here, where God promises Israel that they will gather their grain, the verse refers to a time when they perform God’s will. Here, where the verse indicates that the grain belongs to God, it refers to a time when they do not perform God’s will, as then He will take back the grain, demonstrating that it belongs to Him.

²⁷ The Sages taught: What is the meaning of that which the verse states: “And you shall gather your grain”? Because it is stated: “This Torah shall not depart from your mouths, and you shall contemplate in it day and night” (Joshua 1:8), I might have thought that these matters are to be

understood as they are written; one is to literally spend his days immersed exclusively in Torah study. Therefore, the verse states: “And you shall gather your grain, your wine and your oil,” assume in their regard, the way of the world; set aside time not only for Torah, but also for work. This is the statement of Rabbi Yishmael.

²⁸ Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai says: Is it possible that a person plows in the plowing season and sows in the sowing season and harvests in the harvest season and threshes in the threshing season and winnows in the windy season, as grain is separated from the chaff by means of the wind, and is constantly busy; what will become of Torah? Rather, one must dedicate himself exclusively to Torah at the expense of other endeavors; as when Israel performs God’s will, their work is performed by others, as it is stated: “And strangers will stand and feed your flocks, and foreigners will be your plowmen and your vinedressers” (Isaiah 61:5). When Israel does not perform God’s will, their work is performed by them themselves, as it is stated: “And you shall gather your grain.” Moreover, if Israel fails to perform God’s will, others’ work will be performed by them, as it is stated: “You shall serve your enemy whom God shall send against you, in hunger, in thirst, in nakedness and in want of all things” (Deuteronomy 28:48).

²⁹ Summing up this dispute, Abaye said: Although there is room for both opinions, many have acted in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael, and combined working for a living and learning Torah, and although they engaged in activities other than the study of Torah, were successful in their Torah study. Many have acted in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai and were not successful in their Torah study. They were ultimately forced to abandon their Torah study altogether.

³⁰ Similarly, Rava said to the Sages who would attend his study hall: I implore you; during the months of Nisan and Tishrei, the crucial agricultural periods, do not appear before me. Engage in your agricultural work then so that you will not be preoccupied with your sustenance all year.

³¹ Summarizing these statements, Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of the tanna Rabbi Yehuda, son of Rabbi El’ai: Come and see that the latter generations are not like the earlier generations; rather they are their inferiors. The earlier generations made their Torah permanent and their work occasional, and this, Torah study, and that, their work, were successful for them. However, the latter generations who made their work permanent and their Torah occasional, neither this nor that was successful for them.

³² Along these lines, Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Yehuda, son of Rabbi El’ai: Come and see that the latter generations are not like the earlier generations. In the earlier generations, people would bring their fruits into their courtyards through the main gate in order to obligate them in tithes. However, the latter generations bring their fruits through roofs, through courtyards and through enclosed courtyards, avoiding the main gate in order to exempt them from the mitzva of tithing. As Rabbi Yannai said: Untithed produce is not obligated in the mitzva of tithing until it sees the front of the house through which people enter and exit, and it is brought into the house that way as it is stated in the formula of the confession of the tithes: “I have removed the consecrated from the house” (Deuteronomy 26:13), as the obligation to tithe produce whose purpose has not yet been designated takes effect only when it is brought into the house.

³³ And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even bringing it into the courtyard determines its status as having completed the production process and obligates the produce to be tithed, as it is written in the

confession of the tithes: “And I have given to the Levite, the stranger, the orphan and the widow, and they shall eat in your gates and be satisfied” (Deuteronomy 26:12).

³⁴ We learned in our mishna: Over fruits that grow on a tree one recites: Who creates fruit of the tree, with the exception of wine that even though it originates from fruit of the tree, a separate blessing was established for it: Who creates the fruit of the vine. The Gemara asks: What is different about wine, that a separate blessing was established for it? If you say that because the fruit changed for the better into wine, therefore, the blessing changed. Olive oil changed for the better and nevertheless, its blessing did not change. As Rabbi Yehuda said that Shmuel said, and so too Rabbi Yitzḥak said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Over olive oil, one recites: Who creates fruit of the tree, just as he does over the fruit itself.

³⁵ The Sages said: There, in the case of oil, it is because it is impossible to find an appropriate blessing, as how shall we recite the blessing? If we recite the blessing: Who creates fruit of the olive, the fruit itself is called olive and that is what was created. The oil is a man-made product of that fruit, rendering that formula inappropriate. Similarly, reciting a formula parallel to the blessing on wine: Who creates the fruit of the vine, is inappropriate as the grapes themselves are the fruit that was created, as opposed to oil which was not.

³⁶ The Gemara challenges: Nevertheless, it is still possible to formulate a blessing, as we may recite the blessing: Who creates fruit of the olive tree, which would be parallel to the blessing recited over wine. Rather, Mar Zutra offered a different rationale: The reason that no separate blessing was established over oil is because, as opposed to wine that nourishes, oil does not nourish.

³⁷ The Gemara asks: And oil does not nourish? Didn’t we learn in a mishna: One who vows that nourishment is forbidden to him is permitted to eat water and salt, as they are not considered nourishment. And we discussed this halakha: By inference, water and salt are not considered nourishment, but all other edible items are considered nourishment.

³⁸ Let us say that this is a conclusive refutation of Rav and Shmuel, who said: One only recites: Who creates various kinds of nourishment, over the five species of grain alone, as they alone are considered nourishing. And Rav Huna said as a solution that this mishna referred to a case where he vows and says: Anything that nourishes is prohibited to me. That formula includes anything that is at all nourishing and therefore only water and salt are excluded. Olive oil is not excluded.

³⁹ Apparently, oil nourishes. Rather, there is another distinction between wine and oil: Wine satisfies, oil does not satisfy. Wine not only nourishes, but it is also filling. The Gemara asks: And does wine satisfy? Wouldn’t Rava drink wine all day on the eve of Passover in order to stimulate his heart, i.e., whet his appetite so that he might eat more matza at the seder? Wine does not satisfy, it whets the appetite. The Gemara answers: A lot of wine stimulates, a little satisfies.

⁴⁰ Again, the Gemara asks: Does wine satisfy at all? Isn’t it written: “Wine gladdens the heart of man, making the face brighter than oil, and bread fills man’s heart” (Psalms 104:15); bread is that which satisfies, wine does not satisfy. Rather, this verse is not a proof; wine has two advantages, it satisfies and gladdens. Bread, however, satisfies but does not gladden.

⁴¹ Since wine possesses all of these virtues, the Gemara asks: If so, let us recite the three blessings of Grace after Meals over it after drinking, just as we do after eating bread. The Gemara answers: People do not base their meals on wine.

⁴² Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said to Rava: If one based his meal on it, what is the ruling? Must he recite the Grace after Meals as he does after bread? He replied: When Elijah comes and says whether or not it can serve as the basis for a meal, this will be resolved. Nevertheless, now, until then, his intention is rendered irrelevant by the opinions of all other men and he is not required to recite the complete Grace after Meals.

⁴³ Previously, the Gemara cited the halakha that one recites the blessing: Who creates fruit of the tree, over olive oil. The Gemara discusses the matter itself. Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said, and so too Rabbi Yitzḥak said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One recites the blessing: Who creates fruit of the tree, over olive oil just as he does over the fruit itself. What are the circumstances? If you say that he drank it plain, it causes damage to the drinker. As it was taught in a baraita: One who drinks oil of teruma, while unaware that it was teruma, pays the principal and does not pay the additional fifth which is the typical penalty for unintentional misuse of consecrated property, as in that case the individual is considered to have only damaged consecrated property without deriving benefit from it. One who anoints his body with the oil of teruma pays the principal and pays the fifth, as he derived benefit from it. Apparently, one who drinks oil derives no benefit and it even causes him damage.

⁴⁴ Rather, it is referring to a case where he eats the oil by dipping bread into it. If so, the bread is primary and the oil secondary, and we learned in a mishna: This is the principle: Any food that is primary, and is eaten with food that is secondary, one recites a blessing over the primary food, and that blessing exempts the secondary from the requirement to recite a blessing before eating it. A blessing need only be recited over the bread, not over the oil. Rather, it is referring to a case where he is drinking it by means of an anigeron, as Rabba bar Shmuel said: Anigeron is water in which a beet was boiled, anisigeron is the water

⁴⁵ in which all boiled vegetables were boiled. A certain amount of oil is added to anigeron.

⁴⁶ However, if so, here too, anigeron is primary and oil is secondary, and we learned in a mishna: This is the principle: Any food that is primary, and it is eaten with food that is secondary, one recites a blessing over the primary food, and that blessing exempts the secondary from the requirement to recite a blessing before eating it. One need recite a blessing only over the anigeron.

⁴⁷ The Gemara reconciles: With what are we dealing here? With one who has a sore throat, which he is treating with oil. As it was taught in a baraita: One who has a sore throat should not, *ab initio*, gargle oil on Shabbat for medicinal purposes, as doing so would violate the decree prohibiting the use of medicine on Shabbat. However, he may, even *ab initio*, add a large amount of oil to the anigeron and swallow it. Since it is common practice to swallow oil either alone or with a secondary ingredient like anigeron for medicinal purposes, in this case one recites: Who creates fruit of the tree.

⁴⁸ The Gemara challenges: This is obvious that one must recite a blessing. The Gemara responds: Lest you say: Since he intends to use it for medicinal purposes, let him not recite a blessing over it at all, as one does not recite a blessing before taking medicine. Therefore, it teaches us that, since he derived pleasure from it, he must recite a blessing over it.

⁴⁹ The Gemara clarifies: If one was eating plain wheat flour, what blessing would he recite? Rav Yehuda said that one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground, and Rav Naḥman said that one recites: By Whose word all things came to be.

⁵⁰ Rava said to Rav Nahman: Do not disagree with Rav Yehuda, as Rabbi Yoḥanan and Shmuel hold in accordance with his opinion, even though they addressed another topic. As Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said, and so too Rabbi Yitzḥak said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One recites the blessing: Who creates fruit of the tree, over olive oil. Consequently, even though the olive has changed into olive oil, the formula of the blessing remains as it was. This too, even though the wheat has changed into flour, its blessing remains as it was: Who creates fruit of the ground.

⁵¹ The Gemara responds: Is it comparable? There, the olive oil has no potential for additional enhancement, while here, the flour has the potential for additional enhancement as bread. Since oil is the olive's finished product, one should recite the same blessing over it as over the tree itself. Wheat flour, on the other hand, is used to bake bread, so the flour is a raw material for which neither the blessing over wheat nor the blessing over bread is appropriate. Only the blessing: By Whose word all things came to be is appropriate.

⁵² The Gemara asks: When it has a potential for additional enhancement, one does not recite: Who creates fruit of the ground; rather one recites: By Whose word all things came to be? Didn't Rabbi Zeira say that Rav Mattana said that Shmuel said: Over a raw gourd and over barley flour, one recites the blessing: By Whose word all things came to be. What, is that not to say that over wheat flour one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground? Over barley flour, which people do not typically eat, it is appropriate to recite: By Whose word all things came to be. Over wheat flour, it is appropriate to recite: Who creates fruit of the ground.

⁵³ This argument is rejected: No, one also recites: By Whose word all things came to be, over wheat flour.

⁵⁴ The Gemara asks: Then let the Sages teach us that this halakha applies with regard to wheat flour, and all the more so regarding barley flour as well.

⁵⁵ The Gemara responds: It was necessary to teach us that one must recite a blessing even before eating barley flour. Had the Sages taught us this halakha with regard to wheat, I would have said: This applies only with regard to wheat flour, but over barley flour, let one not recite a blessing at all. Therefore, it teaches us that one recites a blessing over barley flour.

⁵⁶ The Gemara challenges this explanation. How could one have considered that possibility? Is it inferior to salt and salt water [zamt]? As we learned in a mishna that over salt and salt water one recites: By Whose word all things came to be, and all the more so it should be recited over barley flour. This question is rejected: Nevertheless, it was necessary to teach the halakha regarding barley flour, as it might enter your mind to say: Although one occasionally places salt or salt water into his mouth, barley flour, which is damaging to one who eats it and causes intestinal worms, let one recite no blessing over it at all. Therefore, it teaches us, since one derives pleasure from it, he must recite a blessing.

⁵⁷ Another dispute over the appropriate blessing is with regard to the heart of palm [kura], which is a thin membrane covering young palm branches that was often eaten. Rav Yehuda said that one should recite: Who creates fruit of the ground. And Shmuel, Rav Yehuda's teacher, said that one should recite: By Whose word all things came to be.

⁵⁸ Rav Yehuda said: Who creates fruit of the ground; it is a fruit. And Shmuel said: By Whose word all things came to be, since it will ultimately harden and it is considered part of the tree, not a fruit.

⁵⁹ Shmuel said to Rav Yehuda: Shinnana. It is reasonable to rule in accordance with your opinion, as a radish ultimately hardens if left in the ground; nevertheless, one who eats it while it is soft recites over it: Who creates fruit of the ground. In any case, despite this praise, the Gemara states: That is not so; people plant a radish with the soft radish in mind. However, people do not plant palm trees with the heart of palm in mind and therefore it cannot be considered a fruit.

⁶⁰ In response to this, the Gemara asks: And whenever people do not plant with that result in mind, one does not recite a blessing over it? What of the caper-bush that people plant with their fruit in mind, and we learned in a mishna that with regard to the parts of the caper-bush [nitzpa], over the leaves and young fronds, one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground, and over the berries and buds he recites: Who creates fruit of the tree. This indicates that even over leaves and various other parts of the tree that are secondary to the fruit, the blessing is: Who creates fruit of the ground, and not: By Whose word all things came to be.

⁶¹ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said that there is still a difference: Caper-bushes, people plant them with their leaves in mind; palm trees, people do not plant them with the heart of palm in mind. Therefore, no proof may be brought from the halakha in the case of the caper-bush to the halakha in the case of the palm. The Gemara concludes: Although Shmuel praised Rav Yehuda, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel.

⁶² Incidental to this discussion, the Gemara cites an additional halakha concerning the caper-bush. Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: A caper-bush during the first three years of its growth [orla] outside of Eretz Yisrael, when its fruits are prohibited by rabbinic and not Torah law, one throws out the berries, the primary fruit, but eats the buds. The Gemara raises the question: Is that to say that the berries are fruit of the caper, and the bud is not fruit? The Gemara raises a contradiction from what we learned in the mishna cited above: With regard to the parts of the caper-bush [nitzpa], over the leaves and young fronds, one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground, and over the berries, and buds he recites: Who creates fruit of the tree. Obviously, the buds are also considered the fruit of the caper-bush.

⁶³ The Gemara responds: Rav's statement is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, as we learned in a mishna that Rabbi Eliezer says: A caper-bush is tithed from its component parts, its young fronds, berries and buds, as all these are considered its fruit. And Rabbi Akiva says: Only the berries alone are tithed, because it alone is considered fruit. It was in accordance with this opinion, that Rav prohibited only the eating of the berries during the caper-bush's years of orla.

⁶⁴ The Gemara asks: If this is the case, why did Rav issue what seemed to be an independent ruling regarding orla? He should have simply said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, from which we could have drawn a practical halakhic conclusion regarding orla as well. The Gemara responds: Had Rav said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, I would have said that the halakha is in accordance with his opinion even in Eretz Yisrael. Therefore, he teaches us by stating the entire halakha, that there is a principle: Anyone who is lenient in a dispute with regard to the halakhot of orla in Eretz Yisrael, the halakha is in accordance with his opinion outside of Eretz Yisrael, but not in Eretz Yisrael.

⁶⁵ The Gemara questions this: If so, then let Rav say: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva outside of Eretz Yisrael as anyone who is lenient in a dispute with regard to the halakhot of orla in Eretz Yisrael, the halakha is in accordance with his opinion outside of Eretz

Yisrael. The Gemara answers: Had he said that, I would have said: That only applies with regard to the tithing of trees, which even in Eretz Yisrael itself is an obligation by rabbinic law; but with regard to orla, which is prohibited in Eretz Yisrael by Torah law, say that we should issue a decree prohibiting orla even outside of Eretz Yisrael. Therefore, he teaches us that even with regard to orla, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva.

⁶⁶ On this topic, the Gemara relates: Ravina found Mar bar Rav Ashi throwing away the berries and eating the buds of an orla caper-bush. Ravina said to Mar bar Rav Ashi: What is your opinion, that you are eating the buds? If it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who is lenient, then you should act in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai, who are even more lenient. As we learned in a mishna with regard to the laws of forbidden mixtures of diverse kinds that Beit Shammai say: A caper-bush is considered a diverse kind in the vineyard, as it is included in the prohibition against planting vegetables in a vineyard. Beit Hillel say: A caper-bush is not considered a diverse kind in a vineyard. Nevertheless, these and those, Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel, agree that the caper-bush is obligated in the prohibition of orla.

⁶⁷ Before dealing with the problem posed by Ravina to Mar bar Rav Ashi, the Gemara notes an internal contradiction in this mishna. This mishna itself is problematic: You said that Beit Shammai say: A caper-bush is considered a diverse kind in a vineyard; apparently, they hold that it is a type of vegetable bush, and then you taught: These and those, Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel, agree that the caper-bush is obligated in the prohibition of orla; apparently, it is a type of tree.

⁶⁸ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult; Beit Shammai are uncertain whether the caper-bush is a vegetable bush or a tree, and here, regarding diverse kinds, they act stringently and here, regarding orla, they act stringently. In any case, according to Beit Shammai the caper-bush has the status of uncertain orla, and we learned the consensus halakha in a mishna: Uncertain orla in Eretz Yisrael is forbidden to eat, and in Syria it is permitted, and we are not concerned about its uncertain status. Outside of Eretz Yisrael, the gentile owner of a field may go down into his field

⁶⁹ and take from the orla fruit, and as long as the Jew does not see him gather it, he may purchase the fruit from the gentile. If so, then outside of Eretz Yisrael, one may act in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai who hold that the caper-bush has the status of uncertain orla, and eat even the berries without apprehension.

⁷⁰ The Gemara answers: The general rule that outside of Eretz Yisrael one acts in accordance with the lenient opinion in a dispute within Eretz Yisrael applies when Rabbi Akiva expresses a more lenient opinion in place of Rabbi Eliezer, and we act in accordance with his opinion. And however, when Beit Shammai express an opinion where Beit Hillel disagree, their opinion is considered as if it were not in the mishna, and is completely disregarded.

⁷¹ The Gemara approaches this matter from a different perspective: Let us derive the halakha that buds are included in the prohibition of orla from the fact that the bud serves as protection for the fruit, and the Torah says: "When you enter the land and plant any tree for food you shall regard its fruit [et piryu] as orla" (Leviticus 19:23), and et piryu is interpreted to mean that which is secondary to the fruit. What is that? That section of the plant which is protection for the fruit. The buds should be prohibited as orla, since they protect the fruit.

⁷² Rava said: Where do we say that a section of the plant becomes protection for the fruit? That is specifically when it exists both when the fruit is detached from the tree and when it is still connected

to the tree. However, here, it exists when the fruit is connected to the tree, but when it is detached it does not, and since the protection falls off of the fruit when it is picked, it is no longer considered protection.

⁷³ Abaye raised a challenge based on what we learned with regard to the halakhot of ritual impurity: The crown of a pomegranate joins together with the pomegranate as a unified entity with regard to calculating the requisite size in order to become ritually impure. And its flower, however, does not join together with the pomegranate in that calculation. From the fact that it says that the pomegranate's flower does not join, consequently the flower is secondary to the fruit and is not considered food. And we learned in a mishna regarding the laws of orla: The rinds of a pomegranate and its flower, nutshells, and pits of all kinds, are all obligated in the prohibition of orla. This indicates that the criteria dictating what is considered protection of a fruit and what is considered the fruit itself with regard to ritual impurity, are not the same criteria used with regard to orla, as is illustrated by the case of the pomegranate flower. Therefore, even if the buds are not regarded as protecting the fruit with regard to ritual impurity, they may still be considered fruit with regard to orla.

⁷⁴ Rather, Rava said another explanation: Where do we say that a section of the plant becomes protection for the fruit? Where it exists when the fruit is ripe. This bud does not exist when the fruit is ripe, because it falls off beforehand.

⁷⁵ The Gemara challenges this explanation as well: Is that so? Didn't Rav Nahman say that Rabba bar Avuh said: Those orla date coverings are prohibited, because they became protection for the fruit. And when do these coverings serve as protection for the fruit? When the fruit is still young; and he, nevertheless, calls them protection for the fruit. This indicates that in order to be considered protection for the fruit it need not remain until the fruit is fully ripened. The question remains: Why are the buds not accorded the same status as the berries of the caper-bush?

⁷⁶ The Gemara explains that Rav Nahman held in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, as we learned in a mishna that Rabbi Yosei says: The grape-bud, i.e., a cluster of grapes in its earliest stage, immediately after the flowers dropped from the vine, is prohibited due to orla, because it is already considered a fruit. According to this opinion, even the date coverings that exist in the earliest stage of the ripening process are nevertheless considered protection for the fruit and prohibited due to orla. The Rabbis disagree with him, explaining that fruit at that stage is not considered fruit; and, therefore, the date coverings and caper-bush buds are not considered protection for the fruit and are not prohibited due to orla.

⁷⁷ Rav Shimi of Neharde'a strongly objects to this halakha: Do the Rabbis disagree with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei with regard to the fruits of all other trees besides grapes, that even in the very first stage of ripening, they are considered fruit? Didn't we learn in a mishna: With regard to fruit, which grows during the Sabbatical year, the Torah says: "And the Shabbat of the land shall be to you for eating" (Leviticus 25:6). The Sages inferred, for eating, and not for loss. Because one is prohibited from discarding fruit grown during the Sabbatical year, the question is raised: From when may one no longer cut trees during the Sabbatical year as he thereby damages the fruit? Beit Shammai say: All trees, from when the blossoms fall off and fruit begins to emerge in its earliest stage. And Beit Hillel say: There is a distinction between different types of trees. Carob trees may not be cut from when

they form chains of carobs, vines may not be cut misheyegaru, explained below, olives from when they blossom, and all other trees from when fruit emerges.

⁷⁸ And Rav Asi said: Sheyegaru in our mishna is to be understood: It is an unripe grape, it is a grape kernel, it is a white bean. Before this is even explained, the Gemara expresses its astonishment: Does it enter your mind that the grape is, at any stage, a white bean? Rather, say: Its size, that of an unripe grape, is equivalent to the size of a white bean. In any case, whom did you hear that said: An unripe grape, yes, is considered fruit, while a grape-bud, no, is not considered fruit? Wasn't it the Rabbis who disagree with Rabbi Yosei, and it is taught that, according to these Sages, one is forbidden to cut all other trees from when fruit emerges. This indicates that even they agree that from the very beginning of the ripening process, the fruit is forbidden due to orla. The question remains: Why are the buds permitted?

⁷⁹ Rather, Rava said a different explanation: Where do we say that a section of the plant becomes protection for the fruit? Where if you remove the protection, the fruit dies. Here, in the case of the caper-bush, when you remove the bud, the fruit does not die.

⁸⁰ In fact, there was an incident and they removed the flower of a pomegranate, and the pomegranate withered. And they removed the flower of the fruit of a caper-bush and the fruit of the caper-bush survived. Therefore, buds are not considered protection for the fruit.

⁸¹ The Gemara concludes: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Mar bar Rav Ashi, who discarded the berries and ate the buds. And since they are not considered fruit with regard to orla, they are also not considered fruit with regard to blessings, and one does not recite over them: Who creates fruit of the tree, but rather: Who creates fruit of the ground.

⁸² The question arose with regard to the blessing over peppers. Rav Sheshet said: One who eats peppers must recite: By Whose word all things came to be. Rava said: One need not recite a blessing at all. This is consistent with Rava's opinion that eating peppers is not considered eating, as Rava said: One who chews on peppers on Yom Kippur is exempt, one who chews on ginger on Yom Kippur is exempt. Eating sharp spices is an uncommon practice, and is therefore not considered to be eating, which is prohibited by Torah law on Yom Kippur.

⁸³ The Gemara raised an objection to this based on what was taught in a baraita, that regarding the verse: "When you enter the land and plant any tree for food you shall regard its fruit as orla" (Leviticus 19:23), Rabbi Meir would say: By inference from that which is stated: "You shall regard its fruit as orla," don't I know that it is referring to a tree that produces food? Rather, for what purpose does the verse state: "Any tree for food"? To include a tree whose wood and fruit have the same taste. And which tree is this? This is the pepper tree. And this comes to teach you that the peppers, and even the wood portions, are edible and are therefore obligated in the prohibition of orla, and to teach that Eretz Yisrael lacks nothing, as it is stated: "A land where you shall eat bread without scarceness, you shall lack nothing" (Deuteronomy 8:9). Obviously, peppers are fit for consumption.

⁸⁴ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult, as there is a distinction between two different cases. This, where Rabbi Meir spoke of peppers fit for consumption, is referring to a case when it is damp and fresh; and this, where chewing on pepper is not considered eating on Yom Kippur and does not require a blessing, is referring to a case when it is dry.

⁸⁵ With regard to this discussion of chewing pepper on Yom Kippur, the Gemara cites what the Sages said to Mareimar: Why is one who chews ginger on Yom Kippur exempt? Didn't Rava say: One is permitted to eat the ginger that comes from India, and over it, one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground. With regard to blessing, it is considered edible; therefore, with regard to chewing on Yom Kippur, it should be considered edible as well. The Gemara responds: This is not difficult. This, where a blessing is recited, is referring to a case when it is damp and fresh; this, where no blessing is recited, is referring to a case when it is dry.

⁸⁶ The Gemara cites a similar dispute with regard to the blessing be recited over *havitz*, a dish consisting of flour, oil, and honey cooked in a pot as well as pounded grain. Rav Yehuda said that one recites: By Whose word all things came to be. Rav Kahana said that one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment. The Gemara explains: With regard to pounded grain alone, everyone agrees that one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment. When they argue, it is with regard to pounded grain mixed with honey, in the manner of a *havitz* cooked in a pot. Rav Yehuda said that one recites: By Whose word all things came to be, as he held that the honey is primary, and on honey one recites: By Whose word all things came to be. Rav Kahana said that one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, as he held that the flour, as is the case with all products produced from grain, is primary, and therefore one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment. Rav Yosef said: It is reasonable to say in accordance with the opinion of Rav Kahana, as Rav and Shmuel both said: Anything that has of the five species of grain in it, one recites over it: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, even if it is mixed with other ingredients.

⁸⁷ With regard to the halakha of the blessing recited over the five species of grain, the Gemara clarifies the matter itself. Rav and Shmuel both said: Anything that has of the five species of grain in it, one recites over it: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment. Elsewhere, it was stated that Rav and Shmuel both said: Anything that is from the five species of grain, one recites over it: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment. This is problematic, as these statements appear redundant.

⁸⁸ The Gemara explains: Both statements are necessary, as had he taught us only: Anything that is from the five species of grain, one recites over it: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, I would have said that is because the grain is in its pure, unadulterated form, but if one eats it in the context of a mixture, no, one does not recite: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment.

⁸⁹ Therefore, he teaches us: Anything that has of the five species of grain in it, even if it is in the context of a mixture with other ingredients. And had he taught us only: Anything that has of the five species of grain in it, I would have said that specifically over anything that has of the five species of grain in it, yes, one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, even if it is in the context of a mixture with other ingredients. However, over anything that has rice and millet in it, no, one does not recite: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, because one is eating it in the context of a mixture. However, if the rice or millet is in its pure, unadulterated form, say that even over rice and millet one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, because they, too, are types of grain. Therefore, he teaches us specifically: Anything that is from the five species of grain, one recites over it: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, to the exclusion of rice and millet, over which, even in its pure, unadulterated form, one does not recite: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment.

⁹⁰ With regard to the previous conclusion, the Gemara asks: And over rice and millet we do not recite: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment? But wasn't it taught in a baraita: If they brought before him rice bread or millet bread, he recites the blessing over it both before and after, as he would recite the blessing over a cooked dish containing dough from the five species of the grain. And with regard to a cooked dish, it was taught in a baraita: At the start, one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, and at the end, one recites one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals [al hamihya]. Apparently, one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, over rice and millet.

⁹¹ The Gemara rejects this proof: Indeed, rice or millet is like a cooked dish, and is not like a cooked dish in every sense. The Gemara elaborates: It is considered like a cooked dish in that one recites a blessing over it both at the beginning and the end. And it is unlike a cooked dish in that over a cooked dish, at the start, one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, and at the end, one recites one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals; whereas here, over rice, at the start, one recites: By Whose word all things came to be, and at the end, one recites: Who creates the many forms of life and their needs for all that You have created.

⁹² The Gemara challenges: And rice is not a cooked dish? Wasn't it taught in a baraita that these are cooked dishes: Wheat kernels split into two parts, wheat kernels crushed into three parts [teraggis], flour, wheat kernels crushed into four parts [zariz], wheat kernels crushed into five parts [arsan] and rice? Apparently, rice is considered a cooked dish like crushed wheat.

⁹³ The Gemara responds: Whose opinion is reflected in this baraita? It is Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Nuri's opinion, as it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Nuri says: Rice is a type of grain in every respect and, therefore, one is liable to death by karet if it leavens on Passover and he eats it intentionally. And a person who ate matza baked from rice flour fulfills his obligation on Passover; however, according to the Rabbis, no, rice is not in the category of a cooked dish.

⁹⁴ The Gemara challenges this: And the Rabbis hold that rice is not considered a cooked dish? Wasn't it taught in a Tosefta: One who chews wheat recites: Who creates fruit of the ground. However, if he ground the wheat, baked it, and cooked the bread, there is a distinction between two situations: When the slices are intact and did not dissolve in the boiling process, at the start one recites: Who brings forth bread from the earth, and at the end one recites the three blessings of Grace after Meals, as he does after eating bread. When the slices dissolved in the course of the boiling process and are not intact, then at the start one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, and at the end one recites one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals.

⁹⁵ One who chews rice recites: Who creates fruit of the ground. If one ground it, baked it, and then cooked it, even though the pieces are intact, at the start one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, and at the end one recites one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals.

⁹⁶ The Gemara discusses this Tosefta: Whose opinion is reflected in this Tosefta? If you say that it is the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Nuri who said that rice is a type of grain, it should have said that one must recite: Who brings forth bread from the earth, beforehand and the three blessings of Grace after Meals thereafter, as he does after eating bread.

⁹⁷ Rather, isn't it the opinion of the Rabbis, who hold that rice is not a type of grain, but nevertheless hold that over rice one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment? If so, this is a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rav and Shmuel.

⁹⁸ The Gemara comments: Indeed, this is a conclusive refutation of their opinion.

⁹⁹ Above, it was taught in the Tosefta that the Master said: One who chews wheat recites: Who creates fruit of the ground. The Gemara challenges: Wasn't it taught in a baraita that one who chews wheat recites: Who creates various kinds of seeds? The Gemara resolves the problem: This is not difficult, as it is the subject of a tannaitic dispute. This opinion, that one must recite: Who creates various kinds of seeds, is the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and this opinion, that one must recite: Who creates fruit of the ground, is the opinion of the Rabbis. As we learned in our mishna: Over herbs and leafy vegetables one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground. Rabbi Yehuda says: Who creates various kinds of herbs. Rabbi Yehuda designates specific blessings for every type of plant, and he certainly distinguishes between vegetables in general and seeds.

¹⁰⁰ It was taught in the same Tosefta that the Master said: One who chews rice recites: Who creates fruit of the ground. If one ground it, baked it and then cooked it, even though the pieces are intact, at the start one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, and at the end one recites one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals.

¹⁰¹ The Gemara raises the challenge: Wasn't it taught in a baraita that in that case, at the end one need not recite any of the blessings recited over the fruits of Eretz Yisrael, but rather: Who creates the many forms of life. Rav Sheshet said: This is not difficult, as this is the subject of a tannaitic dispute. This, that one recites one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals, is the opinion of Rabban Gamliel. This, that one need only recite: Who creates the many forms of life, is the opinion of the Rabbis. As it was taught in a Tosefta that this is the principle: Anything that is from the seven species of grain and fruits for which Eretz Yisrael is praised, Rabban Gamliel says: Afterwards, one recites the three blessings of the Grace after Meals. And the Rabbis say: One blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals is sufficient.

¹⁰² The Gemara relates: And there was an incident involving Rabban Gamliel and the Sages who were sitting in an upper floor in Jericho and they brought dates before them and they ate. And afterwards, Rabban Gamliel gave Rabbi Akiva permission to recite the blessing. Rabbi Akiva hurried and recited one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals. Rabban Gamliel said: Akiva, until when will you continue to stick your head into the dispute among the Sages with regard to what you did? Rabbi Akiva said to him: Our teacher, even though you say this while your colleagues disagree and say that, you taught us, our teacher, the general principle that guides resolution of halakhic disputes: In a dispute between an individual and the many, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of the many. Although you are the Nasi, it is appropriate to act in accordance with the opinion of the many.

¹⁰³ The Gemara records a variation on the dispute between Rabban Gamliel and the Rabbis: Rabbi Yehuda says in his name, the name of Rabbi Akiva. With regard to anything that is from the seven species

¹⁰⁴ and is not a species of grain, but one of the fruits, or which is a species of grain and has not been made into bread, there is a dispute. Rabban Gamliel says that one recites the three blessings of the Grace after Meals and the Rabbis say that one recites a single blessing. And over anything that is

neither one of the seven species nor a species of grain, such as rice bread or millet bread, Rabban Gamliel says that after eating, one recites one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals, and the Rabbis say that one need not recite any blessing, i.e., Grace after Meals or one blessing abridged from three, but instead he recites: Who creates the many forms of life. If so, the Tosefta, which says that after rice one recites one blessing abridged from three, is in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda's version of Rabban Gamliel's opinion.

¹⁰⁵ The Gemara challenges: How did you establish the Tosefta? In accordance with the opinion of Rabban Gamliel. Say the latter clause of the first section of this Tosefta, which states that even over wheat bread, when the slices are not intact, then at the start one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, and at the end one recites one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals. Whose opinion is reflected in that section of the Tosefta? If it is the opinion of Rabban Gamliel, now if over dates and pounded wheat, Rabban Gamliel said that one recites the three blessings of Grace after Meals, in a case where the slices of bread are not intact, is it necessary to say that one recites Grace after Meals?

¹⁰⁶ Rather, it is clear that the Tosefta is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. If so, there is a contradiction between one opinion of the Rabbis and a second opinion of the Rabbis. The Gemara resolves the contradiction: Rather, actually, the Tosefta is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis and emend the text and teach with regard to rice: At the end, one does not recite any blessing, consistent with their opinion in the baraita.

¹⁰⁷ With regard to the blessings recited over various types of porridge, Rava said: Over the farmer's mixture of flour and honey to which they add extra flour, one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment. What is the reason? Because the flour is the primary ingredient in the mixture. Over this same dish, however, when it is prepared in the manner that it is prepared in Mehoza where they do not add extra flour, one recites: By Whose word all things came to be. What is the reason? Because in that dish, the honey is the primary ingredient. And Rava reconsidered and said: Over both this, the mixture of the farmers, and that, the mixture of Mehoza, one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment. As Rav and Shmuel both said: Anything that is from the five species of grain, one recites over it: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment.

¹⁰⁸ Rav Yosef said: Over this cooked dish, which contains pieces of bread that are the size of an olive-bulk, at the start one recites: Who brings forth bread from the earth, and afterward one recites the three blessings of Grace after Meals as he would over bread. Over that same cooked dish, which does not contain pieces of bread that are the size of an olive-bulk, at the start one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, and at the end one recites one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals, as he would over a cooked dish.

¹⁰⁹ And Rav Yosef said: From where do I say this halakha? As it was taught in a baraita: The first time the priest would stand and offer meal-offerings in Jerusalem, he would recite: Who has given us life, sustained us, and brought us to this time, as it is the first time that he fulfilled the mitzva of offering that sacrifice (Rashi). When he would take the meal-offerings in order to eat them, he would recite: Who brings forth bread from the earth. And it was taught on the topic of meal-offerings: And all of the meal-offerings, he crumbles them into pieces, approximately the size of an olive-bulk. This proves that over bread crumbs the size of an olive-bulk, one recites: Who brings forth bread from the earth.

¹¹⁰ Abaye said to Rav Yosef: But if what you say is so, then now, according to the tanna of the school of Rabbi Yishmael who said with regard to meal-offerings: He crushes them until he restores them to the form that they were when they were flour, would you say that so too, in that case, he need not recite: Who brings forth bread from the earth? And if you say that that is so, that one does not recite: Who brings forth bread from the earth, over these meal-offerings, wasn't it taught in a baraita: One who gathered an olive-bulk sized portion from all of the crumbs of the meal-offerings and ate them, if it was an offering of leavened bread like that of a thanks-offering, if he ate them on Passover he is punishable by karet. If it was an offering of unleavened bread, one fulfills his obligation to eat matza on Passover. This illustrates that bread crumbs, regardless of their size, are always considered bread.

¹¹¹ Rav Yosef answered that this is not the case, and one does not recite a blessing over bread crumbs as he would over actual bread. Rather, with what are we dealing here? With a case where one mixed the bread crumbs with water and compacted them into a single mass. The Gemara challenges this: If so, say the latter clause, in which we learn that this case of one who eats the crumbs speaks specifically about when he ate them, all of the crumbs that constitute the size of an olive-bulk in the time it takes to eat a half-loaf of bread. And if it is referring to a case where one compacted them into a single mass, that expression: When he ate them, is inappropriate. When he ate it, is what it needed to say, as it is a single loaf.

¹¹² Rather, it can be explained in another way: With what are we dealing here? With a case where each of the crumbs came from a large loaf of bread over which one is obligated to recite: Who brings forth bread from the earth. Over crumbs that were never part of a loaf of bread large enough to require this blessing, however, one need only recite: Who brings forth bread from the earth, if they are at least the size of an olive-bulk.

¹¹³ Since all of the proofs for and against this opinion were rejected, the Gemara asks: What conclusion was reached about this halakha? Rav Sheshet said: Over this cooked dish, which contains bread crumbs, even though it does not contain crumbs the size of an olive-bulk, one recites: Who brings forth bread from the earth. Rava said: This is specifically in a case where the crumbs still have the appearance of bread and did not dissolve completely.

¹¹⁴ Another issue concerned terokanin, with regard to which it was said that they are obligated in the mitzva to separate ḥalla, meaning that terokanin have the halakhic status of bread. And, when Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Terokanin are exempt from the mitzva to separate ḥalla. The Gemara asks: What are terokanin? Abaye said: Terokanin are made of a watery mixture of flour and water roasted in a cavity in a stove in the ground and is not actually bread.

¹¹⁵ And Abaye said: Terita is exempt from the mitzva to separate ḥalla. The Gemara asks: What is terita? There are several opinions: Some say, it is flour and water kneaded that is poured onto a boiling hot stove. And some say, it is bread from India, made from dough wrapped around a skewer and covered with oil or eggs before baking. And some say, it is bread made for kutaḥ, bread baked in an unusual manner so that it would become extremely leavened and could be used as an ingredient in the Babylonian spice, kutaḥ.

¹¹⁶ And similarly, Rabbi Ḥiyya taught: Bread made for kutaḥ; one is exempt from the mitzva to separate ḥalla. The Gemara asks: Wasn't it taught in a baraita that one is obligated in the mitzva to separate ḥalla from bread made for kutaḥ? The Gemara answers: There, as the reason was taught that

Rabbi Yehuda says: There is a distinction between different types of bread made for *kutaḥ*, as the actions taken in its preparation prove the purpose for which it was made. If he made them

¹¹⁷ thick [*ke'avin*], so that they appear like loaves of bread, they are obligated in *ḥalla*, and if he shaped them like boards [*kelimmudin*], they are exempt, since they will certainly only be used for *kutaḥ*. Abaye said to Rav Yosef: What blessing is recited over the dough of the ground? Rav Yosef said to him: Do you think that it is bread? It is merely kneaded dough, and just like over all other cooked grains, one recites over it the blessing: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment.

¹¹⁸ Mar Zutra based his meal on this dough, and he recited: Who brings forth bread from the earth, beforehand and the three blessings of Grace after Meals thereafter. Since he based his meal on it, he considered it to be bread.

¹¹⁹ Mar bar Rav Ashi said: With these types of bread, a person fulfills his obligation to eat matza on Passover. What is the reason? Because we call it bread of affliction, and in that sense, it is in the category of matza.

¹²⁰ And with regard to blessings, Mar bar Rav Ashi said: Over this date honey one recites: By Whose word all things came to be. What is the reason that one does not recite: Who creates fruit of the tree, as he does over the date itself? Because date honey is not the essence of the fruit, but merely moisture that drips from the ripe fruit.

¹²¹ In accordance with whose opinion does he recite that blessing? In accordance with the opinion of this tanna, as we learned in a mishna: If a non-priest ate date honey, apple wine or vinegar made from grapes of autumn that grow stunted at the end of the season and are unfit for wine production, or any other type of juice made from fruits of *teruma*, Rabbi Eliezer obligates him to repay the principal and an additional fifth as a penalty for misuse of consecrated items. And Rabbi Yehoshua exempts him from payment, because he holds that these are byproducts of the fruit and do not have the status of the fruit itself. Mar bar Rav Ashi's ruling with regard to blessings was based on Rabbi Yehoshua's ruling with regard to *teruma*.

¹²² One of the Sages said to Rava: What is the *halakha* with regard to *terima*? Rava was unfamiliar with the term *terima* and did not understand what he was saying to him. Ravina sat before Rava and said to the student who had posed the question to Rava: In posing the question, are you speaking of sesame *terima* or are you speaking of safflower *terima* or are you speaking of grape-pits *terima*?

¹²³ Meanwhile, Rava comprehended the meaning of the term and said to the Sage: Certainly, you are speaking of pressed items, and you reminded me of a matter that Rav Asi said: Those dates of *teruma*; one is permitted to press them in order to make *terima*, because the dates maintain their form, and one is forbidden to make date beer from them, as in so doing the dates are damaged and it is forbidden to damage *teruma*. The Gemara concludes: The *halakha* is that over dates that were made into *terima*, one recites: Who creates fruit of the tree. What is the reason? Because they remain in their original state.

¹²⁴ The Gemara raises another question with regard to the blessing recited on roasted barley to which honey or vinegar was added [*shetita*]. Rav said that one recites: By Whose word all things came to be; and Shmuel said that one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment.

¹²⁵ Rav Ḥisda said: And they do not disagree, as each is referring to a different case. This, where Shmuel said that one recites: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, is in a case where the

mixture is thick, while this, where Rav said that one recites: By Whose word all things came to be, is in a case where the mixture is thin. When it is thick, he made it as food; therefore one recites a blessing just as he would over any food made from the five species of grain. When it is thin, he made it as medicine, therefore one only recites: By Whose word all things came to be.

¹²⁶ With regard to the assumption that this mixture is essentially medicinal, Rav Yosef raised a challenge from the laws of Shabbat: And they agree that one may mix shetita on Shabbat and drink Egyptian beer [zitom haMitzri], which contains a mixture of a pungent spice in flour. And if it enters your mind to say that when one prepares shetita, his intention is for medicinal purposes, is medicine permitted on Shabbat?

¹²⁷ Abaye said to Rav Yosef: Do you not hold that to be true? Didn't we learn in a mishna: All foods that are commonly eaten; a person may eat them for medicinal purposes on Shabbat, and all drinks that are not designated for medicinal purposes, a person may drink them for medicinal purposes on Shabbat. But what can you say in explaining that ruling? The man's intention is for the purpose of eating; here too, when he mixes the shetita, the man's intention is for the purpose of eating.

¹²⁸ The Gemara cites another version of what was taught above: But what can you say in explaining that ruling? The man's intention is for the purpose of eating and the cure comes about on its own; here too, the man's intention is for the purpose of eating and the cure comes about on its own. Ostensibly, after proving that it is permissible to drink the shetita on Shabbat, it is clearly a type of food over which one is required to recite a blessing. If so, it is difficult to understand the need for Rav and Shmuel to point out that one is required to recite a blessing over it.

¹²⁹ Therefore the Gemara says: And the statement of Rav and Shmuel is necessary, as if the halakha had been derived solely from this mishna that permits drinking shetita on Shabbat, I would have said: This applies specifically when one's intention is for the purpose of eating and the cure comes about on its own. Here, however, since from the outset, his intention in eating the shetita is for the purpose of medicine; just as one recites no blessing when he ingests medicine, let him recite no blessing over the shetita at all. Therefore, Rav and Shmuel taught us that here, since he derives pleasure from eating it, he is required to recite a blessing.

¹³⁰ We learned in the mishna that over bread one recites: Who brings forth bread from the earth. The Sages taught in a baraita: What does one who eats bread recite before eating? Who brings forth [hamotzi] bread from the earth. Rabbi Neḥemya says that the blessing is phrased: Who brought forth [motzi] bread from the earth. Rava said: Everyone agrees that the term motzi means brought, in the past tense, as it is written: "God who brought them forth [motziam] from Egypt is for them like the horns of the wild ox" (Numbers 23:22). When do they disagree? With regard to the term hamotzi, as the Rabbis hold that hamotzi means that God brought forth, in the past tense, as it is written: "Who brought forth [hamotzi] for you water from a rock of flint" (Deuteronomy 8:15), which depicts a past event. Rabbi Neḥemya holds that the term hamotzi means that God brings forth in the present tense, as it is stated in Moses' prophecy to the Jewish people in Egypt: "And you will know that I am the Lord your God who is bringing you forth [hamotzi] from under the burdens of Egypt" (Exodus 6:7). Since, in that context, hamotzi is used with regard to an event transpiring in the present or possibly even one that will transpire in the future, it is inappropriate to include this term in a blessing referencing the past.

¹³¹ And the Rabbis, how do they respond to that proof? The Sages interpret that verse to mean that the Holy one, Blessed be He, said to Israel as follows: When I bring you forth, I will perform something for you that you will know that I am the one who brought you forth from Egypt, as it is written: “And you will know that I am the Lord your God who brought you forth [hamotzi]”; in this verse, too, hamotzi refers to the past.

¹³² On that note, the Gemara relates: The Sages would praise son of Rav Zevid, brother of Rabbi Shmuel bar Rav Zevid to Rabbi Zeira, that he is a great man and he is expert in blessings. Rabbi Zeira said to the Sages: When he comes to you, bring him to me so that I can meet him. One day he happened to come before him. They brought out bread to the guest, he began and recited: Who brought forth [motzi] bread from the earth. Rabbi Zeira grew annoyed and said: This is he of whom they say that he is a great man and expert in blessings? Granted, had he recited: Hamotzi,

¹³³ I would have understood that he thereby taught us the meaning of the verse: “Who brought you forth from Egypt,” and he thereby taught us that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. However, what did he teach us by reciting motzi? Everyone agrees that one fulfills his obligation when reciting motzi. The Gemara explains: The son of Rav Zevid did this in order to preclude himself from taking sides in the dispute. He preferred to phrase his blessing in a manner appropriate according to all opinions, rather than teach a novel concept, which is not universally accepted.

¹³⁴ The Gemara concludes: And the halakha is that one recites: Who brings forth [hamotzi] bread from the earth, as we hold in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis who say that it also means: Who brought forth.

¹³⁵ We learned in the mishna that over vegetables one recites: Who creates fruits of the ground. The Gemara comments: The mishna taught vegetables together with, and therefore similar to, bread, and from this analogy one may infer: Just as bread is food that was transformed by fire, so too vegetables retain the blessing: Who creates fruits of the ground, after they have been transformed by fire. Rabbenai said in the name of Abaye: This means that over boiled vegetables one recites: Who creates fruits of the ground. From where is this matter inferred? From the fact that the mishna taught vegetables similar to bread.

¹³⁶ Rav Ḥisda taught in the name of Rabbeinu; and the Gemara remarks incidentally: Who is Rabbeinu? Rav. Over boiled vegetables one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground. And our Rabbis who descended from Eretz Yisrael, and again the Gemara explains: And who is the Sage with this title? Ulla said in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan: Over boiled vegetables one recites: By whose word all things came to be, since after they are boiled, they are no longer the same as they were before. Expressing his own opinion, Rav Ḥisda said: And I say that there is an intermediate opinion: Any vegetable that, when eaten in its original uncooked state, one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground, when he boiled it, he recites: By whose word all things came to be, as boiling damages it qualitatively. And any vegetable that when eaten in its original uncooked state, one recites: By whose word all things came to be, because it is not typically eaten raw, when he boiled it, he recites: Who creates fruit of the ground.

¹³⁷ The Gemara asks: Granted, any vegetable that, when eaten in its original uncooked state, one recites: By whose word all things came to be, when he boiled it, he recites: Who creates fruit of the ground, as you can find several vegetables, e.g., cabbage, chard, and pumpkin which are virtually

inedible raw, and boiling renders it edible. However, under what circumstances can you find a case where any vegetable that when eaten in its original uncooked state, one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground, when he boiled it, he recites: By whose word all things came to be, as boiling damages the vegetable qualitatively? Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: You can find it in the case of garlic and leeks.

¹³⁸ Rav Naḥman taught in the name of Rabbeinu; and who is Rabbeinu? Shmuel: Over boiled vegetables one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground. And our colleagues who descended from Eretz Yisrael; and who is the Sage with this title? Ulla said in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan: Over boiled vegetables, one recites: By whose word all things came to be.

¹³⁹ Rav Naḥman remarked: I say this is dependent upon and taught as a tannaitic dispute, as it was taught in a baraita with regard to the halakhot of matza on Passover: One fulfills the mitzva of matza with a wafer soaked in water or with one that is boiled as long that it did not dissolve; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And Rabbi Yosei says: One fulfills the mitzva of matza with a soaked wafer but not with one that is boiled even if it did not dissolve. Rav Naḥman concludes that this dispute with regard to boiled matza reflects a larger dispute with regard to boiling in general, whether or not it diminishes the flavor of that which is boiled.

¹⁴⁰ This approach is rejected by the Gemara: That is not so; as everyone agrees that over boiled vegetables one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground. Rabbi Yosei only said the halakha, that one fulfills his obligation of matza if it is soaked but not if it is boiled, there, because in order to fulfill the mitzva, we require the taste of matza, and it is lacking. However, here, even Rabbi Yosei agrees that boiling vegetables does not damage it qualitatively.

¹⁴¹ Ulla's statement in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan with regard to boiled vegetables was cited above. The Gemara cites two conflicting traditions with regard to Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement. Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Over boiled vegetables, one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground, and Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefet said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Over boiled vegetables, one recites: By whose word all things came to be. Commenting on this, Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: Ulla established his error in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefet, which conflicted with the prevailing opinion among the Sages in Babylonia.

¹⁴² Rabbi Zeira wondered with regard to Ulla's approach: What is the matter of Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefet doing in the same discussion with Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba? Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba was meticulous and learned the halakha from Rabbi Yoḥanan, his teacher; and Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefet was not meticulous. Furthermore, every thirty days, Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba reviews his studies before Rabbi Yoḥanan, his teacher, while Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefet does not review his studies. Furthermore, aside from these reasons concerning the difference between a wise and meticulous student like Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba and a student like Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefet, one can also bring proof from the custom of Rabbi Yoḥanan, as the lupin is boiled seven times in a pot and eaten as dessert at the end of a meal. They came and asked Rabbi Yoḥanan with regard to the blessing to be recited over this lupin, and he said to them: One recites over it: Who creates fruit of the ground, indicating that one recites that blessing over boiled vegetables.

¹⁴³ Furthermore, Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said: I saw Rabbi Yoḥanan eat a salted olive, which, halakhically, is considered cooked, and he recited a blessing over it both before and after. Granted, if you say that boiled vegetables remain in their original state and that cooking does not qualitatively

damage them, then certainly at the start one recites over it: Who creates fruit of the tree, and at the end one recites over it one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals, just as he would over any of the seven species for which Eretz Yisrael was praised. However, if you say that boiled vegetables do not remain in their original state, granted, at the start, one recites: By whose word all things came to be. However, at the end, what blessing does he recite? There are several opinions that hold that no blessing is recited after eating something whose initial blessing was: By whose word all things came to be.

¹⁴⁴ The Gemara rejects this: That is no proof, as perhaps Rabbi Yoḥanan held that on items over which at the start one recites: By whose word all things came to be, at the end he recites: Who creates the many forms of life and their needs, for all that You have created.

¹⁴⁵ Rabbi Yitzḥak bar Shmuel raised an objection to the ruling that over both boiled vegetables and raw vegetables one recites the same blessing, from a baraita concerning the halakhot of eating bitter herbs on Passover: Vegetables with which one may fulfill his obligation in the mitzva of bitter herbs on Passover, one fulfills his obligation with both the vegetables themselves as well as with their stalks. However, one may neither fulfill his obligation with pickled vegetables, nor with boiled vegetables nor with cooked vegetables. And if it would enter your mind that they remain in their original state, why are boiled vegetables not fit for use in fulfilling the mitzva of bitter herbs?

¹⁴⁶ The Gemara answers: It is different there, as even if we assert that boiled vegetables remain in their original state, we require the taste of bitter herbs, and it is lacking. There is no proof that boiling damages the vegetable qualitatively.

¹⁴⁷ The Gemara related above that Rabbi Yoḥanan recited a blessing over a salted olive. With regard to this story, Rabbi Yirmeya said to Rabbi Zeira: How did Rabbi Yoḥanan recite a blessing over a salted olive after he ate it? Since the pit was removed, i.e., he did not eat it,

¹⁴⁸ it lacks the requisite measure? The smallest quantity of food that is considered eating is the size of an olive-bulk, and an olive with its pit removed is smaller than that.

¹⁴⁹ He said to him: Do you hold that we require a large olive as the measure of food necessary in order to recite a blessing after eating? We require a medium-sized olive and that olive was that size, as the olive that they brought before Rabbi Yoḥanan was a large olive. Even though they removed its pit, the requisite measure remained.

¹⁵⁰ The Gemara cites a proof that the halakhic measure of an olive is not based on a large olive as we learned in a mishna: The olive of which the Sages spoke with regard to the halakhic measures is neither small nor large, but medium, and that olive is called aguri. And Rabbi Abbahu said: The name of that genus of olives is not aguri, but its name is avruti, and some say that its name is samrusi. And why, then, is it called aguri? Because its oil is accumulated [agur] inside it.

¹⁵¹ With regard to the appropriate blessing over boiled vegetables: Let us say that this dispute is parallel to a dispute between the tanna'im, as the Gemara relates: Two students were sitting before bar Kappara when cooked cabbage, cooked Damascene plums and pullets were set before him. Bar Kappara gave one of the students permission to recite a blessing. He hurried and recited a blessing over the pullets and his counterpart ridiculed him for gluttonously reciting the blessing that should have been recited later, first. Bar Kappara became angry with both of them, he said: I am not angry with the one who recited the blessing, but at the one who ridiculed him. If your counterpart is like

one who never tasted the flavor of meat and was therefore partial to the pullet, and hurriedly ate it, why did you ridicule him? Bar Kappara continued and said to the second student: I am not upset at the one who ridiculed him, rather it is with the one who recited the blessing that I am angry. And he said: If there is no wisdom here, is there no elder here? If you are uncertain which blessing to recite first, couldn't you have asked me, as I am an elder?

¹⁵² The Gemara concludes that it was taught: And both of them did not live out his year. Due to bar Kappara's anger they were punished, and both died within the year.

¹⁵³ The Gemara attempts to infer from this story to the topic at hand: What? Is it not that they disagreed with regard to the following? The one who recited the blessing over the pullet first held that the blessing to be recited over both boiled vegetables and pullet is: By whose word all things came to be, and, therefore, that which he prefers takes precedence and is eaten first. The one who ridiculed him held that over boiled vegetables one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground, and over pullet one recites: By whose word all things came to be, and, therefore, the fruit takes precedence, as its blessing is more specific and therefore more significant.

¹⁵⁴ The Gemara rejects this explanation: No, everyone agrees that over boiled vegetables and pullet one recites: By whose word all things came to be, and here they argue over this: This Sage, who recited the blessing, held that the food which is preferred takes precedence and one recites a blessing over it first, and the Sage who ridiculed him held: Cabbage takes precedence, as it nourishes.

¹⁵⁵ Rabbi Zeira said: When we were in the study hall of Rav Huna he said to us: These turnip heads, if one cut them into large slices, he recites over them: Who creates fruit of the ground, because in doing so he has not significantly changed them. If he cut them into small pieces, he recites over them: By whose word all things came to be. And when we came to the study hall of Rav Yehuda he said to us: Over both these, large slices, and those, small pieces, one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground, and the fact that he cut them extensively was in order to sweeten its flavor.

¹⁵⁶ On a similar note, Rav Ashi said: When we were in the study hall of Rav Kahana, he said to us: Over a cooked dish of beets to which they, typically, do not add a significant amount of flour, one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground. Over a cooked dish of turnips to which they, typically, add a more significant amount of flour, one recites: Who creates the various types of nourishment. And Rav Kahana reconsidered his previous statement and said: Over both these, beets, and those, turnips, one recites: Who creates fruit of the ground, and the fact that they threw extra flour in with the turnips, they did so merely so the components of the cooked dish would stick together. The primary ingredient in the dish remains the turnips, not the flour.

¹⁵⁷ Tangential to this mention of a turnip dish, Rav Hisda added, and said: A cooked dish of beets is beneficial for the heart, good for the eyes and all the more so, for the intestines. Abaye said: That is specifically when the dish sits on the stove and makes a tukh tukh sound, i.e., it boils.

¹⁵⁸ Rav Pappa said: It is clear to me that beet water, water in which beets were boiled, has the same status as beets, and turnip water has the same status turnips, and the water in which all boiled vegetables were boiled has the same status as all boiled vegetables. However, Rav Pappa raised a dilemma: What is the status of water in which dill was boiled? Do they use dill to sweeten the taste, or do they use it to remove residual filth? If the dill was added to flavor the food then the water in which it was boiled should be treated like water in which any other vegetable was boiled. However,

if the dill was added merely to absorb the residue of the soup, then there was never any intention to flavor the dish and one should not recite a blessing over it.

¹⁵⁹ Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma from what we learned in a mishna in the tractate Okatzin: Dill, once it has already given its flavor in the pot, no longer has any value and is no longer subject to the halakhot of teruma and since it is no longer considered food, it can no longer become impure with the ritual impurity of food. Learn from this that they used dill to sweeten the taste. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this.

¹⁶⁰ Rav Ḥiyya bar Ashi said: Over dry bread that was placed in a bowl to soak, one recites: Who brings forth bread from the earth, even if there is another loaf of bread before him, as it is considered bread in every respect. This halakha disagrees with the opinion of Rabbi Ḥiyya, as Rabbi Ḥiyya said: The blessing must conclude with the beginning of the breaking of the loaf of bread. The dried bread had already been sliced and separated from the loaf.

¹⁶¹ Rava strongly objects to this assumption: What is different about dried bread, that one does not recite: Who brings forth bread from the earth, over it, because when the blessing concludes, it concludes on a slice? In a case where he recites a blessing on a loaf of bread as well, when he completes the blessing, he completes it on a slice, as one cuts the bread before the blessing.

¹⁶² Rather, Rava said: When breaking bread, one recites the blessing over the complete loaf and only afterwards, he breaks it.

¹⁶³ The Gemara relates: The Sages of Neharde'a acted in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Ḥiyya and would recite the blessing as they were breaking the bread and conclude the blessing as he finished breaking off the piece of bread. And the Rabbis acted in accordance with the opinion of Rava and would recite the blessing before breaking the bread. Ravina said: My mother told me: Your father acted in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Ḥiyya, as Rabbi Ḥiyya said: The blessing must conclude with the beginning of the breaking of the loaf of bread. And the Rabbis acted in accordance with the opinion of Rava. The Gemara concludes: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rava, who said one recites the blessing over the complete loaf and only afterwards he breaks it.

¹⁶⁴ It was stated that there was an amoraic dispute with regard to whether to recite the blessing over a whole loaf of bread or to recite it over a piece of bread: If they brought pieces and whole loaves of bread before those partaking of a meal, Rav Huna said: One may recite the blessing over the pieces and with that blessing exempts the whole loaves as well. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The optimal manner in which to fulfill the mitzva is to recite the blessing over the whole loaf. However, if the piece was of wheat bread and the whole loaf was of barley bread, everyone agrees that one recites a blessing over the piece of wheat bread. Although it is a piece of bread, it is nevertheless of superior quality, and in so doing one exempts the whole loaf of barley bread.

¹⁶⁵ Rabbi Yirmeya bar Abba said that the dispute between Rav Huna and Rabbi Yoḥanan is parallel to a tannaitic dispute with regard to the halakhot of teruma. We learned: Even though the onions from which the teruma must be separated are divided equally between the two, one separates teruma from a whole small onion but not from half of a large onion. Rabbi Yehuda says: No, rather, he separates teruma from half of a large onion. What, is it not that they disagree over this point, that one Sage, Rabbi Yehuda, held that the more significant takes precedence; therefore half of a large onion which is of superior quality is preferable, and the first tanna held that the whole item takes precedence?

¹⁶⁶ The Gemara rejects this comparison: Where there is a priest who can immediately take the teruma from him, everyone agrees that more significant takes precedence. When they disagree is in a case where there is no priest there, as we learned in a mishna: Everywhere that there is a priest, one separates teruma from the best, and whenever there is no priest, one separates teruma from that which will endure, so that when a priest ultimately receives it, he will be able to derive benefit from it. Rabbi Yehuda says: One always separates teruma only from the best, even though it is not the longest-lasting.

¹⁶⁷ With regard to the dispute between Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rav Huna, Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: A God-fearing individual fulfills both. And who is this God-fearing person? Mar, son of Ravina, as the Gemara relates that Mar, son of Ravina, would place the piece inside the whole loaf and break them together.

¹⁶⁸ Similarly, the Gemara relates that the tanna recited a baraita before Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak: One places the piece inside the whole loaf, then breaks the bread and recites a blessing. Rav Naḥman said to him: What is your name? He answered: Shalman. Rav Naḥman replied with a pun: You are peace [shalom] and the teaching that you recited is complete [shelema] as by means of this baraita the disputing opinions are reconciled and you established peace among students.

¹⁶⁹ This resolution is reinforced in a unique case, as Rav Pappa said: Everyone agrees that while fulfilling the mitzva of eating matza on Passover, one places the piece inside the whole and breaks. What is the reason? With regard to matza the phrase “Bread of affliction” (Deuteronomy 16:3) is written, and the poor typically eat their bread in pieces. Therefore, eating matza on Passover evening, the broken matza is also significant.

¹⁷⁰ In connection to the various halakhot with regard to breaking bread, especially on Festivals, the Gemara cites another halakha. Rabbi Abba said: And on Shabbat one is obligated to break bread for the meal over two loaves. What is the reason? Because in the Torah portion that discusses gathering manna on Friday for Shabbat, the phrase: “Twice as much bread” (Exodus 16:22) is written. To commemorate this, Shabbat meals are based on two loaves of bread.

¹⁷¹ With regard to the manner in which these two loaves are to be broken, Rav Ashi said: I saw Rav Kahana who would take two loaves and break one. Rabbi Zeira would break off one large piece from the loaf, and eat from it for the entire Shabbat meal. Ravina said to Rav Ashi about this: Doesn’t it appear gluttonous for one to break off so large a piece? Rav Ashi said to him: Since every other day he does not do so, and today he does, it does not appear gluttonous, but rather in deference to the mitzva of the Shabbat meals.

¹⁷² With regard to eating on Shabbat, the Gemara relates: Rav Ami and Rav Asi, when the opportunity to use the bread of the eiruv in the Shabbat meal would present itself, they would recite: Who brings forth bread from the earth over it. They said in explanation: Since one mitzva was performed with it, we will perform another mitzva with it.

¹⁷³ Continuing to discuss the halakhot of breaking bread, Rav said: One who broke bread, and before eating it, offered a piece to another, and said: Take it and recite a blessing, take it and recite a blessing, need not recite the blessing a second time, because that is considered to have been for the purpose of the blessing. If, however, he said: Bring salt or bring relish, he must recite the blessing a second time, as that is considered an interruption between the blessing and eating the bread. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even if he said: Bring salt or bring relish, it is not considered an interruption

and he need not recite the blessing a second time. Only if he said: Mix the food for the oxen, mix the food for the oxen, it is considered an interruption and he is required to recite the blessing a second time. And Rav Sheshet said: Even if he said: Mix for the oxen, he need not recite a blessing a second time, as that is also considered to be for the purpose of the blessing, as Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: One is prohibited from eating before feeding his animals, as it is stated: “And I will give grass in your fields for your animals” first and only then: “And you shall eat and be satisfied” (Deuteronomy 11:15). In the verse, preparation of food for one’s cattle precedes preparation of his own food. Consequently, it is considered part of the preparation for one’s own meal.

¹⁷⁴ Rava bar Shmuel said in the name of Rabbi Ḥiyya: One who breaks bread is not permitted to break it until they bring salt or relish before each and every one seated at the table. However, the Gemara relates that Rava bar Shmuel himself happened to come to the House of the Exilarch. They brought him bread, which he immediately broke, without waiting for them to bring salt or relish. They said to him: Did the Master reconsider his halakhic ruling? He said to them: Although poor quality bread requires salt in order to give the bread flavor, and therefore one must wait before breaking bread, this refined bread served in the House of the Exilarch needs no salt, and does not require waiting.

¹⁷⁵ And Rava bar Shmuel said in the name of Rabbi Ḥiyya: Urine only completely leaves the body if one urinates seated, as, otherwise, due to concern that drops of urine will drip onto his clothes, he attempts to conclude prematurely. Rav Kahana said: Over loose soil which absorbs the urine, one is not concerned that it will splash on him; therefore, even when standing the urine leaves his body. And if there is no loose soil there is another way to prevent the urine from splashing on his clothes while standing. Stand on an elevated place and urinate down an inclined plane.

¹⁷⁶ And Rava bar Shmuel said the following advice in the name of Rabbi Ḥiyya: After all eating, eat salt and after all drinking, drink water and you will not be harmed. That was also taught in a baraita: After all eating, eat salt and after all drinking, drink water and you will not be harmed. It was taught in another baraita: If one ate any food and did not eat salt afterward, or if he drank any liquid and did not drink water afterward, during the day, he should be concerned about bad breath, and at night he should be concerned about diphtheria.

¹⁷⁷ On the topic of health, the Gemara cites that the Sages taught in a baraita: One who inundates his food with water, i.e., one who drinks a great deal of water, will not come to suffer from intestinal illness. The Gemara asks: And how much water? Rav Ḥisda said: One jug [kiton] per loaf.

¹⁷⁸ Rav Mari said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One who is accustomed to eat lentils once in thirty days prevents diphtheria from afflicting his house. The Gemara comments: However, one should not eat lentils every day. What is the reason? Because it is deleterious in that it causes bad breath.

¹⁷⁹ And Rav Mari said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One who is accustomed to eat mustard once in thirty days prevents illnesses from afflicting his house. The Gemara comments: However, one should not eat mustard every day. What is the reason? Because it is deleterious in that it causes weakness of the heart.

¹⁸⁰ Another health recommendation: Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Ashi said that Rav said: One who is accustomed to eat small fish will not come to suffer from intestinal illness. Moreover, eating small fish causes one’s entire body to flourish, to grow, and to be healthy.

¹⁸¹ Rabbi Ḥama, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: One who is accustomed to eat black cumin, a medicine for the heart, will not come to suffer from heart pain. The Gemara raises an objection: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Black cumin is one of sixty deadly drugs, and therefore one who sleeps to the east of its storage area, where its odor wafts with the westerly wind, responsibility for his blood is on his own head. The Gemara responds: This is not difficult, as this, where Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said that black cumin is harmful, refers to its odor, whereas this, where Rabbi Ḥama, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said that it is beneficial for the heart, refers only to its taste. And the Gemara relates: The mother of Rabbi Yirmeya would bake him bread and would stick black cumin to it so its taste would be absorbed, and she would peel it off, so that its odor would not harm him.

¹⁸² We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says that one recites over herbs and leafy greens: Who creates various kinds of herbs. Rabbi Zeira, and some say Rabbi Ḥinnana bar Pappa, said: The halakha is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. And Rabbi Zeira, and some say Rabbi Ḥinnana bar Pappa, said: What is the reason for Rabbi Yehuda's opinion? The verse says: "Blessed is the Lord, day by day" (Psalms 68:20). The question arises: Is it so that one blesses Him by day and does not bless Him at night? Rather, the verse comes to tell you: Each and every day, give the Lord the appropriate blessings for that day. Here too, with regard to the blessings recited over food, for each and every type of food, give the Lord the appropriate blessings for that food.

¹⁸³ And Rabbi Zeira, and some say Rabbi Ḥinnana bar Pappa, said: Come and see that the attribute of flesh and blood is unlike the attribute of the Holy One, Blessed be He. The attribute of flesh and blood is that an empty vessel holds that which is placed within it, while a full vessel does not hold it. The attribute of the Holy One, Blessed be He, however, is not so, as if God adds to a person who is a full vessel in terms of knowledge or good attributes, he will hold it; a person who is an empty vessel will not hold it. This is alluded to by the verse where it is said: "And He said, if you will surely listen [shamo'a tishma] to the voice of the Lord your God and do what is right in His eyes" (Exodus 15:26). This verse is interpreted homiletically: If you listen [shamo'a] in the present, you will listen [tishma] in the future as well; and if not, you will not listen. Alternatively: If you listened [shamo'a] to the old, you review what you already learned, then you will listen [tishma] to the new as well. But if you turn your heart away, you will no longer be able to hear.

¹⁸⁴ MISHNA: This mishna discusses how, after the fact, a more general blessing exempts one from the obligation to recite a more specific one. One who recited: Who creates fruit of the ground, over fruit of the tree, fulfilled his obligation. One who recited: Who creates fruit of the tree, over fruits of the earth, did not fulfill his obligation. And over all food items, one who recited: By whose word all things came to be, fulfilled his obligation.

¹⁸⁵ GEMARA: The Gemara begins by ascertaining: Who is the tanna that holds that the primary factor in the growth of a tree is the earth, and therefore one may recite: Who creates fruit of the ground, over fruits of the tree fulfills his obligation? Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: That is the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as we learned in a mishna dealing with the halakhot of first fruits: If, after one picked the first fruits from his field, the spring dried up and the tree upon which the fruit grew was chopped down, he brings the first fruits to the Temple but does not read the accompanying praise. The tree or spring, which were the primary components of the growth of the fruit, no longer exist and he cannot recite the passage thanking God for "the good land." Rabbi Yehuda says: He brings the first fruits and reads the accompanying praise, as the land is the primary factor in the

growth of the tree, and the tree itself is merely an extension of the land. Even after the tree is felled, the land remains intact. Similarly, with regard to blessings, the halakha maintains that fruit of the tree is considered to be fruit of the ground, as well.

¹⁸⁶ We learned in the mishna: One who recited: Who creates fruit of the tree, over fruits of the earth, did not fulfill his obligation. The Gemara asks: That is obvious, as fruits of the earth do not fall under the rubric of trees. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: This ruling in the mishna is only necessary according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who said in another context that wheat is a type of tree, as we learned in a baraita: The tree from which Adam, the first man, ate, Rabbi Meir says: It was a vine, as nothing brings wailing and trouble upon man even today other than wine, as it is stated with regard to Noah: “And he drank from the wine and became drunk” (Genesis 9:21). Rabbi Neḥemya says: It was a fig tree, as with the object with which they were corrupted and sinned they were rehabilitated, as it is stated: “And they sewed together fig leaves and made for themselves loincloths” (Genesis 3:7). They must have taken the leaves from the tree closest at hand, the Tree of Knowledge. Rabbi Yehuda says: It was wheat, as, even today, the child does not know how to call his father and mother until he tastes the taste of grain.

¹⁸⁷ Based on this, it might have entered your mind to say, since Rabbi Yehuda said that wheat is a type of tree, one should recite over it: Who creates fruit of the tree. Therefore, the mishna taught us that with regard to blessings, the principle is different. Where does one recite: Who creates fruit of the tree? Only in a case where, when you take the fruit, the branch remains and again produces fruit.

¹⁸⁸ However, in a situation where, when you take the fruit, the branch does not remain and again produce fruit, we do not recite the blessing: Who creates fruit of the tree, but rather: Who creates fruit of the ground.

¹⁸⁹ We learned in the mishna: And on all food items, if he recited: By whose word all things came to be, he fulfilled his obligation. It was stated that the amora'im disputed the precise explanation of the mishna. Rav Huna said: This halakha applies to all foods except for bread and wine. Since they have special blessings, one does not fulfill his obligation by reciting the general blessing: By whose word all things came to be. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One fulfills his obligation with the blessing: By whose word all things came to be, even over bread and wine.

¹⁹⁰ The Gemara remarks: Let us say that this dispute is parallel to a tannaitic dispute found elsewhere, as it was taught in a Tosefta: One who saw bread and said: How pleasant is this bread, blessed is the Omnipresent Who created it, fulfilled his obligation to recite a blessing. One who saw a fig and said: How pleasant is this fig, blessed is the Omnipresent Who created it, fulfilled his obligation. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yosei says: One who deviates from the formula coined by the Sages in blessings, did not fulfill his obligation. If so, let us say that Rav Huna, who said that one who recites: By whose word all things came to be, over bread or wine, did not fulfill his obligation, holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei; and Rabbi Yoḥanan, who said that one who recites: By whose word all things came to be, over bread or wine fulfills his obligation, holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir.

¹⁹¹ The Gemara rejects this: Rav Huna could have said to you: I said my statement, even in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, as Rabbi Meir only stated his opinion, that one who alters the formula of the blessing fulfills his obligation, there, where the individual explicitly

mentions the term bread in his blessing, but where he does not mention the term bread, even Rabbi Meir agrees that he did not fulfill his obligation.

¹⁹² And Rabbi Yoḥanan could have said to you: I said my statement, even in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, as Rabbi Yosei only stated his opinion, that one who alters the formula of the blessing does not fulfill his obligation, there, because he recited a blessing that was not instituted by the Sages; however, if he recited: By whose word all things came to be, which was instituted by the Sages, even Rabbi Yosei agrees that, after the fact, he fulfilled his obligation to recite a blessing.

¹⁹³ Regarding blessings that do not conform to the formula instituted by the Sages, the Gemara relates that Binyamin the shepherd ate bread and afterward recited in Aramaic: Blessed is the Master of this bread. Rav said, he thereby fulfilled his obligation to recite a blessing. The Gemara objects: But didn't Rav himself say: Any blessing that does not contain mention of God's name is not considered a blessing? The Gemara emends the formula of his blessing. He said: Blessed is the All-Merciful, Master of this bread.

¹⁹⁴ The Gemara asks: But don't we require three blessings in Grace after Meals? How did he fulfill his obligation with one sentence? The Gemara explains: What is: Fulfills his obligation, that Rav also said? He fulfills the obligation of the first of the three blessings, and must recite two more to fulfill his obligation completely.

¹⁹⁵ The Gemara asks: What is he teaching us? The Gemara answers: Although he recited the blessing in a secular language, other than Hebrew, he fulfilled his obligation.

¹⁹⁶ This remains difficult, as we already learned this in a mishna in Sota: And these are recited in any language that one understands: The portion of the swearing of the sota, the confession of the tithes when a homeowner declares that he has given all teruma and tithes appropriately, the recitation of Shema, and the Amida prayer and Grace after Meals. If Grace after Meals is clearly on the list of matters that may be recited in any language, what did Rav teach us? The Gemara answers: Rav's ruling with regard to Binyamin the Shepherd is necessary, as it might have entered your mind to say: This, the permission to recite Grace after Meals in any language, applies only to a case where one recited it in a secular language, just as it was instituted by the Sages in the holy tongue. However, in a case where one did not recite the blessing in a secular language, just as it was instituted by the Sages in the holy tongue, say that no, he did not fulfill his obligation. Therefore, Rav teaches us that, after the fact, not only is the language not an impediment to fulfillment of his obligation to recite a blessing, the formula is not an impediment either.

¹⁹⁷ The Gemara considers the matter of Rav's opinion itself and cites the fundamental dispute in that regard. Rav said: Any blessing that does not contain mention of God's name is not considered a blessing. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Any blessing that does not contain mention of God's sovereignty is not considered a blessing. Abaye said: It stands to reason in accordance with the opinion of Rav, as it was taught in a Tosefta: In the confession of the tithes, one recites, "I did not transgress your mitzvot and I did not forget" (Deuteronomy 26:13). The meaning of phrase, I did not transgress, is that I did not refrain from blessing You when separating tithes; and the meaning of the phrase, and I did not forget, is that I did not forget to mention Your name in the blessing recited over it. However, this baraita did not teach that one must mention God's sovereignty in the blessing.

¹⁹⁸ And Rabbi Yoḥanan would say: Emend the baraita: And I did not forget to mention Your name and Your sovereignty in the blessing recited over it; indicating that one must mention both God's name and God's sovereignty.

¹⁹⁹ MISHNA: And over a food item whose growth is not from the ground, one recites: By whose word all things came to be. And over vinegar, wine that fermented and spoiled, and over novelot, dates that spoiled, and over locusts, one recites: By whose word all things came to be. Rabbi Yehuda says: Over any food item that is a type resulting from a curse, one does not recite a blessing over it at all. None of the items listed exist under normal conditions, and they come about as the result of a curse.

²⁰⁰ On a different note: If there were many types of food before him, over which food should he recite a blessing first? Rabbi Yehuda says: If there is one of the seven species for which Eretz Yisrael was praised among them, he recites the first blessing over it. And the Rabbis say: He recites a blessing over whichever of them he wants.

²⁰¹ GEMARA: The Sages taught: Over a food item whose growth is not from the earth, for example, meat from domesticated animals, non-domesticated animals, and fowl and fish, one recites: By whose word all things came to be. So too, over milk, and over eggs, and over cheese, one recites: By whose word all things came to be. This is not only true with regard to items that come from animals, but over moldy bread, and over wine that fermented slightly, and over a cooked dish that spoiled, one recites: By whose word all things came to be, because the designated blessing is inappropriate for food that is partially spoiled. Similarly, over salt and over brine, and over truffles and mushrooms, one recites: By whose word all things came to be. The Gemara asks: Is this to say that truffles and mushrooms are not items that grow from the ground? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: One who vows not to eat from the fruit of the earth is forbidden to eat all fruit of the earth; however, he is permitted to eat truffles and mushrooms. And if he said: All items that grow from the ground are forbidden to me, he is forbidden to eat even truffles and mushrooms. Apparently, truffles and mushrooms are items that grow from the ground.

²⁰² Abaye said: With regard to growth, they grow from the earth, but with regard to sustenance, they do not draw sustenance from the earth.

²⁰³ The Gemara asks: Why is that distinction significant? Wasn't it taught: Over a food item whose growth is not from the ground one recites the blessing: By whose word all things came to be? Even according to Abaye, mushrooms grow from the ground. The Gemara answers: Emend the baraita to read: Over a food item that does not draw sustenance from the ground, one recites: By whose word all things came to be. Consequently, even over mushrooms one recites: By whose word all things came to be.

²⁰⁴ We learned in the mishna that over novelot one recites: By whose word all things came to be. The Gemara asks: What are novelot? The Gemara responds that the amora'im Rabbi Zeira and Rabbi Il'a disputed this. One said that the term refers to dates that, due to extreme conditions, were burned by the heat of the sun and ripened prematurely. And one said that they are dates that fell from the tree because of the wind.

²⁰⁵ We learned later in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says: Over any food item that is a type resulting from a curse, one does not recite a blessing over it at all. Granted, according to the one who said that novelot are dates burned by the heat of the sun, that is the reason that he considers them a type of

curse; however, according to the one who said that novelot are dates that fell because of the wind, what is the reason that it is considered a type of curse? Dates that fell from the tree are no worse than other dates.

²⁰⁶ The Gemara reconciles: Rabbi Yehuda's statement was about the rest, the vinegar and locusts, not about the novelot.

²⁰⁷ Some say that the Gemara raised the question differently: Granted, according to the one who said that novelot are dates burned by the heat of the sun, that is the reason that we recite over them: By whose word all things came to be, as they are of inferior quality. However, to the one who said that novelot are dates that fell because of the wind, should we recite over them: By whose word all things came to be? We should recite: Who creates fruit of the tree.

²⁰⁸ Rather, the conclusion is, with regard to novelot unmodified, everyone agrees that they are dates that were burned by the heat of the sun. When they argue, it is with regard to those dates known as novelot temara, as we learned in a mishna concerning the laws of doubtfully tithed produce [demai]: Although, under normal circumstances, fruits that come into one's possession by means of an am ha'aretz must be tithed due to concern lest the am ha'aretz failed to do so, the following fruits of inferior quality are lenient with regard to demai and one need not tithe them: Shittin, rimin, uzradin, benot shuah, benot shikma, gufnin, nitzpa, and novelot temara.

²⁰⁹ The Gemara identifies these plants. Shittin, Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: They are a type of figs. Rimin are lote. Uzradin are crabapples. Benot shuah, Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: They are white figs. Benot shikma, Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: They are the fruit of the sycamore tree. Gufnin are the last grapes which remain on the tree at the end of the season. Nitzpa are the fruit of the caper-bush. Novelot temara, Rabbi Il'a and Rabbi Zeira disagreed. One said that they are dates burned by the heat of the sun, and one said that they are dates that fell because of the wind.

²¹⁰ Here too, the Gemara asks: Granted, according to the one who said that novelot temara are dates burned by the heat of the sun, that is the reason that it was taught concerning them: Their halakhot are lenient with regard to demai, meaning that it is those with regard to which there is uncertainty whether or not they were tithed that are exempt from being tithed. Those with regard to which there is certainty that they were not tithed, one is obligated to tithe those dates. However, according to the one who said that novelot temara are dates felled because of the wind, this is difficult: Those regarding which there is certainty that they were not tithed, one is obligated? They are ownerless, and ownerless produce is exempt from the requirement to tithe.

²¹¹ The Gemara responds: With what are we dealing here? With a case where he gathered the dates that fell because of the wind and made them into a pile, like a pile of threshed grain, signifying that the produce is a finished product. As Rabbi Yitzḥak said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov: Even gifts to the poor such as gleanings, forgotten sheaves, and produce of the corners, which are normally exempt from tithes, if a poor person gathered them and made them into a pile of threshed grain, by rabbinic law they were rendered obligated in tithes. In that case, only demai would be exempt from tithes.

²¹² Some say that the discussion was as follows:

²¹³ Granted, according to the one who said that novelot temara are dates felled by the wind, that is why here, when our mishna speaks of ruined dates, it calls them novelot, unmodified and there, when it speaks of those that fell because of the wind, it calls them novelot temara. However, according to the one who said that novelot temara are dates burned by the heat of the sun, it should have taught in this mishna here and that, the mishna in tractate Demai, novelot temara; or taught in this and that novelot, unmodified. The use of different terms indicates that the mishnayot are discussing different items. No answer was found to this question, and the Gemara notes that indeed, according to the one who said that novelot temara are dates burned by the heat of the sun, it is difficult.

²¹⁴ The mishna cited a dispute with regard to the order in which one is supposed to recite the blessings when there were many types of food before him. Rabbi Yehuda says: If there is one of the seven species for which Eretz Yisrael was praised among them, he recites the first blessing over it. And the Rabbis say: He recites a blessing over whichever of them he wants. Ulla said: This dispute is specifically in a case where the blessings to be recited over each type of food are the same, as in that case Rabbi Yehuda holds: The type of the seven species takes precedence, and the Rabbis hold: The preferred type takes precedence, and a blessing is recited over it first. However, when their blessings are not the same, everyone agrees that one must recite a blessing over this type of food and then recite another blessing over that, ensuring that the appropriate blessing is recited over each type of food.

²¹⁵ The Gemara raises an objection to this based on what was taught in a baraita: If a radish and an olive were before him, he recites a blessing over the radish and exempts the olive from the requirement of a blessing, although their blessings are different. The Gemara answers: With what are we dealing here? With a case where the radish is the primary component for the one partaking of them, and the olive serves only to temper the taste of the radish. Therefore, he need recite a blessing only over the radish.

²¹⁶ The Gemara continues and asks: If so, say the latter clause of the baraita where Rabbi Yehuda says: One recites a blessing over the olive, as the olive is a type of the seven species. Does Rabbi Yehuda not accept that principle which we learned in a mishna: Any food that is primary, and is eaten with food that is secondary, one recites a blessing over the primary food, and that blessing exempts the secondary from the requirement to recite a blessing before eating it? And if you say: Indeed, he does not hold that the primary food exempts the secondary, wasn't it taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda says: If it is due to the radish that the olive comes, one recites a blessing over the radish and exempts the olive. If so, the dispute whether to recite a blessing over the radish or the olive must be in a case where the radish is not primary. This is an apparent contradiction of Ulla's statement.

²¹⁷ The Gemara responds: Actually, we are dealing with a case where the radish is the primary component of the meal, and when Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis disagree, it is with regard to a different case that they disagree, and this baraita is incomplete and it teaches the following: If a radish and an olive were before him, he recites a blessing over the radish and exempts the olive. In what circumstances does this apply? Specifically when the radish is primary, but when the radish is not primary, everyone agrees that one recites the appropriate blessing over this one and then he again recites the appropriate blessing over that one. However, in general, if two types of food whose blessings are identical were before him, he recites a blessing over whichever of them that he wants. Rabbi Yehuda says: He recites a blessing over the olive, as the olive is a type of the seven species.

²¹⁸ Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Yitzḥak Nappaḥa disagreed with regard to this subject. One said: The dispute is in a case where their blessings are identical, as Rabbi Yehuda held: A type of the seven species takes precedence and the blessing is recited over it first. And the Rabbis held: The preferred type takes precedence, and a blessing is recited over it first; however, when their blessings are not identical, everyone agrees that one recites the appropriate blessing over this one and then he again recites the appropriate blessing over that one. And one said: Even when their blessings are not identical, there is also a dispute.

²¹⁹ The Gemara discusses this: Granted, according to the one who said that the dispute is in a case where their blessings are identical, it works out well. However, according to the one who says that they disagree in a case where their blessings are not identical, then about what do they disagree? One must recite two blessings in any case. Rabbi Yirmeya said: They disagree with regard to which blessing precedes the other.

²²⁰ As Rav Yosef, and some say Rabbi Yitzḥak, said: Each food whose significance is manifest in that it precedes the others in this verse, which sings the praises of Eretz Yisrael, takes precedence over the others in terms of blessing as well, as it is stated: “A land of wheat and barley, vines, figs and pomegranates, a land of olive oil and honey” (Deuteronomy 8:8).

²²¹ The Gemara notes: And this opinion disagrees with the opinion of Rabbi Ḥanan. As Rabbi Ḥanan said: The entire verse was stated for the purpose of teaching measures with regard to different halakhot in the Torah.

²²² Wheat was mentioned as the basis for calculating the time required for one to become ritually impure by entering a house afflicted with leprosy, as we learned in a mishna: One who enters a house afflicted with leprosy of the house (see Leviticus 14:33–53) with his clothes resting on his shoulders, and his sandals and his rings are in his hands, both he and they, the clothes, sandals, and rings, immediately become ritually impure. However, if he was dressed in his clothes, and his sandals were on his feet and his rings on his fingers, he immediately becomes ritually impure upon entering the house, but they, the clothes, sandals, and rings, remain pure until he stays in the house long enough to eat half a loaf of bread. This calculation is made with wheat bread, which takes less time to eat, and not with barley bread, and with one who is reclining and eating the bread with a relish, which hastens the eating. There is, then, a Torah measurement that is connected specifically to wheat.

²²³ Barley is also used as the basis for a measure, as we learned in a mishna: A bone from a corpse that is the size of a grain of barley imparts ritual impurity through contact and by being carried, but it does not impart impurity by means of a tent, i.e., if the bone was inside a house, it does not defile all of the articles in the house.

²²⁴ The halakhic measure determined by vines is the quantity of a quarter log of wine for a Nazirite and not the wine equivalent of a quarter log of water, which is a slightly different measure. Figs serve as the basis for the measure of a dried fig-bulk, typically the smallest unit of food for which someone will be held liable for carrying out on Shabbat from one domain to another. Pomegranates teach us a particular measurement as well, as we learned in a mishna: All ritually impure wooden utensils belonging to ordinary homeowners become pure through breaking the utensil,

²²⁵ as an impure vessel loses its status as a vessel and consequently its impurity when it can no longer be used, if they have holes the size of pomegranates.

²²⁶ A land of olive oil: Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said that the verse should be expounded as follows: A land, all of whose measures are the size of olives. The Gemara poses a question: Can it enter your mind that it is a land all of whose measures are the size of olives? Aren't there those measures that we mentioned above, which are not the size of olives? Rather, say: A land, most of whose measures are the size of olives, as most of the measures relating to forbidden foods and other matters are the size of olives.

²²⁷ Honey, i.e., dates from which date honey is extracted, also alludes to a measurement. With regard to Yom Kippur, one is only liable if he eats the equivalent of a large date on Yom Kippur. The Gemara asks: And what will the other amora, who interpreted the verse as referring to the halakhot of precedence in blessings, say with regard to this midrash? The Gemara responds: Are these measures written explicitly in the Torah? Rather, they are by rabbinic law, and the verse is a mere support, an allusion to these measures.

²²⁸ With regard to the halakhot of precedence in blessings, the Gemara relates: Rav Ḥisda and Rav Hamnuna were sitting at a meal. They brought dates and pomegranates before them. Rav Hamnuna took and recited a blessing over the dates first. Rav Ḥisda said to him: Does the Master not hold that halakha which Rav Yosef, and some say Rabbi Yitzḥak, said: Each food that precedes the others in this verse, precedes the others in terms of blessing as well? The pomegranate precedes the date in that verse.

²²⁹ Rav Hamnuna said to him: This, the date, is mentioned second to the word land, in the verse: "A land of olive oil and honey," just after the olive, and this, the pomegranate, is fifth to the word land. Rav Ḥisda said to him admiringly: Who will give us iron legs that we may serve you and constantly hear from you novel ideas.

²³⁰ It was stated: If they brought figs and grapes before them during a meal, what blessings need to be recited? Rav Huna said: They require a blessing before eating them, and do not require a blessing after eating them, as Grace after Meals exempts them. And so too, Rav Naḥman said: They require a blessing before eating them, and do not require a blessing after eating them. And Rav Sheshet said: They require a blessing both before eating them and after eating them, even if he ate them during the meal, as you have nothing which requires a blessing before eating it and does not require a blessing after eating it, because it is exempted by Grace after Meals, except bread, a sweetened and spiced pastry, that comes as dessert, as it, too, is a type of bread. The statements of both Rav Huna and Rav Sheshet disagree with the opinion of Rabbi Ḥiyya, as Rabbi Ḥiyya said: Bread exempts all the types of food that one eats after it, and wine exempts all types of drinks that one drinks after it, and one need not recite a blessing either before or after eating them.

²³¹ Summarizing, Rav Pappa said that the halakha is: Food items that come due to the meal, which are eaten together with the bread as part of the meal, during the meal, neither require a blessing before eating them nor after eating them, as they are considered secondary to the bread. And food items like fruit, that do not come due to the meal, as part of the meal, but may be brought during the meal, require a blessing before eating them and do not require a blessing after eating them. If they come after the meal, they require a blessing both before eating them and after eating them.

²³² The Gemara relates that the students asked Ben Zoma: Why did the Sages say that food items that come due to the meal during the meal, neither require a blessing before eating them nor after eating them? He said to them: Because bread exempts them. They asked: If so, bread should also

exempt wine. Yet, one recites a blessing over wine during the meal. The Gemara responds: Wine is different,

²³³ as it causes a blessing itself. It is so significant, that one recites a blessing over it together with other blessings like kiddush and havdala, even though he does not particularly want to drink it. During a meal too, a blessing is recited over the wine and it is not exempted by the blessing over the bread.

²³⁴ As the Gemara mentioned bread that comes as dessert, it now relates that Rav Huna ate thirteen substantially sized, sweetened loaves, three loaves per kav of flour, and he did not recite Grace after Meals because they were not genuine bread. Rav Naḥman said to him: That is hunger. One does not typically eat that much merely as dessert. Rather, over anything which is substantial enough to satiate and others base a meal upon it, one must recite Grace after Meals.

²³⁵ The Gemara also relates: Rav Yehuda was engaged in preparations for his son's wedding at the house of Rav Yehuda bar Ḥaviva when they brought bread that comes as dessert before them. When it arrived, he heard them reciting: Who brings forth bread from the earth. He said to them: What is this tzitzi sound that I hear? Perhaps you are reciting: Who brings forth bread from the earth? They said to him: Yes, indeed, as it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Mona said in the name of Rabbi Yehuda: Over bread that comes as dessert, one recites: Who brings forth bread from the earth. And Shmuel said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Mona.

²³⁶ Rav Yehuda said to them: You are mistaken. Actually, it was stated that Shmuel said: The halakha is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Mona. They said to him: But aren't you, Master, the one who said in the name of Shmuel with regard to wafers: One may establish an eiruv, the joining of courtyards, to permit carrying in a shared courtyard and the joining of cooked foods, to permit cooking on a festival for Shabbat, with them and recite over them: Who brings forth bread from the earth. Why is that the blessing over those wafers? They too are sweetened bread that comes as dessert. He answered them: It is different there as he based his meal upon them, but here, where one did not base his meal upon them, no, he does not recite: Who brings forth bread from the earth.

²³⁷ The Gemara relates: Rav Pappa happened to come to the house of Rav Huna, son of Rav Natan. After they finished their meal, they brought before them something to eat. Rav Pappa took this food item and ate it without reciting a blessing. They said to him: Do you, Master, not hold that once one finished his meal he is forbidden to eat again without reciting a blessing? He said to them that in the correct version of that halakha, it is stated: Removed. One need recite a second blessing only when eating after the table was removed from before him.

²³⁸ Similarly, the Gemara relates: Rava and Rabbi Zeira happened to come to the house of the Exilarch. After the meal, when they removed the table from before them, a portion [ristena] of food was sent to them from the house of the Exilarch. Rava ate it and Rabbi Zeira did not eat it. Rabbi Zeira said to Rava: Do you, Master, not hold that once the table was removed, he is forbidden to eat? Rava said to him: We are dependent upon the table of the Exilarch, and so long as he has not completed his meal, his guests have not completed their meals either.

²³⁹ Rav said: One who is accustomed to applying fragrant oil to his hands after meals, failure to apply that oil delays the end of his meal and he is not considered to have finished his meal and is not required to recite a blessing before continuing to eat. Similarly, Rav Ashi said: When we were in the house of Rav Kahana, he said to us: We, for example, who are accustomed to oil, failure to apply that

oil delays the end of the meal for us. Nevertheless, the Gemara concludes: And the halakha is not in accordance with all of these statements and the end of the meal is not determined by those factors. Rather, it is determined by that which Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Ashi said that Rav said: There are three pairs that immediately follow each other: Immediately following placing hands on the head of a sacrifice, is its slaughter; immediately following the blessing of redemption recited after Shema, is the Amida prayer; and immediately following the ritual washing of the hands after a meal, is the blessing of Grace after Meals.

²⁴⁰ Abaye said that on a similar note, we too will say: Immediately following the entrance of Torah scholars into a house, a blessing rests upon that house, as it is stated with regard to Laban and Jacob: “The Lord has blessed me because of you” (Genesis 30:27). If you wish, say instead, that the proof is from here, as it is stated: “And it was from when he placed him in charge of his house and over all that he owned, the Lord blessed the house of the Egyptian on account of Joseph” (Genesis 39:5).

²⁴¹ MISHNA: This mishna explains those cases and those circumstances in which blessings recited over particular foods exempt other foods at the meal from the requirement to recite a blessing over them. One who recited a blessing over the wine that one drank before the meal, with that blessing he exempted the wine that he drinks after the meal. Similarly, one who recited a blessing over the appetizers that one ate before the meal, with that blessing he exempted the appetizers that he eats after the meal. One who recited a blessing over the bread exempted the appetizers, as they are considered secondary to the bread. However, one who recited a blessing over the appetizers did not exempt the bread. Beit Shammai say: The blessing recited over the appetizers did not exempt even a cooked dish that he eats during the meal.

²⁴² An additional halakha is cited: If several people were sitting to eat not in the framework of a joint meal, each recites a blessing for himself. If they were reclined on divans to eat, which renders it a joint meal, one recites a blessing on behalf of them all.

²⁴³ Additionally: If wine came before them during the meal, each and every diner recites a blessing over the wine for himself. If the wine came after the meal, one recites a blessing on behalf of them all. And he, who recited the blessing over the wine, also says the blessing over the incense [mugmar], although they only bring the incense to the diners after the meal.

²⁴⁴ GEMARA: With regard to the mishna’s statement that wine that precedes a meal exempts wine that follows a meal, Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: This halakha was only taught with regard to Shabbat and Festivals, since, because one can continue drinking at his leisure, one bases his meal on the wine. However, during the rest of the days of the year, one who drinks wine at a meal recites a blessing over each and every cup, as his original intention was not to drink a lot.

²⁴⁵ It was also stated: Rabba bar Mari said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: This was only taught in the mishna with regard to Shabbat and Festivals, and when a person emerges tired from the bathhouse, and wishes to eat and rest, and during bloodletting, after which one tends to drink a lot, since on these occasions one typically bases his meal on wine. However, during the rest of the days of the year, one who drinks wine at a meal recites a blessing over each and every cup.

²⁴⁶ The Gemara relates that Rabba bar Mari happened to come to the house of Rava during the week. He saw him recite a blessing over wine before the meal, and again recite a blessing on the wine after the meal. He said to him: Well done. And so too, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said that this was proper conduct.

²⁴⁷ The Gemara also relates: Rabbi Yitzḥak bar Yosef happened to come to the house of Abaye on a Festival. He saw that he recited a blessing over each and every cup of wine. Rabbi Yitzḥak said to him: Does the Master not hold in accordance with that halakha of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, who said that one blessing is sufficient? Abaye said to him: My original intention was not to base my meal upon wine and with each cup I change my mind and decide to drink it. Even Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi would agree that under those circumstances, one must recite a blessing over each and every cup.

²⁴⁸ A dilemma was raised before the Sages: If wine came out to them during the meal, what is the halakha with regard to exempting the wine after the meal from a blessing? The dilemma is as follows: If you say: One who recited a blessing over the wine that one drank before the meal, with that blessing he exempted the wine that he drinks after the meal, perhaps that is because the purpose of drinking this, wine before the meal, is to drink, and that, wine after the meal, is to drink for its own sake. However, here, where the purpose of drinking this, the wine after the meal, is to drink and that, the wine during the meal, is to moisten the food and to facilitate its consumption, no. The blessing on one cannot exempt the other. Or perhaps there is no difference, and all drinking is considered the same.

²⁴⁹ Opinions differed: Rav said: It exempts, and Rav Kahana said: It does not exempt. Rav Naḥman said: It exempts, and Rav Sheshet said: It does not exempt. Rav Huna and Rav Yehuda and all the students of Rav said: It does not exempt. Rava raised an objection to Rav Naḥman from our mishna: If wine came before them during the meal, each and every diner recites a blessing over the wine for himself. If the wine came after the meal, one recites a blessing on behalf of them all. Apparently, even though they recited a blessing over wine during the course of the meal, they must recite a blessing over the wine after the meal as well. Rav Naḥman said to him: The mishna says as follows: There are two independent cases. The second case is: If wine did not come before them during the meal, but only after the meal, one recites a blessing on behalf of them all.

²⁵⁰ We learned in the mishna: One who recited a blessing over the bread exempted the appetizers, as they are considered secondary to the bread. However, one who recited a blessing over the appetizers did not exempt the bread. Beit Shammai say: The blessing recited over the appetizers did not exempt even a cooked dish that he eats during the meal.

²⁵¹ With regard to this case, a dilemma was raised before the Sages: Do Beit Shammai disagree with the first clause in the mishna or with the latter clause, as it may be explained in both ways? It can be understood that the first tanna says: One who recited a blessing over the bread exempted the appetizers and all the more so it exempted a cooked dish. And Beit Shammai come to say: It goes without saying that the blessing over bread does not exempt appetizers; as the blessing over bread does not even exempt a cooked dish. Or perhaps they disagree with the latter clause, as it was taught: One who recited a blessing over the appetizers did not exempt the bread. By inference, the blessing did not exempt bread, but it did exempt a cooked dish. And Beit Shammai come to say that the blessing over the appetizers did not exempt even a cooked dish.

²⁵² The Gemara concludes: Let it stand, as this dilemma remains unresolved.

²⁵³ The mishna distinguished between a case where several people were sitting to eat, which is not a joint meal, and each and every diner recites a blessing for himself; and a case where they were reclined on divans, which renders it a joint meal, and one recites a blessing on behalf of all of them. The Gemara infers: If they reclined, yes, it is considered a joint meal; if they did not recline, no. And

the Gemara raises a contradiction: Ten people who were walking on the road, even if they are all eating from one loaf, each and every one recites a blessing for himself. If they sat to eat, even if each and every one is eating from his own loaf, one recites a blessing on behalf of them all as it is considered a joint meal. In any case, it was taught: If they sat to eat, even though they did not recline. Apparently, sitting together is enough to render it a joint meal and reclining is not required.

²⁵⁴ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: With regard to those walking along the road, it was in a case where they said: Let us go and eat in such-and-such a place. Since they designated a specific location to eat together in advance, it is considered a joint meal.

²⁵⁵ On a similar note, the Gemara relates: When Rav died, his students went after his casket to the city where he was to be buried. When they returned, they said: Let us go and eat bread on the banks of the Dannak River. After they ate, they sat, and raised a dilemma: Did we learn in the mishna specifically if they reclined, it is considered a joint meal; however, if they merely sat together, no, it is not considered a joint meal? Or perhaps, since they said: Let us go and eat in such-and-such a place, it is considered as if they reclined? It was not within their capability to resolve this dilemma.

²⁵⁶ Rav Adda bar Ahava stood,

²⁵⁷ and reversed his cloak, so that his tear which he had rent in mourning of Rav was behind him, and in mourning, he rent another tear in his garment. He said: Rav is dead, and we have not yet learned the halakhot of the Grace after Meals. Until, this elder came and raised a contradiction from the mishna to the baraita, as cited above, and he resolved it for them: Since they said: Let us go and eat in such-and-such a place, it is considered as if they reclined.

²⁵⁸ We learned in the mishna: If they were reclined, one recites a blessing on behalf of them all. Rav said: This halakha was only taught with regard to bread that it requires reclining to enable one to recite a blessing on behalf of them all. However, wine does not require reclining. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even wine requires reclining as well.

²⁵⁹ Some say that Rav said: The mishna only taught that reclining is effective and enables one to recite a blessing on behalf of them all, with regard to a group eating bread. However, with regard to a group drinking wine, reclining is ineffective and each individual must recite a blessing for himself. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even with regard to wine, reclining is effective.

²⁶⁰ The Gemara raises an objection based on a Tosefta: What is the order of reclining at a meal? The guests enter and sit upon benches and chairs [katedraot] until all are assembled. Afterward, they brought them water and each and every one washes one hand in which to hold the cup of wine. When wine came before them prior to the meal, each and every one recites a blessing over the wine for himself. Then, when they entered and reclined on the divans for the meal itself, and water came before them, despite the fact that each and every one already washed one hand, they wash both hands again prior to the meal, so that they will be able to eat with both hands. If wine came before them during the meal, despite the fact that each and every one already recited a blessing for himself, one recites a blessing on behalf of them all.

²⁶¹ If so, according to that version that Rav said: This halakha was only taught with regard to bread that it requires reclining to enable one to recite a blessing on behalf of them all. However, wine does not require reclining; the first clause of the Tosefta, which taught that each guest recites a blessing over the wine for himself, is difficult.

²⁶² The Gemara answers: Guests are different, as when they are sitting in the hall prior to the meal, their intention is to leave and enter the dining room. Therefore, while there, their drinking together is not considered a joint meal.

²⁶³ And according to the version that Rav said: The mishna only taught that reclining is effective and enables one to recite a blessing on behalf of them all, with regard to a group eating bread. However, with regard to a group drinking wine, reclining is ineffective and each individual must recite a blessing for himself; the latter clause of the Tosefta, which taught that when drinking wine when reclining, one recites a blessing on behalf of all, is difficult.

²⁶⁴ The Gemara responds: There it is different, as since reclining is effective and enables one to recite a blessing on behalf of them all for bread, reclining is effective for wine as well.

²⁶⁵ We learned in the mishna: If wine came before them during the meal, each and every diner recites a blessing over the wine for himself. If the wine came after the meal, one recites a blessing on behalf of them all. The Tosefta relates: They asked Ben Zoma: Why did the Sages say: If wine came before them during the meal, each and every diner recites a blessing over the wine for himself; but if the wine came after the meal, one recites a blessing on behalf of them all? He said to them: This is because while eating, the throat is not available. If one recites a blessing on behalf of them all, he would be forced to wait until they all had finished eating and readied themselves to drink the wine together (Tosafot). To prevent imposing upon them, the Sages ruled that there is no need to recite the blessing together.

²⁶⁶ The mishna teaches: And he, who recited the blessing over the wine, also recites the blessing over the incense, although they bring the incense only after the meal. The Gemara asks: From the fact that the mishna teaches: And he recites the blessing over the incense, it can be inferred that there is someone who should take precedence over him, to recite the blessing. That is why the mishna must emphasize that it is he who recites the blessing. And why does the one who recited the blessing over the wine nevertheless recite the blessing over the incense?

²⁶⁷ The Gemara responds: Since he washed his hands first after the meal, prior to Grace after Meals, he also recites the blessing over the incense, as the washing of hands after the meal and the burning of the incense serve similar functions.

²⁶⁸ The Gemara comments: This supports the opinion of Rav, as Rav Ḥiyya bar Ashi says that Rav says: He who washes his hands first after the meal is designated to recite the blessing of Grace after Meals. Evidently, being given priority in performing one mitzva related to the meal results in that same person being given priority with regard to other mitzvot related to the meal. The Gemara relates: Rav and Rabbi Ḥiyya were seated before Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi at a meal. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said to Rav: Stand and wash your hands. Rabbi Ḥiyya saw that Rav was trembling, as Rav thought that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi was criticizing him for eating too much or for having dirty hands. Rabbi Ḥiyya said to Rav: Son of noblemen, he is telling you to review Grace after Meals. As you will be the one reciting Grace after Meals, he told you to wash your hands first.

²⁶⁹ Having mentioned the blessing over incense, the Gemara proceeds to discuss various halakhot that deal with blessings recited over scents. Rabbi Zeira said that Rava bar Yirmeya said: From when does one recite the blessing over the scent of incense? From when its column of smoke rises after the incense has been placed upon the coals. Rabbi Zeira said to Rava bar Yirmeya: But at that point, he has not yet smelled it. Rava bar Yirmeya said to him: And according to your reasoning, the blessing:

Who brings forth bread from the earth, that one recites before eating bread, at that point, he has not yet eaten from it. Rather, in that case, one recites the blessing when he intends to eat; here too, he intends to smell.

²⁷⁰ Rabbi Ḥiyya, son of Abba bar Naḥmani, said that Rav Ḥisda said that Rav said, and some say that Rav Ḥisda said that Ze'iri said: Over all the incense one recites: Who creates fragrant trees, except for musk, which is extracted from a living creature, and over which one recites: Who creates various spices.

²⁷¹ The Gemara raises an objection based on what was taught in a baraita: One only recites: Who creates fragrant trees, over the balsam from the house of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, and over balsam from the house of Caesar and over myrtle everywhere. According to the previous statement, one recites that blessing over all types of incense.

²⁷² The Gemara comments: Indeed, it is a conclusive refutation.

²⁷³ Rav Ḥisda said to Rav Yitzḥak: This balsam oil, what blessing does one recite over it? Rav Yitzḥak said to him, this is what Rav Yehuda said: One recites: Who creates the oil of our land, as balsam only grew in Eretz Yisrael, in the Jordan valley. Rav Ḥisda said to him: Except for Rav Yehuda, for whom Eretz Yisrael was extremely beloved and who therefore mentioned it in his blessing, what blessing does everyone else recite over balsam oil?

²⁷⁴ He said to him: This is what Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One recites: Who creates pleasant oil.

²⁷⁵ Rav Adda bar Ahava said: Over costus, a spice, one recites: Who creates fragrant trees, but over oil that was pressed with spices to absorb their scents, no, one does not recite that blessing. And Rav Kahana said: Even over oil pressed with spices, one recites: Who creates fragrant trees, but not over oil into which spices were ground. The Sages of Neharde'a say: Even over oil into which spices were ground, which is of even lower quality, one recites this blessing.

²⁷⁶ Rav Giddel said that Rav said: Over this jasmine [simlak], one recites: Who creates fragrant trees. Rav Ḥananel said that Rav said: Over these spikenards, which grow next to the sea, one recites: Who creates fragrant trees. Mar Zutra said: What is the verse from which we derive that even a plant with soft stalks can be called a tree? From the verse: "She had taken them up to the roof and hidden them under the trees of flax" (Joshua 2:6); evidently, even stalks of flax are called "trees."

²⁷⁷ Rav Mesharshiya said: Over this garden daffodil one recites: Who creates fragrant trees, while over a wild daffodil that grows in the field, one recites: Who creates fragrant plants. Rav Sheshet said: Over fragrant violets one recites: Who creates fragrant plants. Mar Zutra said: One who smells a citron [etrog] or a quince recites: Blessed...who gave pleasant fragrance in fruits.

²⁷⁸ On a related topic, the Gemara cites that Rav Yehuda said: One who goes out during Nisan and sees trees that are blossoming recites: Blessed...who has withheld nothing from His world, and has created in it beautiful creatures and trees for human beings to enjoy. Rav Zutra bar Toviya said that Rav said: From where is it derived that one recites a blessing over scent? As it is stated: "Let every soul praise the Lord" (Psalms 150:6). He explains the verse: What is it from which the soul derives benefit and the body does not derive benefit from it? You must say: That is scent. Even over items from which only the soul derives benefit, one must recite a blessing and praise God.

²⁷⁹ And Rav Zutra bar Toviya said that Rav said: The young men of Israel are destined to emit a sweet scent as the Lebanon, as it is stated: “His branches shall spread and his beauty will be as the olive tree, and his fragrance as Lebanon” (Hosea 14:7).

²⁸⁰ And Rav Zutra bar Toviya said that Rav said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “He has made everything beautiful in its time, and He has placed the world in their heart, yet so man cannot find out the work that God has done from the beginning even to the end” (Ecclesiastes 3:11)? This teaches that each and every individual, God has made his work pleasant for him in his own eyes. In that way, each individual will be satisfied with his work, enabling the world to function properly.

²⁸¹ Rav Pappa said: This is the proverb that people say: Hang a heart of palm on a pig, and he will continue to perform his standard activities. Although hearts of palm are a delicacy, a pig will roll it in the mud as is his wont. Every creature has its own particular tastes, and one cannot draw conclusions with regard to one based on the standards of another.

²⁸² And Rav Zutra bar Toviya said that Rav said: For one walking on a dark path, if he has a torch in his hand, it is like two were walking on that path and the light of the moon is like three. The Gemara raises a dilemma: Is a torch like two including the one carrying the torch or perhaps a torch is like two besides him for a total of three? Come and hear a proof from that which Rav said: And the moon is like three. Granted, if you say three including him, it works out well. However, if you say three besides him, why do I need four, what purpose do they serve? Didn’t the Master say: To one walking alone, a demon can be seen and cause him harm. To two people, a demon can be seen and does not cause them harm. To three people, it cannot be seen at all. Four people are no better than three. Rather, can’t we learn from this that a torch is like two, means two including him. The Gemara comments: Indeed, conclude from this.

²⁸³ And Rav Zutra bar Toviya said that Rav said; and some say Rav Ḥana bar Bizna said that Rabbi Shimon Ḥasida said; and some say Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: It is preferable, from an ethical perspective, for one to throw himself into a fiery furnace rather than humiliate another in public. From where do we derive this? From Tamar, the daughter-in-law of Judah, when she was taken out to be burned, as it is stated: “As she was brought forth, she sent to her father-in-law, saying I am pregnant by the man to whom these belong, and she said examine these, to whom does this seal, cord and staff belong?” (Genesis 38:25). Despite her dire situation, she did not reveal that she was pregnant with Judah’s child; rather, she left the decision to him, to avoid humiliating him in public.

²⁸⁴ The Sages taught: If they brought before him both scented oil and a myrtle branch, Beit Shammai say: One recites a blessing over the oil first and over the myrtle branch thereafter. And Beit Hillel say: One recites a blessing over the myrtle branch first and over the oil thereafter. Rabban Gamliel said: I will decide this dispute in favor of the opinion of Beit Shammai, that one should recite a blessing over the oil first, as it is more significant. With regard to oil; we are privileged to enjoy its fragrance and we are privileged to enjoy it by anointing ourselves with it. With regard to the myrtle branch; we are privileged to enjoy its fragrance, we are not privileged to enjoy it by anointing ourselves with it. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of the decisor, Rabban Gamliel.

²⁸⁵ The Gemara relates: Rav Pappa happened to come to the house of Rav Huna, son of Rav Ika. They brought before him both scented oil and a myrtle branch. Rav Pappa took and recited a blessing

over the myrtle branch first and then recited a blessing over the oil. Rav Huna said to him: And does the Master not hold that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of the decisor? If so, you should have recited a blessing over the oil first. Rav Pappa said: Rava said the following: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel. The Gemara comments: That is not so, as Rava did not issue that ruling. Rather, Rav Pappa did this in order to extricate himself from an unpleasant situation and justify his conduct.

²⁸⁶ Our Sages taught in a baraita: If they brought before them both scented oil and wine, Beit Shammai say: He grasps the oil in his right hand, since he recites a blessing over the oil first, and the wine in his left hand. He recites a blessing over the oil and then he recites a blessing over the wine. Beit Hillel say the opposite: He grasps the wine in his right hand and the oil in his left hand. He recites a blessing over the wine and then he recites a blessing over the oil. And after he has recited a blessing over the oil and anointed his hands with it, he smears it on the head of the servant so that his hands will not remain perfumed. And if the servant is a Torah scholar, he smears the oil on the wall, as it is unbecoming for a Torah scholar to go out perfumed into the marketplace.

²⁸⁷ Tangential to the mention of conduct unbecoming a Torah scholar, the Sages taught in a baraita: Six things are disgraceful for a Torah scholar: He may not go out perfumed into the marketplace; he may not go out of his house alone at night; he may not go out wearing patched shoes; he may not converse with a woman in the marketplace; he may not recline and participate in a meal in the company of ignoramuses; and he may not be the last to enter the study hall. And some say that he may not take long strides and he may not walk with an upright posture.

²⁸⁸ The Gemara elaborates on the statements of the baraita. He may not go out perfumed into the marketplace; Rabbi Abba, son of Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba, said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: This prohibition only applies in a place where they are suspected of homosexuality. One who goes out into the marketplace perfumed, will arouse suspicion. Rav Sheshet said: We only said this with regard to his clothing that was perfumed, but with regard to his body, it is permitted, as his sweat causes the fragrance to dissipate. Rav Pappa said: In this regard, his hair is considered like his clothing. And some say: His hair is considered like his body.

²⁸⁹ He may not go out of his house alone at night because of suspicion of promiscuity. And therefore this was only prohibited if he does not have a set time during the night to study with his teacher, but if he has a set time, everyone knows that he is going to study with his teacher at his set time, and they will not be suspicious of him.

²⁹⁰ He may not go out wearing patched shoes. This supports the statement of Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba, as Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said: It is disgraceful for a Torah scholar to go out wearing patched shoes. The Gemara challenges: Is that so? Didn't Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba himself go out wearing patched shoes? Mar Zutra, son of Rav Naḥman, said: It is only prohibited when the shoe has a patch upon a patch. And we only said this with regard to patches on the upper part of the shoe but if the patch is on the sole, this does not apply. And with regard to patches on the upper part of the shoe, we only said this when he is out on the road, but in his house, we need not be concerned. And we only said this with regard to the summer when the patches would be visible to all, but during the rainy season, when the mud obscures the view of the patches, we need not be concerned.

²⁹¹ He may not converse with a woman in the marketplace. Rav Ḥisda said: Even if she is his wife. This was also taught in a baraita: One may not converse with a woman in the market, even if she is

his wife, even if she is his daughter and even if she is his sister, for not everyone is well-versed in the identity of his female relatives and they will suspect that he is talking to women who are not his relatives.

²⁹² He may not recline and participate in a meal in the company of ignoramuses. The Gemara explains: What is the reason? Perhaps he will be drawn after them and emulate them.

²⁹³ He may not be the last to enter the study hall. The Gemara explains: Because they will call him negligent, in other words, careless and lazy.

²⁹⁴ And some say he may not take long strides, as the Master said: A long stride takes away one five-hundredth of a person's eyesight. The Gemara asks: What is his remedy if he took long strides? The Gemara responds: He can restore it by drinking the wine of kiddush on Shabbat eve.

²⁹⁵ And he may not walk with an upright posture, but slightly bowed, as the Master said: One who walks with an upright posture and in an arrogant manner, even four cubits, it is as if he is pushing away the feet of the Divine Presence, as it is written: "The entire world is full of His glory" (Isaiah 6:3). One who walks in an arrogant way shows a lack of regard for the glory and honor of God that is surrounding him, and thereby chases God from that place.

²⁹⁶ MISHNA: If they brought salted food before him to eat first and bread with it, he recites a blessing over the salted food and thereby exempts the bread, because the salted food is primary while the bread is secondary to it. This is the principle: Any food that is primary and a secondary food is with it, one recites a blessing over the primary and, in so doing, exempts the secondary from its own blessing.

²⁹⁷ GEMARA: The Gemara asks: And is there a circumstance where salted food is primary and bread is secondary? Generally, no meal has a salted food item as its primary component. Rav Aḥa, son of Rav Avira, said that Rav Ashi said: This halakha was taught with regard to those who eat fruits of Genosar, which are extremely sweet and which would be eaten along with salted foods in order to temper this sweetness. They would eat bread along with those salted foods.

²⁹⁸ On a related note, the Gemara employs hyperbole in praising the fruits of Genosar. Rabba bar bar Ḥana said: When we would go after Rabbi Yoḥanan to eat fruits of Genosar, when we were one hundred people together, each and every one of us would bring him ten fruits, and when we were ten people together, each and every one of us would bring him one hundred fruits, and every hundred of the fruits would require a basket of three se'a to hold them. Rabbi Yoḥanan would eat them all, and was prepared to swear that he had not tasted any food. The Gemara asks: Does it enter your mind that he claimed that he had not tasted any food? Rather, say that he had not tasted any sustenance. Due to their delicious taste, he was still not satiated.

²⁹⁹ The Gemara continues to wax hyperbolic: Rabbi Abbahu ate fruits of Genosar until the sweet, lush fruits made his skin so slippery that a fly would slip from his forehead. And Rav Ami and Rav Asi would eat them until their hair fell out. Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish would eat them until he became confused. And then Rabbi Yoḥanan would tell the household of the Nasi about his condition and Rabbi Yehuda Nesia would send the authorities after him and they would take him to his house.

³⁰⁰ On a similar note, the Gemara relates: When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: King Yannai had a city on the King's Mountain, from which they would take six-hundred thousand bowls of sardines for those cutting figs off the trees during the course of the week from

Shabbat eve to Shabbat eve. There were so many workers, and the fruit was so sweet, that they needed such a vast quantity of salted fish to enable them to continue with their work.

³⁰¹ On the subject of the King's Mountain and Eretz Yisrael, when Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said: King Yannai had a tree on the King's Mountain from which they would remove forty se'a of pigeons from three broods each month. When Rabbi Yitzhak came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: There was a city in Eretz Yisrael named Gufnit, in which there were eighty pairs of brothers who were priests, married to eighty pairs of sisters, who were all from priestly families. And to assess the frequency of that phenomenon, the Gemara relates: The Sages checked from Sura to Neharde'a, and with the exception of the daughters of Rav Hisha, who were married to Rami bar Hama and his brother Mar Ukva bar Hama, they could not find a similar case. And, even in the case that they found, although they, the sisters, were the daughters of a priest, they, the brothers were not priests. Throughout virtually the entire country of Babylonia, they could not find a similar circumstance.

³⁰² On the topic of salted food, Rav said: Any meal in which there is no salt is not considered a meal. Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Any meal in which there is no cooked item with gravy (Rashi) is not considered a meal.

³⁰³ MISHNA: One who ate from the fruit for which Eretz Yisrael was praised, grapes and figs and pomegranates, recites the three blessings of Grace after Meals, as he would after eating bread; this is the statement of Rabban Gamliel. And the Rabbis say: One need only recite one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals. Rabbi Akiva says: The three blessings of Grace after Meals are not restricted to bread; rather, even if one ate boiled vegetables, but it is his primary sustenance, he recites the three blessings of Grace after Meals. Additionally: One who drinks water to quench his thirst recites: By whose word all things came to be. Rabbi Tarfon says: He recites: Who creates the many forms of life and their needs.

³⁰⁴ GEMARA: The Gemara asks: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabban Gamliel? The Gemara responds: As it is written in the verse that deals in praise of Eretz Yisrael: "A land of wheat and barley, vines, figs, and pomegranates, a land of olive oil and honey" (Deuteronomy 8:8), and it is written: "A land in which you will eat bread without scarcity" (Deuteronomy 8:9), and it is written: "And you will eat and be satisfied and then you shall bless the Lord your God for the good land He has given you" (Deuteronomy 8:10). Rabban Gamliel concludes from here that the fruits for which Eretz Yisrael was praised are included in the mitzva to recite a blessing after eating. Since that Torah portion alludes to three blessings, fruit also requires three blessings.

³⁰⁵ And what do the Rabbis hold? The verse: "A land in which you will eat bread without scarcity," concluded discussion of that matter, and the mitzva: "You will eat and be satisfied and then you shall bless," applies only to bread. And if so, according to Rabban Gamliel as well, doesn't "land" conclude discussion of that matter? Rather, that verse is necessary in order to exclude one who chews raw wheat from the obligation to recite Grace after Meals. Even according to Rabban Gamliel, it does not have the legal status of bread.

³⁰⁶ Rabbi Ya'akov bar Idi said that Rabbi Hana said: Anything that is from the five species of grain, at the start, one recites over it: Who creates the various kinds of nourishment, and at the end, one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals.

³⁰⁷ Rabba bar Mari said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Anything that is from the seven species for which the Eretz Yisrael was praised, at the start, one recites over it: Who creates fruit of the tree, and afterward and at the end, one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals.

³⁰⁸ Abaye said to Rav Dimi: What is the formula of one blessing abridged from the three blessings of Grace after Meals? He said to him: Over fruits of a tree one recites: For the tree and the fruit of the tree, and for the produce of the field, and for the desirable, good and spacious land that you gave as a heritage to our ancestors that they might eat of its fruit and be satisfied with its goodness. Have compassion, Lord our God, upon Israel Your people and upon Jerusalem Your city, and upon Your Temple and upon Your altar. May You rebuild Jerusalem, Your holy city, swiftly in our time, and may You bring us back there rejoicing in it as You are good and do good to all.

³⁰⁹ After eating products baked from one of the five species of grain, one recites: For the nourishment and sustenance and for the produce of the field, and he concludes: For the land and for the nourishment.

³¹⁰ However, the question was raised: In terms of conclusion, with what does he conclude the blessing? As one does not conclude a blessing with two themes, with which of the themes should he conclude the blessing? When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: Rav would conclude the blessing on the New Moon: Blessed...Who sanctifies Israel and the New Moons. Apparently, one can conclude a blessing with two themes. What does one recite here?

³¹¹ Rav Ḥisda said: For the land and for its fruits. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: For the land and for the fruits. Rav Amram said: They do not disagree; rather, this blessing, for its fruits, is for us, in Babylonia, and this blessing, for the fruits, is for them, in Eretz Yisrael.

³¹² Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak strongly objects: They, in Eretz Yisrael, eat and we, in Babylonia, recite a blessing? How can we, residents of Babylonia, recite a blessing for the fruits of Eretz Yisrael while eating the fruits of Babylonia? Rather, reverse the opinions: Rav Ḥisda said: For the land and for the fruits, and Rabbi Yoḥanan said: For the land and for its fruits.

³¹³ Rav Yitzḥak bar Avdimi said in the name of Rabbeinu, Rav: Over the egg and types of meat [kupra], at the start, one recites: By Whose word all things came to be, and at the end: Who creates the many forms of life. However, after eating vegetables, no, one does not recite a blessing at all. Rabbi Yitzḥak said: Even after eating vegetables one recites a blessing; but after drinking water, no, one does not recite a blessing at all. And Rav Pappa said: Even after drinking water one must recite a blessing.

³¹⁴ Mar Zutra acted in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yitzḥak bar Avdimi and did not recite a blessing after eating vegetables, while Rav Shimi bar Ashi acted in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yitzḥak and recited a blessing after eating vegetables. And a mnemonic by which to remember which Sage acted in accordance with which: One like two, and two like one. In other words, Mar Zutra, who is known only by his name and not by his patronymic, acted in accordance with Rav Yitzḥak bar Avdimi who is known by both his name and his patronymic. Rav Shimi bar Ashi, who is known by both his names, followed the opinion of Rabbi Yitzḥak, who is known only by his first name.

³¹⁵ On this topic, Rav Ashi said: At times when I remember, I act in accordance with the opinions of all of them and recite a blessing even after drinking water.

³¹⁶ We learned in a mishna: Anything that requires a blessing thereafter requires a blessing beforehand; and there are items that require a blessing beforehand and do not require a blessing thereafter. If so, granted, according to Rav Yitzḥak bar Avdimi's opinion, it excludes vegetables from the requirement to recite a blessing thereafter. And, granted, according to Rabbi Yitzḥak's opinion as well, it excludes water from the requirement to recite a blessing thereafter. However, according to Rav Pappa's opinion, what does it exclude? What food requires a blessing before eating but does not require a blessing after eating?

³¹⁷ The Gemara answers: It comes to exclude mitzvot, as one recites a blessing before performing a mitzva, but not thereafter.

³¹⁸ The Gemara challenges: And for the residents of the West, Eretz Yisrael, who, after they remove their phylacteries, recite: Who has made us holy through His mitzvot and commanded us to keep His laws, what does the halakha in the mishna come to exclude?

³¹⁹ The Gemara responds: It serves to exclude types of fragrances. Everyone agrees that no blessing is recited after smelling them.

³²⁰ Since the blessing recited over an egg was mentioned, the Gemara cites what Rabbi Yannai said that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: Anything that is an egg's equivalent in volume, an egg is superior to it. Similarly, when Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: A lightly cooked egg is better than six log of fine flour. Similarly, when Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said: A lightly cooked egg is better than six log of fine flour, a roasted egg is better than four, and with regard to a cooked egg, they said: Anything that is an egg's equivalent, an egg is superior to it except for meat.

³²¹ We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Akiva says: Even if one ate boiled vegetables, but it is his primary sustenance, he recites the three blessings of Grace after Meals, as he would after eating bread. The Gemara asks: And is there a vegetable where in its boiled state it is primary sustenance? Rav Ashi said: This was taught with regard to a cabbage stalk, which is nourishing.

³²² Similarly, the Sages taught in a baraita dealing with types of sustenance: Meat of the spleen is beneficial for the teeth and harmful for the intestines. Leeks, however, are harmful for the teeth and beneficial for the intestines. They also said that all raw vegetables turn one's face pale. Generally speaking, anything small that has not yet reached its full size is harmful and impedes growth, and any living creature eaten whole, e.g., a fully grown fish, restores the soul. And anything close to the soul restores the soul. Cabbage is for nourishment and beets for healing. Woe unto the house through which the turnip passes, for it is extremely harmful.

³²³ The Master said in a baraita: The spleen is beneficial for the teeth and harmful for the intestines. The Gemara asks: What is its remedy? The Gemara responds: One should chew it, spit it out, and throw it away.

³²⁴ Leeks are harmful for the teeth and beneficial for the intestines. The Gemara asks: What is its remedy? The Gemara responds: One should boil them and swallow them without chewing.

³²⁵ All raw vegetables turn one's face pale. Rabbi Yitzḥak said: It refers here to the first meal after bloodletting, when a person should eat more substantial food.

³²⁶ And Rabbi Yitzḥak said: Anyone who eats vegetables before four hours of the day, it is forbidden to speak with him. The Gemara asks: What is the reason? The Gemara explains: This is because the

smell of vegetables from his mouth bothers others who have not yet eaten. And in general, Rabbi Yitzḥak said: It is forbidden to eat raw vegetables before four hours of the day.

³²⁷ The Gemara relates that Ameimar, Mar Zutra, and Rav Ashi were sitting. They brought raw vegetables before them before four hours of the day. Ameimar and Rav Ashi ate and Mar Zutra did not eat. They said to him: What is your thinking that led you not to eat? Was it because Rabbi Yitzḥak said: Anyone who eats vegetables before four hours of the day, it is forbidden to speak with him because of the smell? Aren't we eating and you are nevertheless speaking with us?

³²⁸ He said to them: I hold in accordance with the other halakha of Rabbi Yitzḥak, as Rabbi Yitzḥak said simply: It is forbidden to eat raw vegetables before four hours of the day.

³²⁹ Anything small impedes growth. Rav Ḥisda said: This applies even to a small goat, worth a zuz. Although the goat is worth a zuz, it is still small. And we only said this with regard to a goat that has not reached one fourth of its ultimate size. But if it has reached one fourth of its ultimate size, we need not be concerned.

³³⁰ And any living creature eaten whole restores the soul. Rav Pappa said: This includes even small fish that grow among the reeds, as even a small creature is beneficial if it reached its full size.

³³¹ Anything close to the soul restores the soul. Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: This refers to the neck, which is close to the animal's vital organs. The Gemara relates that Rava said to his servant: When you bring me a piece of meat, make an effort to bring me a piece from the place of the blessing, the neck, where the animal was slaughtered and the slaughterer recited a blessing over the ritual slaughter.

³³² Cabbage for nourishment and beets for healing. The Gemara asks: Is cabbage good for nourishment and not for healing? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: Six things cure the ill person of his disease and their cure is an effective cure, and these are: Cabbage, beets, chamomile water, honey, stomach, heret, and liver. Evidently, cabbage is also good for healing. The Gemara responds: Rather, say: Cabbage is even for sustenance and all the more so for healing, which is not the case with beets.

³³³ Woe unto the house through which the turnip passes, as it is extremely damaging. The Gemara asks: Is that so? Didn't Rava say to his servant: When you see a turnip in the market, do not ask me with what will you eat your bread today? Buy the turnip and bring it for the meal. Apparently, the turnip is a significant and appropriate food.

³³⁴ Abaye said: The turnip is harmful only when it is eaten without meat. And Rava said: Without wine. It was stated that Rav said: The turnip is harmful when it is eaten without meat. And Shmuel said: Without wood, meaning when it is not properly cooked. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Without wine.

³³⁵ Along the same lines, Rava said to Rav Pappa: Farmer (ge'onim) we break the harmful aspects of the turnip with meat and wine. You, who do not have a lot of wine, with what do you break its harmful aspects? Rav Pappa said to him: With wood. As that is what Rav Pappa's wife would do. After she cooked the turnip, she would break it with eighty pieces of wood from a palm tree.

³³⁶ On the topic of foods, the Gemara cites what the Sages taught in a baraita: A small salted fish sometimes kills, specifically seven days, seventeen days, and twenty-seven days after it was salted. And some say: Twenty-three. And we only said this when it is roasted and not roasted well, but when it is roasted well, we need not be concerned. And when it is not roasted well, we only said this when

one does not drink beer thereafter; however, when one drinks beer thereafter, we need not be concerned.

³³⁷ We learned in the mishna that the tanna'im disagreed with regard to one who drinks water to quench his thirst. The Gemara asks: What does this emphasis on his thirst come to exclude? Rav Idi bar Avin said: It comes to exclude one

³³⁸ who was choked by a piece of meat and drank water in order to wash it down. He need not recite a blessing.

³³⁹ We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Tarfon says: Over water one recites: Who creates the many forms of life and their needs. Rava bar Rav Ḥanan said to Abaye, and some say to Rav Yosef: What is the halakha in this dispute? He said to him: Go out and observe what the people are doing and act accordingly.

Chapter 7

¹ MISHNA: This mishna sets out the essential halakhot pertaining to the invitation to recite Grace after Meals after a joint meal [zimmun]: Three people who ate as one are required to form a zimmun and recite Grace after Meals. If, among the diners, one ate doubtfully tithed produce [demai], and first tithe from which its teruma was already taken, or second tithe, and consecrated food that were redeemed and therefore permitted to be eaten; and even the waiter who served the meal to the diners and who ate at least an olive-bulk from the meal, and the Samaritan [Kuti] who ate with two others at a meal; each of these people is included among the three to obligate those with whom they ate in a zimmun.

² However, one who ate untithed produce [tevel], and first tithe from which its teruma was not separated, and second tithe, and consecrated food that were not redeemed, and the waiter who did not eat an olive-bulk, and the gentile who ate with two Jews, none of these people is included among the three to obligate those with whom they ate in a zimmun. Women, slaves, and minors do not obligate those with whom they ate in a zimmun. How much must one eat to obligate those with whom he ate in a zimmun? An olive-bulk of food suffices to obligate those with whom they ate in a zimmun. Rabbi Yehuda says: An egg-bulk is the minimum measure to obligate those with whom they ate in a zimmun.

³ GEMARA: With regard to the basic mitzva of zimmun, the Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived, that after a meal in which three diners participated, a zimmun must be recited? Rav Asi said: As the verse states: "Praise God with me, and we will exalt His name together" (Psalms 34:4), i.e., the one reciting the blessing turns to at least two others to praise God together. Rabbi Abbahu said: The source of the mitzva of zimmun is derived from the verse here: "When I call the Name of the Lord, give [plural] praise to our God" (Deuteronomy 32:3).

⁴ Having mentioned these verses, the Gemara cites related matters. Rav Ḥanan bar Abba said: From where is it derived that one who answers amen should not raise his voice louder than the one reciting the blessing? As it is stated: "Praise God with me, and we will exalt His Name together"; together and not with the respondent raising his voice louder than the one reciting the blessing.

⁵ Similarly, Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi said: From where is it derived that the translator who translated the public Torah reading into Aramaic is not permitted to raise his voice louder than the reader? As it is stated: “Moses spoke, and God responded in a voice” (Exodus 19:19). This verse requires further consideration, as there is no need for the verse to state: In a voice. The phrase, in a voice, adds nothing. Rather, to what purpose did the verse state: In a voice? In Moses’ voice, i.e., in a voice no louder than Moses’ voice. This verse instructs subsequent generations that Torah readers and translators should keep their voices at an equal volume just as Moses transmitted God’s word to the people and their voices were equal in volume.

⁶ This was also taught in a baraita: The translator is not permitted to raise his voice louder than the reader. The converse is also true; and if the translator cannot raise his voice to match that of the reader, the reader should lower his voice and read.

⁷ The mishna rules that three who ate as one are required to join together and recite Grace after Meals. The Gemara discusses this halakha further: It was stated: Two who ate as one and wish to join together in a zimmun, although they are under no obligation, are they permitted to do so? Rav and Rabbi Yoḥanan disagreed: One said: If they wanted to join together, they may form a zimmun. The other said: Even if they wanted to join together, they may not form a zimmun.

⁸ The Gemara cites a proof from what we learned in our mishna: Three who ate as one are required to join together and recite Grace after Meals. By inference: Three, yes, they form a zimmun; two, no, they do not form a zimmun. This contradicts the opinion that holds that two individuals who wish to form a zimmun may do so.

⁹ The Gemara answers: There is no proof from the mishna, as there, the mishna discussed an obligatory zimmun; here, the amora’im disagree with regard to an optional zimmun.

¹⁰ The Gemara cites an additional proof. Come and hear: Three who ate as one are required to join together and recite Grace after Meals and may not disperse to recite Grace after Meals individually. Apparently, three, yes, they form a zimmun; two, no, they do not form a zimmun. If a zimmun was possible with two people, three people would not be forbidden to disperse, as even if one recited Grace after Meals alone, the remaining two would constitute a zimmun.

¹¹ The Gemara rejects this proof: It is different there, in the case of a group of three who dispersed, because from the outset, they established themselves as a group of three who were obligated to form a zimmun. Consequently, they are not permitted to forego an obligatory zimmun in favor of an optional one.

¹² The Gemara cites an additional proof. Come and hear, based on what was taught in a baraita: A waiter who was serving two people eats with them, although they did not give him permission to do so, because he will thereby be eligible to join them in a zimmun. If a waiter was serving three people, he may not eat with them unless they gave him permission to do so. Evidently, two may not form a zimmun. If that were the case, the waiter would require permission even when serving two people.

¹³ The Gemara responds: It is different there,

¹⁴ in the case of a waiter, because from the outset, they prefer to establish their zimmun as an obligation rather than as an option.

¹⁵ The Gemara cites yet another proof. Come and hear: Women form a zimmun for themselves and slaves form a zimmun for themselves; however, women, slaves, and minors, even if they wish to

form a zimmun together, they may not form a zimmun. But aren't one hundred women considered the equivalent of two men, in that they cannot constitute a prayer quorum? And yet, the baraita teaches that women form a zimmun for themselves and Canaanite slaves form a zimmun for themselves. Apparently, like women, two men can form a zimmun on their own.

¹⁶ The Gemara rejects this: There it is different because, although women cannot constitute a prayer quorum, since there are three individual minds, i.e., people, three women can fulfill the verse: "Praise God with me, and we will exalt His name together." Two men cannot.

¹⁷ The Gemara objects: If so, say the latter clause of this baraita: Women and slaves, if they wish to form a zimmun, they may not form a zimmun. Why not? Aren't they individual minds, which should enable the collective praise of God?

¹⁸ The Gemara responds: That is not the reason that women and slaves were prohibited from forming a zimmun together. Rather, it is different there, as the Sages were concerned with regard to women and slaves joining together due to promiscuity.

¹⁹ In the dispute between Rav and Rabbi Yoḥanan, it is unclear which amora held which opinion. The Gemara seeks to resolve this: Conclude that Rav is the one who said: If they wanted to join together, they may not form a zimmun. As Rav Dimi bar Yosef said that Rav said: Three people who ate as one and one of them went out to the marketplace, they call him and include him in the zimmun. The reason is because they call him; by inference, if they do not call him, no, they cannot form a zimmun.

²⁰ The Gemara rejects this proof: It is different there, in the case of three who ate together and one of them left, because from the outset, they established themselves as a group of three who were obligated to form a zimmun. That is why they need to call him and include him in their zimmun.

²¹ The Gemara now attempts to prove the opposite: Rather, conclude that Rabbi Yoḥanan is the one who said: If they wanted to join together, they may not form a zimmun, as Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Two people who ate as one, one fulfills his obligation to recite a blessing with the recitation of the blessing of the other.

²² The Gemara comments: And we discussed it in an attempt to clarify the halakha. What is he teaching us? We already learned this halakha explicitly: One who heard a blessing and did not respond, nevertheless he fulfilled his obligation. And Rabbi Zeira said: Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement teaches us that there is no blessing of zimmun among them. Indeed, conclude that Rabbi Yoḥanan is the amora who held that two may not form a zimmun.

²³ With regard to this, Rava bar Rav Huna said to his father Rav Huna: Didn't the Sages who came from the West, from Eretz Yisrael, say that two individuals who ate together, if they wanted to join together, they may form a zimmun? What, is it not that they heard it from Rabbi Yoḥanan, who was from Eretz Yisrael? Rav Huna answered: No, this is not a proof, as it is possible that they heard this halakha from Rav before he left Eretz Yisrael and descended to Babylonia.

²⁴ The Gemara now explains the matter of Rav's statement itself: Rav Dimi bar Yosef said that Rav said: Three people who ate as one and one of them went out to the marketplace, they call him and include him in the zimmun, even if he is not beside them. And Abaye said: This is only in a case that they call him and he responds, but if he is too far away to answer he cannot be included.

²⁵ Mar Zutra said: We only said this, that it is sufficient to hear and answer, with regard to a zimmun of three; but, with regard to a quorum of ten, they may not form a zimmun which includes mention of God's name until the one who left comes and sits with them.

²⁶ Rav Ashi strongly objects to this: On the contrary, the opposite is more reasonable. Nine people who ate together appear like ten, so even if one is missing, the quorum does not seem to be incomplete. Two people who ate together do not appear like three, so it would be reasonable to require the actual presence of the third.

²⁷ The Gemara concludes: And the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Mar Zutra. What is the reason? Because in a zimmun of ten they need to mention the Name of Heaven, and it is not proper conduct to invoke the Name of Heaven with fewer than ten people present.

²⁸ With regard to the halakhot of zimmun, Abaye said that we have a tradition: Two people who ate as one, it is a mitzva for them to separate and for each to recite a blessing for himself. This was also taught in a baraita: Two people who ate as one, it is a mitzva for them to separate. The baraita, however, adds: In what case are these matters stated? Specifically when both individuals are learned people [soferim] and capable of reciting prayers and blessings. However, if one of them was a learned person and the other an ignoramus, the learned person recites the blessing and the ignoramus thereby fulfills his obligation.

²⁹ Rava said: This is a statement that I said and it was stated in the name of Rabbi Zeira in accordance with my opinion: Three people who ate as one but did not conclude their meals together, one interrupts his meal in order to join the other two in a zimmun, but two do not interrupt their meal to join the other one in a zimmun.

³⁰ The Gemara challenges: And do two really not interrupt their meal to join the other one in a zimmun? Didn't Rav Pappa interrupt his meal to enable Abba Mar, his son, to recite the zimmun blessing; and, in that case, it was Rav Pappa and one other person? The Gemara responds: The case of Rav Pappa is different, as he acted beyond the letter of the law.

³¹ The Gemara relates that three Sages, Yehuda bar Mareimar, Mar bar Rav Ashi and Rav Aha of Difti ate bread together. None among them was greater than the other in either age or wisdom, rendering him the obvious choice to recite the blessing on their behalf. They sat down and raised a dilemma: That which we learned in our mishna: Three people who ate as one are required to join together and recite Grace after Meals, does that apply only when there is a great man among them, but where they are on a par with each other, perhaps separating and reciting independent blessings is preferable?

³² Indeed, that is what they did, and each person recited the blessing for himself. Later, they came before Mareimar to ask him if they had acted correctly. Mareimar said to them: Although you fulfilled your obligation to recite a blessing over your food, you did not fulfill your obligation to form a zimmun. And if you say: Let us go back and form a zimmun, there is no retroactive zimmun. Once the blessing over the meal has been recited, one can no longer recite the zimmun.

³³ The Gemara discusses another question: One who came and found them reciting the zimmun blessing, what does he say after them in response to the zimmun. Rav Zevid said that he says: Blessed is He and blessed is His Name for ever and all time (Tosafot). Rav Pappa said: He answers amen.

³⁴ The Gemara explains that Rav Zevid and Rav Pappa do not disagree. This is in a case where he found them saying: Let us bless; and that is in a case where he found them saying: Blessed be. The Gemara specifies: Where he found them saying: Let us bless, he says: Blessed is He and blessed is His Name for ever and all time; where he found them saying: Blessed be, he answers amen.

³⁵ A similar explanation resolves a difficulty in a related topic. One baraita taught: One who answers amen after his own blessings, it is praiseworthy. Another baraita taught: It is reprehensible.

³⁶ The Gemara resolves this apparent contradiction: This is not difficult. This, where the first baraita says that it is praiseworthy to answer amen after his own blessing, is in the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem; this, where the second baraita deems it offensive, is in other blessings.

³⁷ The Gemara relates: Abaye would answer amen aloud after reciting the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, so the workers would hear and stand to return to work, as the ensuing blessing: Who is good and does good, is not required by Torah law, so the laborers working for the homeowner need not recite it. Rav Ashi, on the other hand, would answer amen in a whisper, so that those who heard him would not relate to the blessing: Who is good and does good, with contempt.

³⁸ The Gemara recounts: Rabbi Zeira took ill. Rabbi Abbahu went to visit him and resolved: If the little man with the scorched legs, a nickname for Rabbi Zeira, is cured, I will make a festival, a feast, for the Sages. Rabbi Zeira was cured and Rabbi Abbahu made a feast for all the Sages. When it came time to break bread, Rabbi Abbahu said to Rabbi Zeira: Master, please break bread for us. Rabbi Zeira said to him: Doesn't the Master hold in accordance with that halakha of Rabbi Yoḥanan, who said: The host breaks bread? Rabbi Abbahu broke bread for them.

³⁹ When the time came to recite the blessing, Rabbi Abbahu said to Rabbi Zeira: Master, recite Grace after Meals on our behalf. Rabbi Zeira said to him: Doesn't the Master hold in accordance with that halakha of Rabbi Huna of Babylonia, who said: He who breaks bread recites Grace after Meals?

⁴⁰ The Gemara asks: And in accordance with whose opinion does Rabbi Abbahu hold that he asked Rabbi Zeira to recite Grace after Meals?

⁴¹ The Gemara answers: Rabbi Abbahu holds in accordance with that halakha that Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: The host breaks bread and a guest recites Grace after Meals. The host breaks bread so that he will break bread generously, whereas a guest might be embarrassed to break a large piece for himself and other guests; and the guest recites Grace after Meals so that he may bless the host in the course of reciting Grace after Meals, as the Gemara proceeds to explain.

⁴² What is the formula of the blessing with which the guest blesses his host? May it be Your will that the master of the house shall not suffer shame in this world, nor humiliation in the World-to-Come.

⁴³ Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi added to it elements pertaining to material success: And may he be very successful with all his possessions, and may his possessions and our possessions be successful and near the city, and may Satan control neither his deeds nor our deeds, and may no thought of sin, iniquity, or transgression stand before him or before us from now and for evermore.

⁴⁴ The Gemara asks: Until where does the zimmun blessing extend?

⁴⁵ Rav Naḥman says: The blessing extends only until: Let us bless. Rav Sheshet says that the zimmun blessing extends until the end of the first blessing of Grace after Meals: Who feeds all.

⁴⁶ The Gemara proposes: Let us say that this amoraic dispute is parallel to a dispute between the tanna'im. As one baraita taught: Grace after Meals is two and three blessings, and another baraita taught: Grace after Meals is three and four blessings. In attempting to understand these conflicting baraitot, the Sages assumed that everyone agrees that the blessing: Who is good and does good, the fourth blessing of Grace after Meals, is not required by Torah law. What then? Is it not that they disagree about this: The one who said that Grace after Meals is two and three blessings holds that the zimmun blessing extends until the end of the blessing: Who feeds all? If there is a zimmun, three blessings are recited; if there is no zimmun, only two blessings are recited, since the blessing: Who feeds all, is not recited. And the one who said that Grace after Meals is three and four blessings holds that the zimmun blessing extends only until: Let us bless, and includes no part of Grace after Meals itself. If there is a zimmun, four blessings are recited, the three blessing of Grace after Meals plus the blessing of the zimmun, while if there is not, only three blessings are recited.

⁴⁷ This explanation distinguishing between the baraitot is rejected: No; Rav Naḥman explains in accordance with his reasoning and Rav Sheshet explains in accordance with his reasoning.

⁴⁸ Rav Naḥman explains in accordance with his reasoning; everyone agrees that the zimmun blessing extends only until Let us bless. According to the one who said that Grace after Meals is three and four blessings, this works out well. And the one who said that Grace after Meals is two and three blessings could have said to you: Here we are dealing with the blessing recited by laborers, as the Master said that when a laborer is working, he is permitted to abridge Grace after Meals, and he begins with the blessing: Who feeds all, and includes the third blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, in the context of the second blessing, the blessing of the land.

⁴⁹ Rav Sheshet explains in accordance with his reasoning; everyone agrees that the zimmun blessing extends until the end of the blessing: Who feeds all. According to the one who said that Grace after Meals is two and three blessings, this works out well; and the one who said that Grace after Meals is three and four blessings holds that the blessing: Who is good and does good, is required by Torah law.

⁵⁰ With regard to the matter of the blessing: Who is good and does good, Rav Yosef said: Know that the blessing: Who is good and does good, is not required by Torah law, as laborers who recite Grace after Meals at work eliminate it. If it can be eliminated, it could not be a Torah obligation.

⁵¹ Rav Yitzḥak bar Shmuel bar Marta said another proof in the name of Rav: Know that the blessing: Who is good and does good, is not required by Torah law, as one who recites it begins to recite it with: Blessed, but does not conclude reciting it with: Blessed. This is the formula in all comparable blessings, as it was taught in a baraita: All blessings, one begins to recite them with: Blessed, and concludes reciting them with: Blessed, except for blessings over fruit, blessings over mitzvot, a blessing that is juxtaposed to another blessing, and the final blessing after Shema. There are among these blessings those that one who recites it begins to recite it with: Blessed, but does not conclude reciting it with: Blessed;

⁵² and there are among these blessings that one who recites it concludes reciting it with: Blessed, but does not begin reciting it with: Blessed. The blessing: Who is good and does good, one who recites it begins to recite it with: Blessed, but does not conclude reciting it with: Blessed. This proves by inference that it is an independent blessing.

⁵³ And Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: Know that the blessing: Who is good and does good, is not required by Torah law, as it is eliminated in the house of the mourner, as it was taught in a baraita according to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva: What do they say in the house of the mourner? Blessed... Who is good and does good. Rabbi Akiva says: Blessed...the true Judge.

⁵⁴ The first opinion in the baraita is challenged: Who is good and does good, yes, it is recited in the house of the mourner, the true Judge, no, it is not recited? Rather, say: Who is good and does good, is recited as well.

⁵⁵ The Gemara recounts: Mar Zutra happened to come to Rav Ashi's home when an incident of mourning befell Rav Ashi. Mar Zutra began a combined blessing and recited: Who is good and does good, God of truth, the true Judge, Who judges with righteousness, takes away with justice, and is the ruler of His world to do in it as He wills, as all His ways are just, that all is His and we are His people and His servants, and in everything we are obligated to thank Him and bless Him, Who repairs the breaches in Israel, He will repair this breach in Israel for life. Mar Zutra included both: Who is good and does good, as well as mourning and acceptance of divine justice.

⁵⁶ Returning to the original topic, it was mentioned above that one interrupts his meal to form a zimmun with two others who finished eating. The question is raised: To where does he return when he finishes his own meal and must begin to recite his own Grace after Meals? Rav Zevid in the name of Abaye said: He returns to the beginning and recites the entire Grace after Meals. And the Rabbis say: He returns to the place that he stopped. And the halakha is: He returns to the place that he stopped, i.e., to the beginning of the second blessing.

⁵⁷ On the topic of meals, the Gemara relates the following: The Exilarch said to Rav Sheshet: Although you are elderly Sages, the Persians are more expert than you with regard to the required etiquette at meals. The Persian custom is that when there are two divans on which they would recline, the greater of the two people reclines first and the person second to him in importance reclines on the divan above him, alongside his head. When there are three divans, the greatest of the three reclines on the middle divan, the one second to him in importance reclines on the divan above him, and the one third to him in importance reclines on the divan below the greatest of the three.

⁵⁸ Rav Sheshet said to the Exilarch that the custom is flawed. If the greater wishes to speak with the one second to him in importance who is reclining above his head, he must straighten up and sit and only then will he be able to speak to him. The Exilarch answered: The Persians are different, as they signal and communicate with hand gestures, especially during mealtimes, so there is no need to sit up.

⁵⁹ Rav Sheshet asked the Exilarch about the Persian practice with regard to the first waters. When washing hands before the meal, from where do they begin? The Exilarch said to him: They begin from the greatest.

⁶⁰ Rav Sheshet asked: If that is so, should the greatest person present sit and keep his hands clean and wait until everyone has washed so that they may all be served? The Exilarch said to him: They bring him his table [takka] immediately, as the custom was that each person ate at his own private table, and they brought the table before the greatest person present immediately after he washed so that he need not wait for the others.

⁶¹ Rav Sheshet asked the Exilarch about the Persian practice with regard to the final waters. When washing hands after the meal, from where do they begin? The Exilarch said to him: They begin with the least significant of the attendees.

⁶² Rav Sheshet said: If so, should the greatest person present sit with dirty hands until everyone washes his hands? The Exilarch said to him: They do not remove the table from before him until the water reaches him; he can continue eating while the others are washing.

⁶³ Rav Sheshet said: In terms of conduct at a meal, I know a baraita, as it was taught: What is the order of reclining? When there are two divans on which they would recline, the greater of the two people reclines first, and the person second to him in importance reclines on the divan below him. When there are three divans, the greatest of the three reclines first, on the middle divan, the one second to him in importance reclines on the divan above him, and the one third to him in importance reclines on the divan below the greatest of the three. The first waters before the meal, they begin with the greatest person present. The final waters; when they are five people, they begin with the greatest person present. When they are more than that, even one hundred, they begin the final waters with the least significant of the attendees until they reach the five greatest present, at which point they return and begin with the greatest present. And to the place that the final waters return the blessing also reverts, and the greatest present, the first among the final five to wash his hands, recites Grace after Meals.

⁶⁴ This baraita supports the opinion of Rav, as Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Ashi said that Rav said: Whoever washes his hands first at the end of the meal is designated to recite the blessing of Grace after Meals.

⁶⁵ Similarly, the Gemara relates: Rav and Rabbi Ḥiyya were seated at a meal before Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said to Rav: Stand, wash your hands. Rabbi Ḥiyya saw that Rav was trembling in fear that perhaps he had conducted himself improperly during the meal and therefore had to wash his hands. Rabbi Ḥiyya said to him: Son of noblemen, he is saying to you to review Grace after Meals, as the first to wash his hands after the meal is honored with leading the blessing.

⁶⁶ The Gemara continues to discuss the topic of washing after a meal. The Sages taught: Although it is customary to defer to greater people, nevertheless, one shows deference neither on roads nor on bridges,

⁶⁷ nor with regard to dirty hands, i.e., with regard to washing hands at the end of a meal.

⁶⁸ The Gemara recounts: Ravin and Abaye were traveling along the road on donkeys. Ravin's donkey preceded Abaye's and Ravin did not say to Abaye: Let the Master go first. Abaye said to himself: Ever since this one of the Sages, Ravin, ascended from the West, Eretz Yisrael, he has become arrogant. When they reached the door of the synagogue, Ravin said to Abaye: Let the Master enter first. Abaye said to him: Until now was I not Master? Why do you only begin deferring to me now but did not do so while we were traveling? Ravin said to him: Rabbi Yoḥanan said the following: One only defers to those greater than he at a doorway that has a mezuzah, as only there is it appropriate to allow him to go first.

⁶⁹ The Gemara challenges: A doorway that has a mezuzah, yes, one defers; a doorway that does not have a mezuzah, no, one does not defer? If so, a synagogue or study hall that has no mezuzah, there too, does one not defer at their doorways? Rather, say that this is the principle: One only shows deference at a doorway where it is worthy of affixing a mezuzah, but not on a road or a bridge.

⁷⁰ The Gemara continues with the subject of deferring to one's superior during a meal: Rav Yehuda, son of Rav Shmuel bar Sheilat, said in the name of Rav: Those reclining at a meal may not eat anything until the one breaking bread has tasted the bread. Rav Safra sat and said: May not taste, was stated by Rav, and not: May not eat.

⁷¹ The Gemara asks: What difference does it make whether Rav said taste or eat? The Gemara explains that there is no difference and that Rav Safra's insistence teaches that one must say what he was taught in the precise language employed by his teacher without altering a single detail.

⁷² The Gemara continues to discuss the subject of honors during a meal. The Sages taught: Two people who are eating from a single dish must wait for each other, but if there are three, everyone eats when he wishes and they need not wait for each other. Generally, the one who breaks bread extends his hand to take food first, but if he wishes to defer to his teacher or to one who is greater than he, he has permission to do so.

⁷³ The Gemara relates: Rabba bar bar Ḥana engaged in preparations for his son's wedding in the house of Rav Shmuel bar Rav Ketina. He arrived early and sat and taught his son the halakhot of meals: The one who breaks bread may not break the bread until amen has ended from the mouths of those responding. Rav Ḥisda said: One need only wait until amen has ended from the mouths of the majority of those responding.

⁷⁴ Rami bar Ḥama said to him: What is different regarding the majority that one must wait until their amen ends before proceeding? That until then, the blessing has not yet concluded. If so, when the amen of the minority has not yet ended as well, the blessing has not yet concluded. Why doesn't the one breaking bread need to wait in that case?

⁷⁵ Rav Ḥisda said to him: Because I say that anyone who answers an amen of excessive duration is merely mistaken.

⁷⁶ With regard to answering amen, the Sages taught: One should not respond with an abbreviated [ḥatufa] amen, in which the first syllable is not properly enunciated, and a truncated [ketufa] amen, in which the second syllable is not properly enunciated, and an orphaned [yetoma] amen, in which the respondent is unaware of the blessing to which he is responding. Similarly, one should not quickly and indifferently discharge a blessing from his mouth.

⁷⁷ Ben Azzai says: Anyone who recites an orphaned amen, his children will be orphaned; one who recites an abbreviated amen, his days will be abbreviated and incomplete; one who recites a truncated amen, his days will be truncated. One who extends his amen, they will extend his days and years for him. Nonetheless, one should not prolong it extensively.

⁷⁸ Returning to matters of zimmun, the Gemara relates: Rav and Shmuel were sitting at a meal when, much later, Rav Shimi bar Ḥiyya arrived and was hurrying and eating. Rav said to him: What is your thinking? Are you rushing in order to join together with us for a zimmun? We have already eaten and finished our meal before you arrived. Shmuel said to Rav: We have not really finished our meal, as if they brought me truffles or a young pigeon for Abba, Rav, wouldn't we eat it? Since we would still eat, we have not yet finished our meal and Rabbi Shimi bar Ḥiyya can join us in the zimmun.

⁷⁹ Rav's students were seated at a meal when Rav Aḥa entered. The students said: A great man has come who can recite the blessing on our behalf. Rav Aḥa said to them: Do you think that the greatest recites the blessing? That is not so. Rather, one of the main participants who was present from the

beginning of the meal recites the blessing. The Gemara concludes: The halakha, however, is that the greatest person present recites the blessing, even if he arrived at the end of the meal.

⁸⁰ In the mishna, we learned that if, among the diners, one ate doubtfully tithed produce [demai], he is included among the three to obligate those with whom he ate in a zimmun. The Gemara raises an objection: But demai is not fit for his consumption. He is forbidden to eat demai. The Gemara responds: He may recite Grace after Meals over it because, if he wants, he could declare all of his property ownerless [hefker] and he would be a pauper, in which case the demai would be fit for his consumption. As we learned in a mishna: One may feed the impoverished demai and one may feed soldiers [akhsania], whose support is imposed upon the residents of the city, demai. And Rav Huna said: It was taught in a baraita that Beit Shammai say: One may not feed the impoverished and soldiers demai.

⁸¹ We learned in the mishna: If, among the diners, one ate first tithe from which its teruma was already taken, he may be included in a zimmun. The Gemara remarks: It is obvious that if the teruma was already taken there is no problem. Why was it necessary for the mishna to teach that one can join a zimmun? The Gemara explains: It was only necessary to teach this halakha in a case where the Levite preceded the priest while the grain was still on the stalks, and he separated the teruma of the tithes but did not separate the teruma gedola. Teruma gedola was not separated from the tithe that was eaten by the Levite. Although this should not be done ab initio, after the fact it is permitted, and one who eats first tithe produce under these circumstances may be included in a zimmun. And this is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Abbahu, as Rabbi Abbahu said that Reish Lakish said: First tithe in which the Levite preceded the priest while the grain was still on the stalks is exempt from teruma gedola, as it is stated: “And you shall set apart from it a gift for the Lord, even a tenth part of the tithe” (Numbers 18:26). This verse teaches that the Levite is obligated to set apart a tenth part of the tithe, i.e., the teruma of the tithe and not teruma gedola and the teruma of the tithe.

⁸² Rav Pappa said to Abaye: If so, even if the Levite preceded the priest after the kernels of grain were removed from the stalks and placed in a pile, the Levite should not have to separate teruma gedola. Abaye said to him: With regard to your claim, the verse stated:

⁸³ “From all of that is given to you, you shall set apart that which is the Lord’s teruma” (Numbers 18:29). God’s teruma, teruma gedola, must be taken from all of the Levites’ gifts. The Gemara asks: And what did you see that led you to require teruma gedola from first tithe that was taken from grain in piles and not from first tithe that was taken from grain on stalks? Abaye answers: This, after it was threshed and placed into piles, is completely processed and has become grain, and that, which remained on the stalk, did not yet become grain. The verse regarding teruma gedola states: “The first of your grain” (Deuteronomy 18:4), is given to the priest. Once it is considered grain, the right of the priest takes effect and the Levite is required to separate teruma gedola.

⁸⁴ The mishna states that if, among the diners, one ate second tithe and consecrated food that were redeemed, he may be included in a zimmun. The Gemara remarks: It is obvious that if these items were redeemed that one could participate in a zimmun. The Gemara responds: With what are we dealing here? We are dealing with a case where the consecrated property was not completely redeemed, i.e., where one gave payment for the principal, the value of the tithe, but he did not give payment for the fifth that he must add when redeeming items that he consecrated; and the mishna teaches us that failure to add the fifth does not invalidate the redemption.

⁸⁵ We learned in the mishna: The waiter who ate at least an olive-bulk from the meal may join in a zimmun. The Gemara remarks: It is obvious. Why was it necessary for the mishna to teach this halakha? The Gemara answers: Lest you say that the waiter who stands and serves the diners did not establish himself as a participant in the meal and, therefore, cannot join the zimmun, the mishna teaches us that even the waiter is considered to have established himself as a participant in the meal.

⁸⁶ The mishna states that a Samaritan [Kuti] may be included in a zimmun. The Gemara asks: Why? Even if you consider him a member of the Jewish people, let him be merely an am ha'aretz, one who is not scrupulous in matters of ritual purity and tithes, and it was taught in a baraita: An am ha'aretz may not be included in a zimmun.

⁸⁷ The Gemara offers several answers: Abaye said: The mishna is referring to a Kuti who is a ḥaver, one who is scrupulous in those areas. Rava said: Even if you say that the mishna refers to a Kuti who is an am ha'aretz, and here the prohibition to include an am ha'aretz in a zimmun refers to an am ha'aretz as defined by the Rabbis who disagree with Rabbi Meir, as it was taught in a baraita: Who is an am ha'aretz? Anyone who does not eat non-sacred food in a state of ritual purity. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Rabbis say: An am ha'aretz is anyone who does not appropriately tithe his produce. And these Kutim tithe their produce appropriately, as they are scrupulous with regard to that which is written in the Torah, as the Master said: Any mitzva that the Kutim embraced and accepted upon themselves, they are even more exacting in its observance than Jews.

⁸⁸ The Gemara cites a baraita with additional opinions with regard to the defining characteristics of an am ha'aretz: The Sages taught: Who is an am ha'aretz? One who does not recite Shema in the evening and morning. This is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. Rabbi Yehoshua says: An am ha'aretz is one who does not don phylacteries. Ben Azzai says: An am ha'aretz is one who does not have ritual fringes on his garment. Rabbi Natan says: An am ha'aretz is one who does not have a mezuzah on his doorway. Rabbi Natan bar Yosef says: An am ha'aretz is one who has children but who does not want them to study Torah, so he does not raise them to engage in Torah study. Aḥerim say: Even if one read the Bible and studied Mishna and did not serve Torah scholars to learn from them the meaning of the Torah that he studied, that is an am ha'aretz. Rav Huna said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Aḥerim.

⁸⁹ The Gemara relates: Rami bar Ḥama did not include Rav Menashya bar Taḥlisa, who studied Sifra, Sifrei, and halakhot, in a zimmun because he had merely studied and did not serve Torah scholars. When Rami bar Ḥama passed away, Rava said: Rami bar Ḥama died only because he did not include Rabbi Menashya bar Taḥlisa in a zimmun. The Gemara asks: Was it not taught in a baraita: Aḥerim say: Even if one read the Bible and studied mishna and did not serve Torah scholars, that is an am ha'aretz? Why, then, was Rami bar Ḥama punished? The Gemara answers: Rav Menashya bar Taḥlisa is different, as he served the Sages. And it was Rami bar Ḥama who was not precise in his efforts to check after him to ascertain his actions. Another version of the Gemara's answer: Anyone who hears halakhot from the mouths of Sages and studies them is considered a Torah scholar.

⁹⁰ The mishna states that one who ate untithed produce and first tithe etc. is not included in a zimmun. The Gemara remarks: It is obvious as one is forbidden to eat untithed produce. The Gemara responds: It was only necessary to teach this halakha with regard to a case where it is only considered untithed produce by rabbinic law, although by Torah law it was permitted. What are the

circumstances? Where the produce grew in an unperforated flowerpot, as anything grown disconnected from the ground is not considered produce of the ground and is exempt by Torah law from tithing. It is only by rabbinic law that it is considered untithed.

⁹¹ We learned in the mishna that one who ate first tithe from which its teruma was not separated may not be included in a zimmun. The Gemara remarks: It is obvious. The Gemara responds: It was only necessary for the mishna to teach this with regard to a case where the Levite preceded the priest after the kernels of grain were placed in a pile. Lest you say as Rav Pappa said to Abaye, that in that case, too, the produce should be exempt from the obligation to separate teruma gedola, the tanna of the mishna teaches us as Abaye responded to Rav Pappa, that there is a difference between the case when the grain was on the stalks and the case when the grain was in a pile.

⁹² We also learned in the mishna that if one ate second tithe and consecrated food that had not been redeemed, he may not be included in a zimmun. The Gemara remarks: It is obvious? Why was it necessary for the mishna to teach this halakha? The Gemara responds: It was only necessary for the mishna to teach this halakha with regard to a case where they were redeemed, but not redeemed properly, i.e., second tithe that was redeemed with an unminted coin [asimon], a silver bullion that had not been engraved. And the Torah says: “And bind up [vetzarta] the money in your hand” (Deuteronomy 14:25), which the Sages interpreted as follows: Vetzarta refers to money that has a form [tzura] engraved upon it. Consecrated property; in a case where he redeemed it by exchanging it for land instead of money, and the Torah states: “He will give the money and it will be assured to him” (Leviticus 27:19).

⁹³ The mishna states that a waiter who ate less than an olive-bulk may not join a zimmun. The Gemara remarks: It is obvious. Why was it necessary for the mishna to teach this halakha? The Gemara answers: Since the first clause of the mishna taught the halakha with regard to a waiter who ate an olive-bulk, the latter clause taught the halakha with regard to a waiter who ate less than an olive-bulk. Although it is obvious, in the interest of arriving at a similar formulation in the two parts of the mishna, it was included.

⁹⁴ The mishna further states that a gentile is not included in a zimmun. The Gemara remarks: It is obvious. Why was it necessary for the mishna to teach this halakha? The Gemara answers: With what are we dealing here? We are dealing with a case of a convert who was circumcised but did not yet immerse himself in a ritual bath, as Rabbi Zeira said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One is never considered a proselyte until he is circumcised and immerses himself. As long as he did not immerse himself, he is a gentile.

⁹⁵ We also learned in the mishna that women, slaves, and minors are not included in a zimmun. Rabbi Yosei said: A minor lying in a cradle is included in a zimmun.

⁹⁶ The Gemara objects: Didn't we learn in the mishna that women, slaves, and minors are not included in a zimmun?

⁹⁷ The Gemara responds: Rabbi Yosei stated his opinion in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, as Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Although a minor lying in a cradle is not included in a zimmun, one may make him an adjunct to complete an assembly of ten people, enabling them to invoke God's name in a zimmun.

⁹⁸ On the subject of completing a zimmun, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Nine Jews and a slave join together to form a zimmun of ten. The Gemara raises an objection: There was an incident involving Rabbi Eliezer, who entered a synagogue and did not find a quorum of ten, and he liberated his slave and he completed the quorum of ten. From this we may infer that if he freed his slave, yes, he may join the quorum of ten, but if he did not free him, no, he may not join the quorum of ten. The Gemara responds: In that case, two were required to complete the quorum; Rabbi Eliezer freed one and fulfilled his obligation with another one, who completed the quorum of ten without being freed.

⁹⁹ With regard to this incident, the Gemara asks: How did he do that? Didn't Rav Yehuda say: Anyone who frees his Canaanite slave violates a positive mitzva, as it is stated with regard to Canaanite slaves: "You will keep them as an inheritance for your children after you, to hold as a possession; they will serve as bondsmen for you forever" (Leviticus 25:46)? How, then, could Rabbi Eliezer have freed his slave? The Gemara answers: The case of a mitzva is different. The Gemara asks: It is a mitzva that comes through a transgression, and a mitzva fulfilled in that manner is inherently flawed. The Gemara responds: A mitzva that benefits the many is different, and one may free his slave for that purpose.

¹⁰⁰ In praise of a quorum of ten, the Gemara states that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One should always rise early to go to the synagogue in order to have the privilege and be counted among the first ten to complete the quorum, as even if one hundred people arrive after him, he receives the reward of them all, as they are all joining that initial quorum. The Gemara is perplexed: Does it enter your mind that he receives the reward of them all? Why should he take away their reward? Rather, emend the statement and say: He receives a reward equivalent to the reward of them all.

¹⁰¹ With regard to the laws of joining a quorum, Rav Huna said: Nine plus an ark in which the Torah scrolls are stored join to form a quorum of ten. Rav Naḥman said to him: Is an ark a man, that it may be counted in the quorum of ten? Rather, Rav Huna said: Nine who appear like ten may join together. There was disagreement over this: Some said this halakha as follows: Nine appear like ten when they are gathered. And some said this halakha as follows: Nine appear like ten when they are scattered, the disagreement being which formation creates the impression of a greater number of individuals.

¹⁰² Similarly, Rav Ami said: Two people and Shabbat join to form a zimmun. Rav Naḥman said to him: Is Shabbat a person, that it may be counted in a zimmun? Rather, Rav Ami said: Two Torah scholars who hone each other's intellect in halakhic discourse join together and are considered three. The Gemara relates: Rav Ḥisda pointed to an example of two such Torah scholars who hone each other's intellect: For example, me and Rav Sheshet. Similarly, Rav Sheshet pointed: For example, me and Rav Ḥisda.

¹⁰³ With regard to a minor's inclusion in a zimmun, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: A mature minor, i.e., one who is still a minor in terms of age, but is displaying signs of puberty, is included in a zimmun. That opinion was also taught in a baraita: A minor who grew two pubic hairs, a sign of puberty, is included in a zimmun; and one who did not grow two hairs is not included in a zimmun. And one is not exacting with regard to a minor. The Gemara comments: This baraita itself is difficult. You said that a minor who grew two hairs, yes, he is included, one who did not grow two hairs, no, he is not included, and then it taught that one is not exacting with regard to a minor. What does this last clause come to include? Is it not

¹⁰⁴ to include a mature minor? Explain the baraita as follows: A minor who grew two hairs is included in a zimmun, and we are not exacting with regard to a minor to ascertain whether or not he has reached the age of majority.

¹⁰⁵ The Gemara concludes: The halakha is not in accordance with all of these statements. Rather, the halakha is in accordance with this statement that Rav Nahman said: A minor who knows to Whom one recites a blessing is included in a zimmun.

¹⁰⁶ The Gemara relates that Abaye and Rava, when they were children, were seated before Rabba. Rabba said to them: To whom does one recite blessings? They said to him: To God, the All-Merciful. Rabba asked them: And where does the All-Merciful reside? Rava pointed to the ceiling. Abaye went outside and pointed toward the heaven. Rabba said to them: You will both become Sages. It is as the popular saying goes: A cucumber can be recognized from its blossoming stage. Similarly, a great person can be recognized even from a young age.

¹⁰⁷ Rav Yehuda, son of Rav Shmuel bar Sheilat, said in the name of Rav: If nine ate grain and one ate vegetables, they join and form a zimmun of ten. Rabbi Zeira said: I raised a dilemma before Rav Yehuda: What is the ruling if eight ate grain and two ate vegetables? May they join together? What is the ruling if seven ate grain? He said to me: There is no difference. I certainly had no dilemma with regard to six, as it was clear to me that six are insufficient to warrant a zimmun. Rabbi Yirmeya said to him: You did well that you had no dilemma with regard to six, but for the opposite reason. There, in the case of seven or eight, what is the reason that they form a zimmun of ten? Because there is a majority of those dining who ate grain. Here, too, there is a majority. Rabbi Zeira, however, held: We require an obvious majority. Therefore, contrary to the opinion of Rabbi Yirmeya, it was clear to him that six who ate grain are insufficient to form a zimmun.

¹⁰⁸ The Gemara relates: King Yannai and the queen ate bread together. And since Yannai executed the Sages, there was no one to recite the Grace after Meals blessing on their behalf. He said to his wife: Who will provide us with a man to recite the blessing on our behalf? She said to him: Swear to me that if I bring you such a man, you will not harass him. He swore, and she brought her brother, Shimon ben Shataḥ. She sat him between the King's throne and hers. The King said to him: Do you see how much honor I am according you? He responded: It is not you who honors me; rather, the Torah honors me, as it is written: "Extol her and she will exalt you; she will bring you to honor when you embrace her" (Proverbs 4:8). Yannai said to his wife: You see that he does not accept authority.

¹⁰⁹ They gave Shimon ben Shataḥ a cup of wine over which to recite Grace after Meals. He said: How shall I recite the blessing? Shall I say: Blessed is He from Whom Yannai and his companions have eaten? I have not eaten anything. He drank that cup of wine. They gave him another cup, and he recited the Grace after Meals blessing. By drinking the first cup he joined the other diners and was therefore eligible to recite Grace after Meals on their behalf.

¹¹⁰ With regard to this story, Rabbi Abba, son of Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba, said (that Rabbi Yoḥanan said): That which Shimon ben Shataḥ did, reciting Grace after Meals on their behalf, he did on his own, and not in accordance with the accepted halakha, as Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said as follows: One who recites Grace after Meals cannot fulfill the obligation of others to recite it until he eats an olive-bulk of grain.

¹¹¹ The Gemara raises an objection based on what was taught in a baraita: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: One who entered and reclined together with those who were dining, even if he only

dipped with them a small bit of food in spicy brine that was before them and ate with them only a single dry fig, he joins them. This baraita demonstrates that one need not necessarily eat grain to recite Grace after Meals on their behalf.

¹¹² The Gemara responds: Indeed, he joins them, but he cannot satisfy the obligation of the many unless he has eaten an olive-bulk of grain.

¹¹³ Similarly, this halakha was also stated: Rav Ḥana bar Yehuda said in the name of Rava: Even if he only

¹¹⁴ dipped with them a small bit of food in brine and ate with them only a single dry fig, he joins them. And to satisfy the obligation of the many, he does not satisfy their obligation until he eats an olive-bulk of grain. Rabbi Ḥana bar Yehuda said in the name of Rava that the halakha is: If one ate a vegetable leaf and drank a cup of wine, he joins the diners. However, to satisfy the obligation of others, he does not satisfy their obligation until he eats an olive-bulk of grain.

¹¹⁵ With regard to the origins of the four blessings of Grace after Meals, Rav Naḥman said: Moses instituted for Israel the first blessing of: Who feeds all, when the manna descended for them and they needed to thank God. Joshua instituted the blessing of the land when they entered Eretz Yisrael. David and Solomon instituted the third blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, in the following manner: David instituted "...on Israel Your people and on Jerusalem Your city..." as he conquered the city, and Solomon instituted "...on the great and Holy Temple..." as he was the one who built the Temple. They instituted the blessing: Who is good and does good, at Yavne in reference to the slain Jews of the city of Beitar at the culmination of the bar Kokheva rebellion. They were ultimately brought to burial after a period during which Hadrian refused to permit their burial. As Rav Mattana said: On the same day that the slain of Beitar were brought to burial, they instituted the blessing: Who is good and does good, at Yavne. Who is good, thanking God that the corpses did not decompose while awaiting burial, and does good, thanking God that they were ultimately brought to burial.

¹¹⁶ On the topic of the blessings of Grace after Meals, the Gemara adds that the Sages taught in a baraita that the order of Grace after Meals is as follows: The first blessing is the blessing of: Who feeds all; the second is the blessing of the land; the third is: Who builds Jerusalem; and the fourth is: Who is good and does good. On Shabbat one begins the third blessing with consolation and ends with consolation and mentions the sanctity of the day with mention of Shabbat in the middle. Rabbi Eliezer says: If one wishes to recite the supplement for the sanctity of Shabbat in the blessing of consolation: Who builds Jerusalem, he recites it there; in the blessing of the land, he recites it there; in the blessing instituted by the Sages at Yavne, Who is good and does good, he recites it there. And the Rabbis say: He may only recite the mention of the sanctity of Shabbat in the context of the blessing of consolation.

¹¹⁷ The Gemara remarks: The opinion of the Rabbis is identical with the opinion of the first tanna. Both opinions hold that the mention of Shabbat is in the third blessing. The Gemara responds: The difference between the opinion of the Rabbis and the opinion of the first tanna is with regard to after the fact. They both agree that *ab initio*, Shabbat should be mentioned in the third blessing. If, though, one inadvertently mentioned Shabbat in one of the other blessings mentioned by Rabbi Eliezer, the first tanna holds that he fulfilled his obligation and the Rabbis emphasize that it may only be recited in the blessing of consolation.

¹¹⁸ The Sages taught in a Tosefta: From where is it derived that Grace after Meals is from the Torah? As it is stated: “And you shall eat and be satisfied, and you shall bless the Lord, your God, for the good land that He has given you” (Deuteronomy 8:10). The Gemara explains: And you shall bless, that is the blessing of: Who feeds all. The Lord, your God, that is the zimmun blessing in which God’s name is invoked. For the land, that is the blessing of the land; good, that is the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, and it also says: “This good mountain and Lebanon” (Deuteronomy 3:25), which is interpreted homiletically as referring to Jerusalem and the Temple. That He gave you, that is: Who is good and does good. However, I only have a Torah source for blessings after eating, i.e., Grace after Meals. From where is it derived that one is obligated to recite blessings before eating? You said that it can be derived through an a fortiori inference: When one is satisfied, he is obligated to recite a blessing and thank God for food; when he is hungry, all the more so that he should recite a blessing to offer thanks for the food he will eat.

¹¹⁹ Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: It is not necessary to interpret the verse this way; rather, it should be understood in a slightly different manner, as follows: “And you shall eat and be satisfied, and you shall bless,” that is the blessing of: Who feeds all; however, the zimmun blessing is derived from the verse: “Praise God with me and we will exalt His name together” (Psalms 34:3). He continues: For the land, that is the blessing of the land. Good, that is the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, and it also says: This good mountain and Lebanon. They instituted the blessing: Who is good and does good, at Yavne and, as such, it has no biblical source. However, I only have a Torah source for blessings after eating, i.e., Grace after Meals. From where is it derived that one is obligated to recite blessings before eating? The verse states: That he gave you. A blessing must be recited over food from the moment that God gave it to you, not only afterward.

¹²⁰ Rabbi Yitzḥak says: That source for the obligation to recite a blessing beforehand is not necessary, as it says: “And He will bless your bread and your water” (Exodus 23:25); do not read: And He will bless [uveirakh], rather: And you will bless [uvareikh]. And when is it called bread? Before it is eaten.

¹²¹ Rabbi Natan says: That source for the obligation to recite a blessing beforehand is not necessary, as it says when the maidens told Saul: “As soon you come into the city, find him right away, before he goes up to the high place to eat; for the people will not eat until he comes, because he will bless the sacrifice; and afterwards all those who are invited will eat; now go, for you shall find him at this time of day” (I Samuel 9:13). A blessing recited prior to eating is explicitly mentioned in that verse.

¹²² Tangentially, the Gemara asks: Why did these maidens go on so expansively while speaking to Saul? It is because women are chatterers. And Shmuel said a different reason: They spoke expansively in order to gaze upon Saul’s beauty longer, as it is written about him: “An excellent young man; no one among the Israelites was better than he; he was taller than the people from the shoulders up” (I Samuel 9:2). Rabbi Yohanan said that their expansiveness was initiated by God, because one sovereignty does not overlap with its counterpart, even one hairbreadth. Saul’s coronation was delayed so that Samuel’s leadership would not be curtailed.

¹²³ The baraita with regard to Grace after Meals continues: I only have a Torah source for Grace after Meals. From where is the obligation to recite the blessing of the Torah derived? Several answers are offered: Rabbi Yishmael said: It is derived through an a fortiori inference from Grace after Meals: Over food, which is an aspect of temporal life, one recites a blessing, all the more so one recites a

blessing over the Torah, which is eternal life. Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Naḥmani, the student of Rabbi Yishmael, says in the name of Rabbi Yishmael: This a fortiori inference is not necessary, as this halakha can be derived from the same verse from which Grace after Meals is derived, as it states: “For the good land that He gave [natan] you,” and below, with regard to the Torah, it says: “And I will give [ve’etna] you the stone tablets, and the Torah and the mitzva, which I have written, that you may teach them” (Exodus 24:12). Here, just as giving with regard to the good land requires a blessing, giving with regard to the Torah requires a blessing.

¹²⁴ Concerning this verse, Rabbi Meir says: From where is it derived that just as one recites a blessing over the good that befalls him he recites a blessing over the bad? The verse states: “That the Lord, your God gave you.” “Your God” is a reference to the attribute of divine justice; your Judge, in whatever judgment that He judges you, whether it is a positive measure of goodness or a measure of calamity.

¹²⁵ Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira says: Proof for a blessing over the Torah from a different verse is not necessary, as it says: “For the good [hatova] land.” Two different matters are derived from different aspects of the word hatova: Tova, that is Torah, as it says: “For I have given you good [tov] teachings, do not forsake My Torah” (Proverbs 4:2); hatova, that is the building of Jerusalem, as it says: “This good mountain [hatov] and Lebanon.”

¹²⁶ With regard to the formula of Grace after Meals, the Gemara continues: It was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Eliezer says: Anyone who did not say: A desirable, good, and spacious land in the blessing of the land, and who did not mention the royal house of David in the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, did not fulfill his obligation. Naḥum the Elder says: One must mention the covenant of circumcision in the blessing of the land. Rabbi Yosei says: One must mention the Torah in the blessing of the land. Pelimu, one of the last tanna'im, says: He must make mention of the covenant of circumcision preceding mention of the Torah, as this, the Torah, was given to the Jewish people with three covenants,

¹²⁷ and that, the covenant of circumcision, was given with thirteen covenants, as the word brit, covenant, appears thirteen times in the portion dealing with the circumcision of Abraham (Genesis 17:1–14).

¹²⁸ Rabbi Abba says: One must mention thanks in the blessing of thanksgiving in Grace after Meals at the beginning and the end of the blessing. And one who decreases the number of expressions of thanksgiving may not decrease their number to fewer than one, and if anyone decreases their number to fewer than one, it is reprehensible.

¹²⁹ The Gemara added that the conclusions of the blessing of the land and the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, may also not be changed. Anyone who concludes the blessing of the land: Who bequeaths lands and concludes the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, with the formula: Who redeems Israel, is an ignoramus, as he thereby corrupts the intention of the blessing. And anyone who does not mention covenant and Torah in the blessing of the land and the royal house of David in the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, did not fulfill his obligation.

¹³⁰ The Gemara notes: This baraita supports the opinion of Rabbi Il'a, as Rabbi Il'a said that Rabbi Ya'akov bar Aḥa said in the name of Rabbeinu, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi: Anyone who did not mention covenant and Torah in the blessing of the land and the royal house of David in the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, did not fulfill his obligation.

¹³¹ Abba Yosei ben Dostai and the Rabbis disagreed whether or not God's sovereignty must be invoked in the blessing: Who is good and does good. One said: Who is good and does good, requires mention of God's sovereignty, and one said: It does not require mention of God's sovereignty. The Gemara explains: The one who said that it requires mention of God's sovereignty holds that this blessing was instituted by the Sages, so it is not a continuation of the previous blessings. As an independent blessing, God's sovereignty must be mentioned. The one who said that it does not require mention of God's sovereignty holds that the obligation to recite this blessing is by Torah law. Therefore, it is a continuation of the previous blessings.

¹³² The Sages taught in a baraita: With what formula does he conclude the third blessing of Grace after Meals, which discusses the building of Jerusalem? Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Yehuda says: He concludes it with: Who redeems Israel. This is perplexing: Is that to say that with: Who redeems Israel, yes, he concludes the blessing; with: The building of Jerusalem, no, he does not conclude the blessing? The Gemara responds: Rather, say that Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Yehuda said the following: One who recites the blessing concludes either with: The building of Jerusalem, or even with: Who redeems Israel.

¹³³ The Gemara recounts: Rabba bar Rav Huna happened to come to the house of the Exilarch. While reciting the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem in Grace after Meals, he opened with one theme: Have compassion on Jerusalem, and concluded with two themes: Both the building of Jerusalem and Who redeems Israel. Rav Hisda said derisively: It takes great fortitude to conclude with two themes. How could you conclude with two themes? Wasn't it taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: One may not conclude with two themes? Each blessing has its own particular ending.

¹³⁴ The Gemara discusses the matter itself: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: One may not conclude with two themes. Levi, his student, raised an objection to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi based on the standard conclusions of various blessings. The second blessing of Grace after Meals concludes: For the land and for the food. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi explained that the conclusion to that blessing is actually a single theme: The land that produces food. Levi raised a similar objection from the blessing that concludes: For the land and for the fruit. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi explained that there, too, it means: The land that produces fruit.

¹³⁵ Levi cited two other blessings: Who sanctifies Israel and the seasons. It means: Who sanctifies Israel, who sanctify the seasons. Who sanctifies Israel and the New Moon. It means: Who sanctifies Israel, who sanctify the New Moons.

¹³⁶ Levi cited an additional blessing that concludes with two themes, the blessing recited when Shabbat coincides with a Festival: Who sanctifies Shabbat, Israel, and the seasons. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi answered: Except for that one.

¹³⁷ The Gemara asks: What is different about this blessing? The Gemara answers: Here, the blessing thanks God for one matter, the sanctity of the day. However, there, in the conclusion of the third blessing of Grace after Meals, the building of Jerusalem and redemption of Israel are two themes, and each one is distinct from the other.

¹³⁸ The Gemara asks: And what is the reason that one does not conclude a blessing with two themes? The Gemara responds: Because there is a general principle: One does not perform mitzvot in bundles; rather, each mitzva must have its own blessing.

¹³⁹ The Gemara has yet to arrive at a clear conclusion regarding the conclusion of the third blessing of Grace after Meals. The Gemara asks: What conclusion was reached about it?

¹⁴⁰ Rav Sheshet said: If he opened with: Have compassion on Your people, Israel, mentioning redemption of Israel at the start, he concludes with: Who redeems Israel; if he opened with: Have compassion on Jerusalem, he concludes with: Who builds Jerusalem. Rav Nahman said: Even if he opened with: Have compassion on Israel, he concludes with: Who builds Jerusalem, because it is stated: “The Lord builds Jerusalem; He gathers in the exiles of Israel” (Psalms 147:2). This verse is interpreted to mean: When does God build Jerusalem? When He gathers in the exiles of Israel. The rebuilding of Jerusalem symbolizes Israel’s redemption.

¹⁴¹ On a similar topic, the Gemara relates: Rabbi Zeira said to Rav Hisda: Let the Master come and teach Mishna. He responded: I have not yet learned Grace after Meals, and I will teach Mishna? He responded: What is this? Why do you say that you have not yet learned Grace after Meals? He said to him: I happened to come to the house of the Exilarch and recited Grace after Meals, and Rav Sheshet stiffened his neck over me like a snake, i.e., he got angry and challenged me. Rabbi Zeira asked: And why did Rav Sheshet become angry with you? He answered: I did not mention covenant, Torah, or sovereignty in Grace after Meals. Rabbi Zeira wondered: And why did you not mention those themes? He answered that he did so in accordance with the opinion that Rav Hananel said that Rav said, as Rav Hananel said that Rav said: If one does not mention covenant, Torah or sovereignty in Grace after Meals, he nevertheless fulfilled his obligation because these themes are not applicable to all of Israel. Covenant does not apply to women; Torah and sovereignty apply neither to women nor to slaves. Rabbi Zeira said to him: Rav Sheshet should have been angry with you. And you abandoned all of these tanna’im and amora’im who disagree with him, and followed Rav? Evidently, many tanna’im and amora’im hold that covenant, Torah, and sovereignty must be mentioned in the second blessing of Grace after Meals.

¹⁴² Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The blessing: Who is good and does good, requires mention of God’s sovereignty. The Gemara asks: What is he teaching us that we did not already know? If you say that he is teaching us that any blessing that does not contain mention of God’s sovereignty is not considered a blessing, didn’t Rabbi Yoḥanan already say that halakha once? Rabbi Zeira said: Rabba bar bar Hana is saying that the blessing: Who is good and does good, requires two mentions of sovereignty, one for itself and one for the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem.

¹⁴³ The Gemara asks: If so, that God’s sovereignty must be mentioned a second time in the blessing: Who is good and does good, to compensate for the fact that it was not mentioned in the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, it should require three mentions; one of its own, one for the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, and one for the blessing of the land, in which sovereignty is also not mentioned. Rather, in the blessing of the land, what is the reason that sovereignty is not mentioned? Because it is a blessing juxtaposed to another preceding blessing. Who builds Jerusalem, should also not require its own mention of God’s sovereignty, as it is a blessing juxtaposed to another preceding blessing.

¹⁴⁴ The Gemara responds: The same is true even with regard to the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, that it does not require mention of sovereignty. However, since he mentioned the royal house of David in the blessing, it would not be proper if he did not mention God’s sovereignty as well. On the other hand, Rav Pappa said: The blessing: Who is good and does good, requires two mentions of

sovereignty besides its own; one to compensate for its lack of mention in the blessing: Who builds Jerusalem, and one for the blessing of the land.

¹⁴⁵ The Gemara recounts: Rabbi Zeira sat behind Rav Giddel in the study hall, and Rav Giddel sat before Rav Huna, and he sat and he said: One who erred and did not mention the formula for Shabbat in Grace after Meals, says the following abridged version instead: Blessed...Who gave Shabbatot for rest to His people Israel with love, as a sign and a covenant; Blessed...Who sanctifies the Shabbat. Rav Huna said to him: Who said this halakha? He answered: Rav.

¹⁴⁶ Again Rav Giddel sat and said: One who erred and did not mention the formula for Festivals in Grace after Meals, says: "Blessed...Who gave Festivals to His people Israel for joy and for commemoration; Blessed...Who sanctifies Israel and the seasons." Rav Huna said to him: Who said this halakha? He answered: Rav.

¹⁴⁷ Again Rav Giddel sat and said: If one erred and did not mention the New Moon, he says: "Blessed...Who gave the New Moon to His people Israel for commemoration. Rabbi Zeira, who related this incident, said: I do not know whether he mentioned joy in the formula or whether he did not mention joy, whether he concluded this formula with a blessing as he did in the parallel formulas for Shabbat and Festivals or if he did not conclude it with a blessing; and whether this halakha is his or whether it is his teacher Rav's statement.

¹⁴⁸ The Gemara relates: Giddel bar Manyumi was standing before Rav Nahman, Rav Nahman erred and did not mention the special formula for Shabbat in Grace after Meals,

¹⁴⁹ and he returned to the beginning of Grace after Meals and repeated it. Giddel bar Manyumi said to Rav Nahman: Why did the master act in that manner? He said: As Rabbi Sheila said that Rav said: If one erred, he returns to the beginning.

¹⁵⁰ Giddel bar Manyumi challenged: Didn't Rav Huna say that Rav said: If one erred, he recites: Blessed...Who gave? Rav Nahman said to him: Wasn't it stated about this that Rabbi Menashya bar Tah̄lisa said that Rav said: They only taught that one recites the short blessing in a case where he did not yet begin reciting: Who is good and does good; however, if he already began reciting: Who is good and does good, he must return to the beginning of Grace after Meals?

¹⁵¹ Rav Idi bar Avin said that Rav Amram said that Rav Nahman said that Shmuel said: If one erred and did not mention the formula for the New Moon in his Amida prayer, we require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it. However, if one erred and forgot to mention the New Moon in Grace after Meals, we do not require him to return to the beginning and repeat it.

¹⁵² Rav Avin said to Rav Amram about this: What is the difference between the Amida prayer and Grace after Meals? He said to him: That question was also difficult for me and I asked Rav Nahman about it, and he said to me: I did not hear the reason from Mar Shmuel himself, but let us see if we can analyze it ourselves. For the Amida prayer, which is an obligation, we require him to return to the beginning of the prayer and repeat it. For Grace after Meals, which is not an obligation, as if he wants to eat, he eats and if he wants not to eat, he does not eat, we do not require him to return to the beginning and repeat it. Grace after Meals is not a full-fledged obligation; it is dependent upon eating, which is optional. Consequently, failure to mention the New Moon in Grace after Meals is not a source of concern.

¹⁵³ The Gemara asks: If so, on Shabbatot and Festivals, when there is a mitzva to eat and when it is not possible to refrain from eating, there too, if he erred and failed to mention them in Grace after Meals, would you say that he must return to the beginning and repeat it? He said: Yes. As Rabbi Sheila said that Rav said: If one erred, he returns to the beginning of Grace after Meals. The Gemara asks: Didn't Rav Huna say that Rav said: If one erred, he recites: Blessed...Who gave? The Gemara rejects this: Wasn't it stated about this: They only taught that one recites the short blessing in a case where he did not yet begin reciting: Who is good and does good; however, if he already began reciting: Who is good and does good, he must return to the beginning of Grace after Meals.

¹⁵⁴ There is a dispute in the mishna: How much must one eat to obligate those with whom they ate in a zimmun? An olive-bulk; Rabbi Yehuda says: An egg-bulk.

¹⁵⁵ The Gemara asks: Is that to say that Rabbi Meir considers an olive-bulk significant and Rabbi Yehuda considers an egg-bulk significant? Didn't we hear them say the opposite elsewhere? As we learned in a mishna: And similarly, one who left Jerusalem and remembered that there was consecrated meat in his hand, which may not be removed from Jerusalem, if he passed Mount Scopus, or anywhere that is a comparable distance from the Temple Mount, he burns the sanctified meat at the site where he is located; and if he has not yet traveled that distance, he must return to burn it before the Temple with the wood of the arrangement that was designated for burning consecrated items that were disqualified.

¹⁵⁶ The mishna continues: How much meat must be in their possession in order to obligate them to return? Rabbi Meir says: One must return for an egg-bulk of this, sanctified meat, and that, leaven mentioned there previously. And Rabbi Yehuda says: One must return for an olive-bulk of this and that. Their opinions there seem to contradict their opinions in our mishna.

¹⁵⁷ To resolve this contradiction, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The opinions are reversed in one of these sources and must be emended. Abaye said: Actually do not reverse them. Here, with regard to zimmun, they disagree with regard to the interpretation of verses. Rabbi Meir holds: "And you shall eat," that is eating; "and be satisfied," that is drinking after eating. The halakha is in accordance with the standard halakhic principle that eating is defined as the consumption of an olive-bulk. And Rabbi Yehuda holds: "And you shall eat and be satisfied," refers to eating that includes satisfaction. And what is considered eating with satisfaction? The consumption of an egg-bulk.

¹⁵⁸ On the other hand, there, in the case of leaven and sanctified foods, they disagree not with regard to the interpretation of verses, but with regard to logical reasoning. Rabbi Meir holds: The requirement to return consecrated food is analogous to its ritual impurity, and just as its susceptibility to ritual impurity is only when it is the size of an egg-bulk, so too, the requirement to return it is only when it is the size of an egg-bulk. And Rabbi Yehuda holds: The requirement to return consecrated food is analogous to its prohibition, and just as its prohibition is only when it is the size of an olive-bulk, so too, the requirement to return it is only when it is the size of an olive-bulk.

¹⁵⁹ MISHNA: The mishna delineates distinctions in the halakhot of the zimmun blessing, based on the number of people present. How does one recite the zimmun? In a group of three people, the one reciting the zimmun says: Let us bless the One from Whose food we have eaten. In a group of three people and him, the one reciting the zimmun says: Bless the One from Whose food we have eaten, as even without him there are enough people to recite the zimmun.

¹⁶⁰ With the increase in the number of participants, the blessing is more complex. In a group of ten people, the one reciting the zimmun says: Let us bless our God. In a group of ten people and him, the one reciting the zimmun says: Bless our God. This formula is recited both in a group of ten and in a group of one hundred thousand.

¹⁶¹ In a group of one hundred people, the one reciting the zimmun says: Let us bless the Lord our God. In a group of one hundred people and him, the one reciting the zimmun says: Bless the Lord our God. In a group of one thousand people, the one reciting the zimmun says: Let us bless the Lord our God, the God of Israel. In a group of one thousand people and him, he says: Bless the Lord our God, the God of Israel. In a group of ten thousand people, the one reciting the zimmun says: Let us bless the Lord our God, the God of Israel, the God of Hosts, Who sits upon the cherubs, for the food that we have eaten. In a group of ten thousand people and him, the one reciting the zimmun says: Bless the Lord our God, the God of Israel, the God of Hosts, Who sits upon the cherubs, for the food that we have eaten.

¹⁶² The principle is that just as he recites the blessing, so too those present recite in response: Blessed be the Lord our God, the God of Israel, the God of Hosts, Who sits upon the cherubs, for the food that we have eaten.

¹⁶³ On a similar note, Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: According to the size of the crowd, they recite the blessing, as it is stated: "Bless you God in full assemblies, even the Lord, you who are from the fountain of Israel" (Psalms 68:27). Rabbi Akiva said that there are no distinctions based on the size of the crowd: What do we find in the synagogue? Both when there are many and when there are few, as long as there is a quorum of ten, the prayer leader says: Bless [barekhu] the Lord. Rabbi Yishmael said that in the synagogue, one recites: Bless the Lord the blessed One.

¹⁶⁴ GEMARA: Shmuel said: One should never exclude himself from the collective.

¹⁶⁵ The Gemara raises a challenge from what we learned in our mishna: In a group of three people and him, the one reciting the zimmun says: Bless the One from Whose food we have eaten. He thereby excludes himself from the collective.

¹⁶⁶ The Gemara answers: Say that the meaning of the mishna is:

¹⁶⁷ He may even say: Bless; nevertheless: Let us bless, is preferable as Rav Adda bar Ahava said that they said in the school of Rav: We learned: A group of six to ten people may divide into two groups, each forming its own zimmun. However, a group of ten, which invokes God's name in the zimmun, may not divide into two groups as that would negate the opportunity to invoke God's name.

¹⁶⁸ The Gemara proceeds: Granted, if you say: Let us bless is preferable, that is why six people who ate together may divide into two groups. However, if you say: Bless is preferable, why are they permitted to divide into two groups? Neither group would be able to say: Bless. Rather, mustn't one conclude from this: Let us bless is preferable as the one reciting the zimmun does not exclude himself from the group? The Gemara sums up the discussion: Indeed, conclude from this that that is the case.

¹⁶⁹ That was also taught in the Tosefta: Both if he said: Bless, and if he said: Let us bless, we do not reprimand him for doing so; and the punctilious reprimand him for doing so. And the Gemara says: As a rule, from the style of one's blessings it is obvious whether or not he is a Torah scholar. How so? For example, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: In a zimmun, one who recites: Blessed be the One

from Whose food we have eaten and by Whose goodness we live, he is a Torah scholar. However, one who recites: Blessed be the One from Whose food we have eaten and from Whose goodness we live, he is an ignoramus, as that expression insinuates that only some of God's goodness was bestowed upon him, which is tantamount to a denial of God's loving-kindness.

¹⁷⁰ Abaye said to Rav Dimi: Isn't it written that King David articulated his prayer in that manner: "Be pleased, therefore, to bless Your servant's house, that it abide before You forever; for You, Lord God, have spoken. And from Your blessing may Your servant's house be blessed forever" (II Samuel 7:29). David said: From Your blessing. The Gemara answers: In a case of request it is different, as it is inappropriate to demand the full bounty of God's blessing. The Gemara questions this: In a case of request, too, is it not written that a request for the full bounty of God's blessing is granted: "Open your mouth wide, that I will fill it" (Psalms 81:11)? What one receives corresponds to what he requests. The Gemara answered: That verse is written with regard to matters of Torah, where it is wholly appropriate to make excessive requests.

¹⁷¹ On the topic of the zimmun formula, it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: One who recites in a zimmun: And by His goodness we live, he is a Torah scholar. However, one who recites: And by His goodness they live, he is a fool, as he excluded himself from the collective. The Sages of Neharbela taught the opposite. In their opinion, they live is preferable because it is a more inclusive formula, whereas, we live is more limited and personal. Nonetheless, the Gemara concludes: The halakha is not in accordance with the opinion of the Sages of Neharbela.

¹⁷² On a similar note, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One who recites in a zimmun: Let us bless the One Whose food we have eaten, he is a Torah scholar. However, one who recites: Let us bless to Him from Whose food we have eaten, he is an ignoramus, as it appears that the blessing is directed to the host of the meal.

¹⁷³ Rabbi Aḥa the son of Rava questioned this and said to Rav Ashi: Don't we say during the Passover seder: To He Who performed all of these miracles for our ancestors and for us, using the expression: To He Who? Rav Ashi said to him: There, in the case of miracles performed for our ancestors and for us, it is self-evident that the blessing refers to God. Who performs miracles? The Holy One, blessed be He. In the case of food, however, it is not self-evident, as the host of the meal also provided the food that was eaten.

¹⁷⁴ Rabbi Yoḥanan said with regard to the formula of the zimmun that one who recites in a zimmun: Blessed be the One from Whose food we have eaten, he is a Torah scholar. However, one who recites: For the food we have eaten, he is an ignoramus, as it appears that he is blessing the host of the meal. If he was blessing God, why would he restrict the blessing to food (Tosafot)?

¹⁷⁵ Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua said: We only said this halakha with regard to a zimmun of three, where there is no mention of God's name. In a zimmun of ten, however, where there is mention of God's name, it is self-evident to whom the blessing refers, as we learned in our mishna: Just as he recites the blessing, so too do those present recite in response: Blessed be the Lord our God, the God of Israel, the God of Hosts, Who sits upon the cherubs, for the food that we have eaten.

¹⁷⁶ We learned in our mishna with regard to the formula of zimmun: This formula is recited both in a group of ten and in a group of one hundred thousand. The Gemara raises an objection: The mishna itself is difficult. On one hand, you said: This formula is recited both in a group of ten and in a group of one hundred thousand; consequently, the two cases are the same. On the other hand, it is then

taught: In a group of one hundred people, the one reciting the zimmun says; in a group of one thousand people, the one reciting the zimmun says; in a group of ten thousand people, the one reciting the zimmun says. Evidently, the formula depends on the number of people.

¹⁷⁷ Rav Yosef said: This is not difficult, as these two statements are the opinions of different Sages. This is the opinion of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, and that is the opinion of Rabbi Akiva. As we learned in our mishna: Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: According to the size of the crowd, they recite the blessing, as it is stated: “Bless you God in full assemblies, even the Lord, you who are from the fountain of Israel” (Psalms 68:27).

¹⁷⁸ We also learned in our mishna that Rabbi Akiva said that there are no distinctions based on the size of the crowd: What do we find in the synagogue? Both when there are many and when there are few, as long as there is a quorum of ten, the prayer leader says: Bless the Lord. In the case of Grace after Meals as well, the formula remains the same regardless of the number of people participating in the zimmun. The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Akiva, what does he do with that verse cited by Rabbi Yosei HaGelili? The Gemara answers: He needs it to derive that which was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Meir says: From where is it derived that even fetuses in their mother’s womb recited the song at the Red Sea? As it is stated in the chapter of Psalms that describes the exodus from Egypt: “In assemblies, bless God, the Lord, from the source of Israel,” and fetuses are included in these assemblies. The Gemara asks: And from where does the other Sage, Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, derive the matter of the singing of the fetuses? The Gemara answers: He derives it from “from the source of Israel,” which he interprets as an allusion to the womb.

¹⁷⁹ Rava said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva. The Gemara recounts that Ravina and Rav Ḥama bar Buzi happened to come to a banquet at the house of the Exilarch. At the end of the meal, Rav Ḥama rose and was seeking to gather a group of one hundred participants in the meal so that the zimmun for one hundred could be recited. Ravina said to him: You need not do so, as Rava declared the following: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva and the formula remains the same regardless of the number of people participating in the zimmun, as long as there are at least ten.

¹⁸⁰ The Gemara discusses Rava’s conduct at meals at the house of the Exilarch. Rava said: When we would eat bread at the house of the Exilarch, we would recite the Grace after Meals blessing in groups of three. The Gemara asks: Let them recite the blessing in groups of ten. The Gemara answers: Then the Exilarch would hear and become angry upon seeing a large group of Sages reciting Grace after Meals before he completed his meal. The Gemara asks: Why could they not satisfy their obligation with the Exilarch’s blessing? The Gemara answers: Since everyone is making noise, they do not hear and would not fulfill their obligation.

¹⁸¹ Rabba Tosefa’a said: These three people, who break bread together and one of them went ahead and recited Grace after Meals on his own without a zimmun, they, the other two diners, fulfill their obligation with his participation in their zimmun; he, however, does not fulfill his obligation with his participation in their zimmun because there is no retroactive zimmun, and once he recited his blessing, participating in the zimmun accomplishes nothing for him.

¹⁸² The mishna states that Rabbi Akiva holds that in the synagogue, one recites: Bless the Lord, while Rabbi Yishmael said that he recites: Bless the Lord the blessed One. Rafram bar Pappa happened to come to the synagogue of Abei Givar when he rose to read from the Torah scroll and

recited: Bless the Lord, and was silent, and did not recite: The blessed One. Because Rafram bar Pappa followed the principle that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, and those present were not accustomed to that ruling, everyone in the synagogue cried out: Bless the Lord the blessed One. Rava said to Rafram bar Pappa: You black pot, a fond nickname for a Torah scholar who invests great effort in Torah study and worship of God, why are you involving yourself in this tannaitic dispute? Although Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Yishmael disagree, Rabbi Yishmael's formula, in which Rabbi Akiva's formula is included, is acceptable to both. Furthermore, standard practice is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael.

¹⁸³ MISHNA: Three people who ate as one are not permitted to divide and recite Grace after Meals individually; rather, they recite the zimmun together. And the same is true of four who ate together, and the same is true of five. However, a group of six, up to but not including ten people who ate as one, may divide into two groups, each reciting its own zimmun. And a group of ten may not divide into two groups until there are twenty people present. The general principle is that a group may not divide unless the smaller groups will be able to recite the same zimmun formula that the whole group would have recited.

¹⁸⁴ The mishna states a halakha with regard to two groups joining together: Two groups that were eating in one house, when some members of each group can see each other, they may combine to form a zimmun. And if not, these recite a zimmun for themselves and those recite a zimmun for themselves.

¹⁸⁵ The mishna also speaks of the blessing over wine: One does not recite a blessing over wine until he adds water to it, that is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. Undiluted wine is too strong to drink and a blessing is inappropriate. And the Rabbis say: Since it is possible to drink undiluted wine, one recites a blessing over it.

¹⁸⁶ GEMARA: At the beginning of the mishna, we learned that three people who ate together may not disperse. The Gemara asks: What does this mishna teach us? We already learned this once: Three people who ate as one are required to form a zimmun.

¹⁸⁷ The Gemara answers: This teaches us that halakha which Rabbi Abba said that Shmuel said: Three individuals who sat to eat as one, and they have not yet begun to eat, nevertheless, they are not permitted to divide and recite Grace after Meals individually.

¹⁸⁸ The Gemara cites another version: Rabbi Abba said that Shmuel said that this is what the mishna teaches: Three individuals who sat to eat as one, even though they do not share a meal, but each and every one of them eats from his own loaf, they are considered a single group in terms of zimmun, and are not permitted to divide. Alternatively, perhaps the mishna comes to teach that halakha of Rav Huna, as Rav Huna said: Three individuals who came from three different groups and sat together to continue their meals also form a zimmun and are not permitted to divide.

¹⁸⁹ Rav Ḥisda said: And that is only the halakha in a case where the three individuals came from three groups of three people each, so that each original group was independently obligated to recite the zimmun, and that obligation never lapsed.

¹⁹⁰ Rava qualified this, and said:

¹⁹¹ We only said this halakha in a case where those members of the previous groups did not include them in the zimmun in their original place, but in a case where they included them in the zimmun in

their original place, their obligation to participate in a zimmun has left them. The obligation incumbent upon these three individuals to form a zimmun stems from their obligation to form a zimmun with the members of their original groups. If their groups already included them in a zimmun, their obligation as individuals has lapsed and they can no longer form another zimmun.

¹⁹² In order to explain the general principle contained in this halakhic ruling, Rava said: From where do I derive to say this halakha? As we learned in a mishna: A ritually impure bed, half of which was stolen or half of which was lost, or it was divided by brothers after they inherited it from their father, or was divided by partners, it is ritually pure. This is true with regard to any ritually impure utensil that was broken or divided; it is no longer a utensil and is therefore ritually pure. However, if they restored it and reattached the parts, it is susceptible to ritual impurity from here on.

¹⁹³ Rava infers: From here on, yes, it is susceptible to ritual impurity, retroactively, no, it does not reassume its previous status of ritual impurity. Apparently, once they divided it, the ritual impurity left it. Although it was restored, it does not reassume its previous status of ritual impurity. Here, too, once they included them in the zimmun, their obligation left them and they do not reassume their previous obligation.

¹⁹⁴ The mishna explained the circumstances in which two groups that were eating in one house may combine to form a zimmun. The Gemara adds: It was taught: If there is a common waiter among them, serving both groups, the waiter joins them into a single group, even if they cannot see each other.

¹⁹⁵ In the mishna, we learned: One does not recite a blessing over wine until he adds water to it, that is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. And the Rabbis say: One recites a blessing over it. Regarding this, the Sages taught in the Tosefta: Over wine, until he added water to it, one does not recite: Who creates fruit of the vine; rather, he recites: Who creates fruit of the tree, as it is merely fruit juice and not wine. Moreover, since it is not halakhically considered wine, one ritually washes his hands with it. Once he added water to it, however, it is considered wine, and one recites over it: Who creates fruit of the vine, and one does not ritually wash his hands with it, that is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. The Rabbis say: In either case, whether water has been added or not, it is considered wine for all intents and purposes, and one recites over it: Who creates fruit of the vine, and one may not ritually wash his hands from it.

¹⁹⁶ In accordance with whose opinion is that halakha which Shmuel said: A person may perform all his needs with bread? He may use it for purposes other than food, and he need not be concerned that he is treating the food contemptuously. In accordance with whose opinion among the tannaitic opinions cited above? The Gemara answers: It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who permits one to wash his hands with undiluted wine.

¹⁹⁷ Rabbi Yosei bar Rabbi Ḥanina said: The Rabbis agree with Rabbi Eliezer with regard to a cup of blessing, e.g., the cup of wine over which Grace after Meals is recited, that one does not recite a blessing over it until he adds water to it. What is the reason? Rav Oshaya said: We require that a mitzva be performed in the best possible manner.

¹⁹⁸ With regard the issue of wine itself, the Gemara asks: And according to the Rabbis, for what is undiluted wine, which is virtually undrinkable, fit? Rabbi Zeira said: It is good for koraiyeti, a medicinal drink made of wine and oil.

¹⁹⁹ The Gemara continues to discuss the topic of using food. The Sages taught: Four things were said with regard to bread: One may not place raw meat on bread so the blood will not drip onto the bread and render it inedible; and one may not pass a full cup of wine over bread lest the wine drip on it and ruin the bread; and one may not throw bread; and one may not prop up a dish with a piece of bread. The basis for these laws is the need to treat bread with respect.

²⁰⁰ The Gemara recounts: Ameimar, Mar Zutra and Rav Ashi ate bread together when they brought dates and pomegranates before them. Mar Zutra took fruit and threw a portion before Rav Ashi. Rav Ashi was astounded and said to him: Does the Master not hold with that which was taught in a baraita: One may not throw food? He responded: That was taught with regard to bread, not other foods. Rav Ashi challenged him again: Wasn't it taught in a baraita: Just as one may not throw bread, so too one may not throw other foods? Mar Zutra said to him: Wasn't the opposite taught in another baraita: Although one may not throw bread, he may throw other foods?

²⁰¹ Rather, that is not difficult, as the two baraitot address two different cases. This baraita, in which it is taught that one may not throw other foods, refers to a food item that becomes disgusting when thrown, whereas that baraita, in which it is taught that one may throw other foods, refers to a food item that does not become disgusting when thrown.

²⁰² Similarly, the Sages taught: One may draw wine through pipes before a bride and groom as a blessed omen, and one may throw roasted grain and nuts before them in the summer, but not in the rainy season, as in the summer they can be retrieved and eaten, which is not the case in the rainy season. But one may not throw cakes, neither in the summer nor in the rainy season.

²⁰³ Rav Yehuda said: If one forgot and put food items in his mouth without reciting a blessing, he moves them to one side of his mouth and recites the blessing.

²⁰⁴ The Gemara notes that there are three baraitot on this topic: It was taught in one baraita: He swallows them. It was taught in another baraita: He spits them out. Another baraita taught: He moves them to the side of his mouth.

²⁰⁵ The Gemara explains: That is not difficult, as each baraita addresses a different case. This baraita in which it was taught: He swallows them refers to liquids, as there is no alternative. This baraita in which it was taught: He spits them out, refers to a food item that does not become disgusting and if he removes it from his mouth he can subsequently eat it. This baraita in which it was taught: He moves them to the side of his mouth, refers to a food item that becomes disgusting, in which case it is sufficient to move it to the side.

²⁰⁶ The Gemara asks: With regard to a food item that does not become disgusting as well, let him shift it to the side and recite the blessing. Why need he spit it out? Rav Yitzḥak Kaskesa'a explained before Rabbi Yosei bar Avin, in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan: One spits it out because it is stated: "My mouth will be filled with Your praise" (Psalms 71:8), meaning that one should recite God's praises with his entire mouth, not merely half.

²⁰⁷ They raised a dilemma before Rav Ḥisda: One who ate and drank and did not recite a blessing, what is the ruling? Does he return and recite the blessing that he should have recited beforehand before he continues eating or not? In response, Rav Ḥisda said to them an analogy: Should one who ate garlic and the odor on his breath smells return and eat another garlic so that the odor on his breath will smell? That is to say, one must recite a blessing. Should one who committed a transgression and

failed to recite a blessing before eating, remedy his situation by continuing to eat without reciting a blessing (Talmidei Rabbeinu Yona)?

²⁰⁸ Ravina said: Therefore, even if one finished his meal, he must return and recite a blessing. He cites a proof, as it was taught in a baraita with regard to the laws of immersion: One who was ritually impure who immersed himself in a ritual bath and emerged, as he emerges he recites: Blessed...Who has made us holy through His mitzvot and has commanded us about ritual immersion. Evidently, in certain cases, one may recite the blessing after completing the act.

²⁰⁹ The Gemara rejects the parallel between the cases: That is not so, as there, in the case of immersion, initially, before he immersed himself, the man was unfit to recite the blessing because he was ritually impure; here, in the case where one did not recite a blessing before eating, initially he was fit to recite the blessing, and since he did not recite the blessing before he ate and he concluded his meal and is, therefore, excluded from reciting the blessing, he is completely excluded and has no way to remedy the situation.

²¹⁰ Tangential to the laws concerning wine that the Gemara cited earlier, the Sages taught: Asparagus, wine or other alcoholic beverages that they were accustomed to drink early in the morning before eating, is agreeable for the heart and beneficial for the eyes, and all the more so for the intestines. And in extolling the virtues of this drink, the Gemara says: One who is accustomed to drink it, it is agreeable for his entire body. However, one must be careful, as one who drinks excessively and becomes drunk, it is harmful for his entire body.

²¹¹ The Gemara discusses this: From the fact that it was taught that asparagus is agreeable for the heart, it may be inferred that we are dealing with asparagus made from wine, which is known to be agreeable for the heart. And we learned: And all the more so, asparagus is beneficial for the intestines. Wasn't it taught in a baraita: For L-E-T, which is an acronym for lev, heart; einayim, eyes; tehol, spleen, it is beneficial, but for R-M-T, rosh, head; me'ayim, intestines; tahtoniot, hemorrhoids, it is harmful. Apparently, asparagus is harmful for one's intestines.

²¹² The Gemara responds: That baraita, in which it was taught that asparagus is beneficial to one's intestines, refers to asparagus made with old wine. As we learned in the mishna concerning the laws of vows that one who vowed: Wine is konam for me to taste because it is harmful to the intestines, and those who heard him said to him: But isn't old wine beneficial to the intestines? If he was silent and did not argue the point, he is forbidden to drink new wine because of his vow, but he is permitted to drink old wine. Conclude from this that old wine is beneficial for the intestines.

²¹³ The Sages taught: Six things were said with regard to asparagus: One only drinks it undiluted and from a full cup; he receives it from the attendant in his right hand and drinks it with his left hand; one should not converse after drinking it and one does not stop while drinking it, but should drink it all at once; one only returns it to the one who gave it to him; and he spits after drinking it; and one may only supplement it with its own kind, meaning that after drinking asparagus, one should only eat something that is used to make similar beverages, e.g., dates after date beer, etc.

²¹⁴ The Gemara challenges: Wasn't it taught in a baraita that one may only supplement asparagus with bread? The Gemara responds: That is not difficult. This baraita, in which it was taught that one supplements it with bread, refers to asparagus made of wine, while that baraita, in which it was taught that one supplements it with its own kind, refers to asparagus made of beer.

²¹⁵ It was taught in one baraita that asparagus is beneficial for L-E-T, heart, eyes, and spleen, and harmful for R-M-T, head, intestines, and hemorrhoids. And it was taught in another baraita that asparagus is beneficial for R-M-T, head, intestines, and hemorrhoids, and harmful for L-E-T, heart, eyes, and spleen. The Gemara responds: That is not difficult. This baraita, in which it was taught that asparagus is beneficial for L-E-T, refers to asparagus made of wine, while that baraita, in which it was taught that asparagus is harmful for L-E-T, refers to asparagus made of beer.

²¹⁶ The Gemara resolves a contradiction between two other baraitot in the same manner. It was taught in one baraita that if he spit after drinking asparagus, he suffers an illness. And it was taught in another baraita that if he did not spit after drinking asparagus, he suffers an illness. The Gemara responds: That is not difficult. This baraita, in which it was taught that if he spit after drinking it he suffers an illness, refers to asparagus made of wine, while that baraita, in which it was taught that if he did not spit he suffers an illness, refers to asparagus made of beer.

²¹⁷ Rav Ashi said: Now that you said that if he did not spit after drinking it he suffers an illness, its water, the saliva in his mouth after drinking asparagus, may be expelled even when standing before the king, as failure to do so will endanger him.

²¹⁸ Rabbi Yishmael ben Elisha said: Surriel, the heavenly ministering angel of the Divine Presence, told me three things from on high: Do not take your cloak in the morning from the hand of your servant and wear it; do not ritually wash your hands from one who has not ritually washed his own hands; and only return a cup of asparagus to the one who gave it to you. Why is this? Because a band of demons and some say a band of angels of destruction lie in wait for a person and say: When will a person encounter one of these circumstances and be captured?

²¹⁹ Similarly, the Gemara relates that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: The Angel of Death told me three things: Do not take your cloak in the morning from the hand of your servant and wear it; do not ritually wash your hands from one who has not ritually washed his own hands; and do not stand before the women when they return from the burial of the deceased, because I dance and come before them and my sword is in hand, and I have license to destroy.

²²⁰ The Gemara asks: And if one encounters women returning from a funeral, what is his remedy? The Gemara answers: Let him jump four cubits from where he stands; if there is a river, let him cross it; if there is another path, let him go down it; if there is a wall, let him stand behind it; and if not, he should turn his face around and recite the verse: “And the Lord said to the Satan: The Lord rebukes you, Satan, the Lord that has chosen Jerusalem rebukes you; is not this man a brand plucked from the fire?” (Zechariah 3:2), until they pass him.

²²¹ Rabbi Zeira said that Rabbi Abbahu said, and some say that this halakha was taught in a baraita: Ten things were said with regard to a cup of blessing, e.g., the cup of wine over which Grace after Meals is recited: It requires rinsing and washing; it must be undiluted wine, and full; it requires adorning and wrapping; he takes it in his two hands and places it in his right hand, and he lifts it at least one handbreadth from the ground, and when reciting the blessing he fixes his eyes upon it. And some say: He also sends it as a gift to members of his household.

²²² Rabbi Yoḥanan said: We only have four of those ten things: Rinsing, washing, the wine must be undiluted, and the cup must be full. In explanation, it was taught: Rinsing is from the inside of the cup, and washing is from the outside of the cup.

²²³ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Anyone who recites a blessing over a full cup, they give him a boundless inheritance, as it is stated: “And full of the blessing of the Lord, possess the sea and the south” (Deuteronomy 33:23), indicating that one whose cup is full will receive God’s blessing and will inherit from all sides. Rabbi Yosei bar Ḥanina says: He merits and inherits two worlds, this world and the World-to-Come.

²²⁴ The Gemara continues explaining the ten things said with regard to the cup of blessing: The Sages would adorn the cup of blessing in different ways. Rav Yehuda would adorn it with students, as when he recited the blessing he would surround himself with students to accord honor to the blessing. Rav Ḥisda, however, would adorn it with other cups; he would surround the cup of blessing with other cups. Rabbi Ḥanan said: And specifically with undiluted wine. Rav Sheshet said: And in the blessing of the land.

²²⁵ The Sages also had different customs with regard to wrapping. Rav Pappa would wrap himself in his prayer shawl and sit and recite Grace after Meals. Rav Asi spread a cloth on his head as a sign of respect.

²²⁶ With regard to what was said that he takes it in his two hands, Rabbi Ḥinnana bar Pappa said: What is the verse that proves this? As it is stated: “Lift your hands in holiness and bless the Lord” (Psalms 134:2).

²²⁷ As for what was said after he takes it in his two hands: And he places it in his right hand, Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The early Sages asked: What is the ruling, may the left hand assist the right when taking the cup? Rav Ashi said: Since the early Sages raised this dilemma and it was not resolved for them,

²²⁸ we will act stringently and not assist the right hand with the left.

²²⁹ And he lifts it at least one handbreadth from the ground. Rav Aḥa, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, says: What is the verse that proves this? “I will lift the cup of salvation and upon the name of the Lord I will call” (Psalms 116:13).

²³⁰ And he fixes his eyes upon the cup; so that his attention will not be distracted from it.

²³¹ And he sends it as a gift to members of his household; so that his wife will be blessed.

²³² The Gemara relates: Ulla happened to come to the house of Rav Naḥman. He ate bread, recited Grace after Meals, and gave the cup of blessing to Rav Naḥman. Rav Naḥman said to him: Master, please send the cup of blessing to Yalta, my wife. Ulla responded to him: There is no need, as Rabbi Yoḥanan said as follows: The fruit of a woman’s body is blessed only from the fruit of a man’s body, as it is stated: “And He will love you, and bless you, and make you numerous, and He will bless the fruit of your body” (Deuteronomy 7:13). The Gemara infers: “He will bless the fruit of her body” was not stated. Rather, “He will bless the fruit of your [masculine singular] body.” For his wife to be blessed with children, it is sufficient to give the cup to Rav Naḥman.

²³³ That opinion was also taught in a baraita: Rabbi Natan says: From where is it derived that the fruit of a woman’s body is only blessed from the fruit of a man’s body? As it is stated: And He will bless the fruit of your body; He will bless the fruit of her body was not stated. Rather, He will bless the fruit of your body.

²³⁴ The Gemara relates that meanwhile Yalta heard Ulla’s refusal to send her the cup of blessing. Yalta was the daughter of the Exilarch and was accustomed to being treated with deference, so she

arose in a rage, entered the wine-storage, and broke four hundred barrels of wine. Afterward, Rav Naḥman said to Ulla: Let the Master send her another cup. Ulla sent Yalta a different cup with a message saying that all of the wine in this barrel is wine of blessing; although you did not drink from the cup of blessing itself, you may at least drink from the barrel from which the cup of blessing was poured. She sent him a stinging response: From itinerant peddlers, Ulla traveled regularly from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia and back, come meaningless words, and from rags come lice.

²³⁵ Rav Asi said: One may not speak over a cup of blessing from the moment he takes it in his hand until he drinks it. And Rav Asi said: One may not recite a blessing over a cup of punishment. The Gemara clarifies: What is a cup of punishment? Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: A second cup. That opinion was also taught in a baraita: One who drinks in pairs should not recite a blessing, because it is stated: “Prepare to meet your God, O Israel” (Amos 4:12). One must be well-prepared in order to stand before his Creator, and this person who drank two cups of wine is not prepared, as drinking an even number of cups of wine is dangerous due to demons.

²³⁶ In concluding the halakhot of blessings, the Gemara cites that Rabbi Abbahu said, and some say it was taught in a baraita: One who eats and walks, recites the blessing of Grace after Meals standing in one place, and one who eats standing, recites the blessing while seated, and one who eats reclining on a divan sits and then recites the blessing. And the halakha is: In all of these cases one sits and then recites the blessing.

Chapter 8

¹ MISHNA: These are the matters of dispute between Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel with regard to the halakhot of a meal: One dispute concerns the order of blessings in kiddush. Beit Shammai say: When one recites kiddush over wine, one recites a blessing over the sanctification of the day and recites a blessing over the wine thereafter. And Beit Hillel say: One recites a blessing over the wine and recites a blessing over the day thereafter.

² Similarly, Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai disagree with regard to drinking wine before a meal. Beit Shammai say: One washes his hands and mixes water with the wine in the cup thereafter, and Beit Hillel say: One mixes water with the wine in the cup and only washes his hands thereafter. The basis of this particular dispute is with regard to the laws of ritual purity, as the Gemara will explain below.

³ Also with regard to the laws of ritual purity, Beit Shammai say: After washing, one dries his hands with a cloth and places it on the table. And Beit Hillel say: One places it on the cushion upon which he is sitting.

⁴ Similarly, Beit Shammai say: One sweeps the area of the house where the meal took place and he washes his hands with the final waters before Grace after Meals thereafter. And Beit Hillel say: One washes his hands and sweeps the house thereafter.

⁵ Just as they dispute the order of the blessings in kiddush, they dispute the order of the blessings in havdala. If a meal continued until the conclusion of Shabbat, Beit Shammai say: One recites the blessing over the candle, then the Grace after Meals blessing, then the blessing over the spices, and finally the blessing of havdala. And Beit Hillel say: The order is candle, spices, Grace after Meals, and havdala.

⁶ With regard to the blessing over the candle, Beit Shammai say: Who created [bara] the light of fire. And Beit Hillel say: Who creates [boreh] the lights of fire.

⁷ One may neither recite a blessing over the candle nor over the spices of gentiles, nor over the candle nor the spices designated to pay respects to the dead, nor over the candle nor the spices of idolatry. The mishna cites another halakha with regard to the blessing over the candle: And one does not recite the blessing over the candle until he derives benefit from its light.

⁸ The mishna cites an additional dispute: One who ate and forgot and did not recite a blessing; Beit Shammai say: He returns to the place where he ate and recites the blessing. Beit Hillel say: That is unnecessary. He recites the blessing at the place where he remembered. Both agree, however, that there is a limit with regard to how long after eating one may recite Grace after Meals. And until when does he recite the blessing? Until the food is digested in his intestines.

⁹ Wine came before the diners after the meal; if only that cup of wine is there, Beit Shammai say: One recites a blessing over the wine and recites a blessing over the food, Grace after Meals, thereafter. And Beit Hillel say: One recites a blessing over the food and recites a blessing over the wine thereafter.

¹⁰ And one answers amen after a Jew who recites a blessing even if he did not hear the entire blessing, and one does not answer amen after a Samaritan [Kuti] who recites a blessing until he hears the whole blessing in its entirety, as perhaps the Kuti introduced an element inconsistent with the Jewish faith in that section of the blessing that he did not hear.

¹¹ GEMARA: The Sages taught in a Tosefta: These are the matters of dispute between Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel with regard to the halakhot of a meal: Beit Shammai say: When one recites kiddush over wine, one recites a blessing over the sanctification of the day and recites a blessing over the wine thereafter as the day causes the wine to come before the meal. And Beit Shammai offer an additional reason: The day has already been sanctified and the wine has not yet come. Since Shabbat was sanctified first, it should likewise be mentioned first.

¹² And Beit Hillel say: One recites a blessing over the wine and recites a blessing over the day thereafter, because the wine causes the sanctification to be recited. Were there no wine, kiddush would not be recited. Alternatively, Beit Hillel say: The blessing over wine is recited frequently, and the blessing over the day is not recited frequently, and there is a general principle: When a frequent practice and an infrequent practice clash, the frequent practice takes precedence over the infrequent practice. The Tosefta concludes: The halakha is in accordance with the statement of Beit Hillel.

¹³ The Gemara asks: What is alternatively? Why did Beit Hillel cite an additional reason? The Gemara responds: And if you say that there Beit Shammai cite two reasons, and here Beit Hillel offer only one, therefore Beit Hillel said they are two reasons here as well: The blessing over wine is recited frequently and the blessing over the day is not recited frequently. When a frequent practice and an infrequent practice clash, the frequent practice takes precedence over the infrequent practice.

¹⁴ It was taught in the Tosefta: The halakha is in accordance with the statement of Beit Hillel. The Gemara remarks: It is obvious, as a Divine Voice emerged and proclaimed that the halakha is always in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel. Why did the Tosefta tell us here that the halakha is in accordance with their opinion?

¹⁵ The Gemara offers two answers: If you wish, say that this Tosefta was taught before the Divine Voice emerged and proclaimed that general principle. And if you wish, say instead, that this Tosefta was indeed taught after the Divine Voice emerged,

¹⁶ and this Tosefta is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua, who said, with regard to the Divine Voice that emerged and proclaimed that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer in the case of the oven of akhnai (Bava Metzia 59b), that one disregards a Heavenly Voice. Just as he disregarded the Divine Voice in his dispute with Rabbi Eliezer, so too, one disregards the Divine Voice that proclaimed that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel.

¹⁷ As to the substance of these statements, the Gemara asks: Do Beit Shammai hold that the blessing over the day takes precedence? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: One who enters his house at the conclusion of Shabbat recites a blessing over the wine, then over the candle, then over the spices, and recites havdala thereafter? And if he has only one cup of wine, he leaves it for after the last Shabbat meal and arranges all of the blessings: Grace after Meals, the blessings of havdala and the blessing over wine together thereafter. Evidently, the blessing over wine precedes the primary havdala blessing.

¹⁸ The Gemara asks: And this baraita, from where is it ascertained that it is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai? Perhaps it is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel. Beit Shammai's opinion cannot be challenged with an unattributed baraita.

¹⁹ The Gemara responds: It cannot enter your mind that this baraita is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, as it was taught at the beginning of the baraita: Light and spices thereafter. And who, did you hear, adopts that reasoning? Beit Shammai. As it was taught in a Tosefta that Rabbi Yehuda said: Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel did not dispute that Grace after Meals is recited first and that havdala is recited last. With regard to what did they disagree? With regard to the blessings recited in the middle of havdala, the blessings over the light and over the spices. Beit Shammai say: Light and spices thereafter; and Beit Hillel say: Spices and light thereafter. Therefore, the baraita, where it is taught that the blessing over the candle precedes the blessing over the spices, must be according to Beit Shammai and it says that wine precedes havdala.

²⁰ The Gemara presents another challenge: And from where do you ascertain that this baraita is the opinion of Beit Shammai in accordance with the interpretation of Rabbi Yehuda? Perhaps it is the opinion of Beit Hillel in accordance with the interpretation of Rabbi Meir.

²¹ The Gemara responds: It cannot enter your mind that this baraita is the opinion of Beit Hillel in accordance with the interpretation of Rabbi Meir. As it was taught here in the mishna, which like all unattributed mishnayot is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir: Beit Shammai say: One recites the blessing over the candle, then the Grace after Meals blessing, then the blessing over the spices, and finally the blessing of havdala. And Beit Hillel say: The order is candle, spices, Grace after Meals, and havdala. And there, in the baraita, it was taught: And if he has only one cup of wine, he leaves it for after the last Shabbat meal and arranges all of the blessings: Grace after Meals, the blessings of havdala, and the blessing over wine together thereafter. According to the baraita, all of the blessings follow Grace after Meals. Since the baraita and the mishna do not correspond, conclude from here that the baraita is the opinion of Beit Shammai, in accordance with the interpretation of Rabbi Yehuda.

²² And, nevertheless, after the Gemara has proven that the baraita corresponds to the opinion of Beit Shammai as interpreted by Rabbi Yehuda, the contradiction between Beit Shammai's statement in the baraita and their statement in the Tosefta is difficult. The Gemara responds: Beit Shammai hold that the arrival of the day of Shabbat or a Festival is different from the departure of the day. As with regard to the arrival of the day, the more that we can advance it, the better; with regard to the departure of the day, the more we postpone it, the better, so that Shabbat should not be like a burden to us. Consequently, although Beit Shammai situate kiddush before the blessing over the wine, they agree that one should recite havdala after the blessing over the wine.

²³ The above discussion referred to Beit Shammai's opinion with regard to Grace after Meals recited over a cup of wine. The Gemara poses the question: And do Beit Shammai hold that Grace after Meals requires a cup of wine? Didn't we learn in the mishna: Wine came before the diners after the meal; if only that cup of wine is there, Beit Shammai say: One recites a blessing over the wine and recites a blessing over the food, Grace after Meals, thereafter. What? Is it not that he recites a blessing over the wine and drinks it, leaving Grace after Meals without wine? The Gemara rejects this: No. The mishna means that he recites a blessing over the cup of wine and leaves it to drink from it after Grace after Meals.

²⁴ The Gemara raises a difficulty: Didn't the Master say that one who recites a blessing is required to taste? The Gemara answers: Indeed, this refers to a case where he tasted it. The Gemara raises a difficulty: Didn't the Master say that one who tasted the cup of wine disqualified it and it is no longer suitable to be used for a cup of blessing? The Gemara answers: This does not refer to a case where he drank the wine; but rather, where he tasted it with his hand or poured a bit into another cup and drank from it.

²⁵ The Gemara raises a difficulty: Didn't the Master say: A cup of blessing requires a minimum measure of wine? By drinking the wine, doesn't he diminish the cup from containing its minimum measure? The Gemara answers: This refers to a case where the cup contained more than the required measure of wine.

²⁶ The Gemara asks: Wasn't it taught explicitly: If he has only one cup of wine? If there is more than the required measure of wine, he does not have only one cup. The Gemara responds: Indeed, there are not two cups, but there is more than one.

²⁷ The Gemara raises another difficulty: Didn't Rabbi Ḥiyya teach in a baraita that Beit Shammai say: He recites a blessing over the wine and drinks it, and recites Grace after Meals thereafter? Evidently, according to Beit Shammai, wine is not required for Grace after Meals. Rather, it must be that two tanna'im hold in accordance with Beit Shammai and differ with regard to their opinion.

²⁸ We learned in our mishna that Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel disagree over whether the washing of the hands or mixing water with the wine takes precedence. Beit Shammai say: One washes his hands and mixes water with the wine in the cup thereafter, and Beit Hillel say: One mixes water with the wine in the cup and only washes his hands thereafter.

²⁹ The Sages taught a Tosefta where this issue is discussed in greater detail: Beit Shammai say: One washes his hands and mixes water with the wine in the cup thereafter, as if you say that one mixes water with the wine in the cup first, his hands will remain ritually impure, as the Sages decreed that unwashed hands have second degree ritual impurity status as if they touched something rendered ritually impure by a creeping animal. Consequently, there is room for concern that the liquid that

inevitably drips on the outside of the cup might become ritually impure due to his hands, and those liquids will in turn render the cup ritually impure. Consequently, Beit Shammai said that the hands must be washed first in order to prevent that result.

³⁰ The Gemara asks: If the concern is with regard to ritual impurity to the cup, why mention the liquids on the outside of the cup? Let his hands render the cup ritually impure directly.

³¹ The Gemara answers: Hands have second degree ritual impurity status, and there is a general halakhic principle that an object of second degree ritual impurity status cannot confer third degree ritual impurity status upon non-sacred items, as opposed to teruma or consecrated food, except by means of liquids. By rabbinic decree, liquids that come into contact with second degree ritual impurity assume first degree ritual impurity status and, consequently, can render non-sacred items impure.

³² And Beit Hillel say: One mixes water with the wine in the cup and only washes his hands thereafter, as if you say that one washes his hands first, there is a decree lest the liquid from the outside of the cup that dampened one's hands will be rendered ritually impure due to the cup which is liable to be impure, and the liquid will in turn render his hands ritually impure.

³³ The Gemara asks: Let the cup render his hands ritually impure directly, without any liquid? The Gemara responds that, according to a general principle in the halakhot of ritual impurity, a vessel does not render a person ritually impure. The cup alone does not render his hands ritually impure.

³⁴ The Gemara asks: If the back of the cup is ritually impure, let it render the liquids that are within the cup ritually impure? The Gemara answers: Here we are dealing with a vessel that only the outside of which has been rendered ritually impure by liquids by rabbinic law and not by Torah law. In that case, the inside of the cup is pure and the outside is impure. As we learned in a mishna: A vessel whose outer side is rendered ritually impure by liquid, only the outer side of the vessel is impure,

³⁵ while its inner side, and its rim, the edge of the vessel that protrudes outwards, and its ear-shaped handle, and its straight handles are pure. However, if the inside of the vessel became ritually impure, it is all ritually impure.

³⁶ Although the decrees of Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai are different, they are based on realistic contingencies and on concerns shared by both parties. The Gemara seeks to clarify: With regard to what do they disagree? What is the crux of their dispute?

³⁷ The Gemara explains: Beit Shammai hold: It is prohibited to use a vessel the outer side of which has been rendered ritually impure by liquids. This prohibition stems from a decree of the Sages, due to concern for drips of liquid that would fall from inside the vessel to its outer side, as those drips themselves would be rendered ritually impure by virtue of their contact with the outer side of the vessel. And Beit Shammai hold that there is no reason to issue a decree due to the concern of Beit Hillel lest the liquid on one's hands will be rendered ritually impure by the cup, as Beit Shammai hold that the use of a vessel of that kind is prohibited.

³⁸ And Beit Hillel hold: One is permitted to use a vessel the outer side of which has been rendered ritually impure by liquid, as they say: Drips are uncommon, and decrees are not issued on the basis of an uncommon case. Because Beit Hillel permit the use of a vessel of that kind, there is concern lest the liquid on one's hands will be rendered ritually impure due to the cup.

³⁹ Alternatively, Beit Hillel hold that one mixes the water with the wine in the cup and then washes his hands due to the principle: Immediately after the washing of the hands comes the meal. Therefore, he mixes the water and wine in the cup, then he washes his hands, and then he immediately proceeds to the meal.

⁴⁰ The Gemara asks: What is the point of Beit Hillel adding: Alternatively? The Gemara answers: Beit Hillel said to Beit Shammai as follows: Even according to you, who said that it is prohibited to use a vessel the outer side of which is ritually impure as we issued a decree due to concern for drips, even so, our opinion is preferable to yours, as our opinion adheres to the principle: Immediately after the washing of the hands comes the meal.

⁴¹ We learned in the mishna that Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai disagree over where the cloth that one used to dry his hands should be placed. Beit Shammai say: After washing, one dries his hands with a cloth and places it on the table. And Beit Hillel say: One places it on the cushion upon which he is sitting.

⁴² In a Tosefta, the Sages taught in greater detail: Beit Shammai say: After washing, one dries his hands with a cloth and places it on the table, as if you say that he should place the cloth on the cushion, there is room to issue a decree lest the liquids on the cloth, which is wet because he used it to dry his hands, become ritually impure due to their contact with the cushion, and the liquids would in turn render the hands of anyone who touches the towel ritually impure.

⁴³ The Gemara asks: Even without the liquid, let the cushion render the towel ritually impure directly? The Gemara answers: There is a principle: A vessel does not render another vessel ritually impure.

⁴⁴ The Gemara asks: Let the cushion render the man sitting upon it ritually impure. The Gemara answers: There, too, there is a general principle: A vessel does not render a person ritually impure.

⁴⁵ And Beit Hillel say: One places it on the cushion upon which he is sitting, as if you say that he should place it on the table, there is room to issue a decree lest the liquids on the towel might be rendered ritually impure by their contact with the table, and those liquids in turn will render the food placed on the table ritually impure.

⁴⁶ The Gemara asks: Let the table render the food upon it ritually impure directly. The Gemara explains: Here we are dealing with a table that has second degree ritual impurity status, and an object of second degree ritual impurity status can only confer third degree ritual impurity status upon non-sacred items by means of liquids. By rabbinic decree, liquids that come into contact with second degree ritual impurity assume first degree ritual impurity status and, consequently, can render non-sacred items impure.

⁴⁷ The Gemara seeks to clarify: With regard to what do they disagree? The Gemara answers: The basis of their dispute is that Beit Shammai hold: It is prohibited to use a table that has second degree ritual impurity status for purposes of eating because of a decree due to those who eat teruma. A table with that status renders teruma ritually impure through contact. To prevent priests who partake of teruma from unwittingly eating off a table of that sort, a decree was issued prohibiting its use even with non-sacred foods.

⁴⁸ And Beit Hillel hold: It is permitted to use a table that has second degree ritual impurity status, and we are not concerned about the priests. As those who eat teruma are vigilant and would ascertain the status of a table before eating.

⁴⁹ Alternatively, Beit Hillel hold that there is no requirement of washing of the hands for non-sacred items by Torah law.

⁵⁰ The Gemara asks: What is the point of Beit Hillel adding the additional reason introduced with: Alternatively? The Gemara answers: Beit Hillel said to Beit Shammai as follows: And if you say, what is the difference with regard to food that we are concerned that it might be rendered ritually impure by the cloth on the table; and what is the difference with regard to hands that we are not concerned that they might be rendered ritually impure by the cloth placed on the cushion? Beit Hillel continue: We can respond that even so, this is preferable, as there is no requirement of washing of the hands for non-sacred items by Torah law. It is preferable that hands, whose impurity has no basis in Torah law, will become ritually impure with second degree ritual impurity status, and food, whose impurity has a basis in Torah law, will not become ritually impure.

⁵¹ We learned in the mishna that Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai disagree over whether cleaning the place where one ate or washing one's hands should be performed first after the meal. Beit Shammai say: One sweeps the area of the house where the meal took place and he washes his hands with the final waters thereafter. And Beit Hillel say: One washes his hands and sweeps the house thereafter.

⁵² The Sages taught in a Tosefta where this issue is discussed in greater detail: Beit Shammai say: One sweeps the area of the house where the meal took place and washes his hands thereafter, as if you say that one washes his hands first, the water is liable to splash on the remaining crumbs and you will have ruined the food. But Beit Shammai do not hold that the washing of the hands is first. What is the reason? Due to concern, lest the crumbs will be made disgusting.

⁵³ And Beit Hillel say: If the attendant is a Torah scholar, he removes the crumbs that are an olive-bulk from the table at the end of the meal and leaves only crumbs that are not an olive-bulk, as food that is less than an olive-bulk is not considered food and there is no prohibition to ruin it.

⁵⁴ This supports the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, as Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Crumbs that are less than an olive-bulk in size, one may destroy them with his hand without violating the prohibition against ruining food.

⁵⁵ Here too the Gemara poses the question: With regard to what do they disagree? The Gemara answers: The basis of their argument is that Beit Hillel hold: One is forbidden to use the services of a waiter who is an am ha'aretz. Therefore, there is no room for concern that food will be ruined as only crumbs remain on the table. And Beit Shammai hold: One is permitted to use the services of an attendant who is an am ha'aretz. Food will remain on the table and, therefore, there is room for concern that food will be ruined. The solution is to clean the food off the table and only then wash one's hands.

⁵⁶ Rabbi Yosei bar Ḥanina said that Rav Huna said: In our entire chapter, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, except for this case, where the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai. And Rabbi Oshaya would teach the opposite and reverse the opinions of Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai as they appear in our mishna, and in this case as well, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel.

⁵⁷ We learned in the mishna that Beit Shammai say: One recites the blessing over the candle, then the Grace after Meals blessing, then the blessing over the spices, and finally the blessing of havdala. And Beit Hillel say: The order is candle, spices, Grace after Meals, and havdala.

⁵⁸ The Gemara relates that Rav Huna bar Yehuda happened to come to Rava's house. He saw that Rava recited a blessing over the spices first. Rav Huna bar Yehuda said to him: Now since Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai do not disagree with regard to the blessing over light, as we learned in our mishna that Beit Shammai say: One recites the blessing over the candle, then the Grace after Meals blessing, then the blessing over the spices, and finally the blessing of havdala. And Beit Hillel say: The order is candle, and spices, Grace after Meals, and havdala, why did you recite the blessing over the spices first?

⁵⁹ Rava answered after him: Indeed, that is the statement of Rabbi Meir. However, Rabbi Yehuda says in a baraita that Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai neither disagree with regard to Grace after Meals that it is recited first, nor with regard to havdala, which is recited last. With regard to what do they disagree? They disagree with regard to the light and the spices. Beit Shammai say: One recites a blessing over light and over spices thereafter, and Beit Hillel say: One recites a blessing over spices and over light thereafter.

⁶⁰ And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The people were accustomed to conduct themselves in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel according to the interpretation of Rabbi Yehuda. The blessing over the spices is recited first.

⁶¹ The mishna cited a dispute between Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai with regard to the formula of the blessing over fire in havdala. Beit Shammai say: Who created [bara] the light of fire. And Beit Hillel say: Who creates [boreh] the lights of fire.

⁶² Regarding this, Rava says: With regard to the word bara, everyone agrees that it means created in the past. Where they disagree is with regard to the word boreh. Beit Shammai hold: Boreh means that God will create in the future, and Beit Hillel hold: Boreh also means that He has created in the past.

⁶³ Rav Yosef raised an objection: How can there be a dispute over the meaning of the word boreh? In the following verses it is clear that it refers to acts of creation in the past: "Who forms light and creates [boreh] darkness" (Isaiah 45:7), "Who forms mountains and creates [boreh] wind" (Amos 4:13), or "Who creates [boreh] the heavens and stretches them out" (Isaiah 42:5). Rather, said Rav Yosef: With regard to both bara and boreh, everyone agrees that they mean created. Where they disagree is with regard to the light of the fire or the lights of the fire. As Beit Shammai hold that there is one light in a fire, and Beit Hillel hold that there are many lights in a fire, as a flame consists of red, green, and white light. That was also taught in a baraita: Beit Hillel said to Beit Shammai: There are many lights in the fire.

⁶⁴ We learned in the mishna that one may neither recite a blessing over the candle nor over the spices of gentiles. The Gemara asks: Granted, the prohibition against the recitation of a blessing over a candle of gentiles in havdala, as the flame of the candle did not rest. Because it was burning during Shabbat, one should not recite a blessing over it at the conclusion of Shabbat. However, what is the reason that one may not recite a blessing over spices of gentiles?

⁶⁵ Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: Here we are dealing with a party arranged by gentiles and the spices used at that party were prohibited because the parties of gentiles are generally devoted to idolatry.

⁶⁶ The Gemara asks: But from that which was taught in the latter clause of the mishna: One may neither recite a blessing over the candle nor over the spices of idolatry, infer by implication that in the first clause of our mishna we are not dealing with idolatry? There must be a different reason why the spices of gentiles are prohibited.

⁶⁷ Rabbi Ḥanina of Sura said: These two halakhot are complementary, and the mishna states the halakha employing the style of: What is the reason. The mishna should be understood as follows: What is the reason that one may neither recite a blessing over the candle nor over the spices of gentiles? Because the parties of gentiles are generally devoted to idolatry and one may neither recite a blessing over the candle nor over the spices of idolatry.

⁶⁸ The Sages taught in a baraita: Over fire that rested, one may recite a blessing in havdala, and over fire that did not rest, one may not recite a blessing. The Gemara asks: What is meant by rested, and what is meant by did not rest?□

⁶⁹ If we say that did not rest means that it did not rest from labor, even from labor that is permitted? Wasn't it taught in a baraita that over light that was kindled on Shabbat for a woman giving birth or a dangerously ill person, for whom one is permitted to perform prohibited labor on Shabbat, one may recite a blessing during havdala at the conclusion of Shabbat?

⁷⁰ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: What is meant by rested? Light that rested from labor of transgression on Shabbat. However, if the light burned for the entire Shabbat or was kindled on Shabbat in a permissible manner, one may recite a blessing over it. That halakha was also taught in a baraita: A lantern that was continuously burning throughout the entire day of Shabbat, one may recite a blessing over it at the conclusion of Shabbat.

⁷¹ The Sages taught in a baraita: A gentile who lit a candle from a candle that was in the possession of a Jew or if a Jew lit a candle from a gentile, one may recite a blessing over it at the conclusion of Shabbat. However, if a gentile lit a candle from a gentile, one may not recite a blessing over it.

⁷² The Gemara asks: What is different about a candle that a gentile lit from a gentile, that one may not recite a blessing over it? Because the light did not rest on Shabbat. If so, the light of a Jew who lit a candle from a gentile also did not rest on Shabbat.

⁷³ And if you say that this prohibited flame has gone and this flame is a new and different one which came into being in the possession of a Jew, as a flame is not a concrete, static object, but rather it constantly recreates itself; however, this halakha that was taught in a Tosefta in tractate Shabbat states: One who carries out a flame from the private to the public domain on Shabbat is liable for carrying out from one domain to another. If the flame is constantly recreating itself, why is he liable? That flame which he lifted from the private domain he did not place in the public domain and that which he placed he did not lift. One is only liable for carrying out on Shabbat if he lifted an object from one domain and placed that same object in another domain. Since one who carries out a flame on Shabbat is considered liable, evidently, despite any change that it may undergo, the flame is essentially considered a single entity.

⁷⁴ Rather, actually that prohibited flame is also extant, and when one recites the blessing, he recites the blessing over the permitted addition to that flame. The Gemara asks: If so, even if a gentile lit a candle from a gentile as well, the flame should be considered essentially new; one should be able to recite a blessing over the addition.

⁷⁵ The Gemara answers: Yes, it is indeed so. Fundamentally, there is no reason to prohibit doing so. However, the Sages issued a decree because of the first gentile, who did not light the flame from another gentile, and the first pillar of flame that was kindled on Shabbat. Consequently, they prohibited all somewhat similar cases, including when a gentile lights a flame from another gentile.

⁷⁶ The Sages taught in a baraita: If one was walking outside the city, saw fire there, and wanted to recite the blessing over it as part of havdala, if the city has a majority of gentiles he may not recite the blessing over the fire, but if the city has a majority of Jews, he may recite the blessing.

⁷⁷ The Gemara notes: The matter itself is difficult in this baraita. You said in the baraita that if the town has a majority of gentiles he may not recite the blessing. By inference, if the town population was half gentiles and half Jews, one may recite a blessing. And then you teach that if the town has a majority of Jews, he may recite the blessing. By inference, if the town population was half gentiles and half Jews, one may not recite a blessing. The inferences from two sections of the baraita are contradictory.

⁷⁸ The Gemara responds: By right, the baraita should have taught that even if the town population was half gentiles and half Jews, one may recite a blessing, but since in the first clause it taught: The majority of gentiles, in the latter clause it used the same expression and taught: The majority of Jews.

⁷⁹ And the Sages taught: One who was walking outside the city at the conclusion of Shabbat and saw a child with a torch in his hand, he must check after his background. If the child is a Jew, he may recite a blessing over this flame, but if the child is a gentile, he may not recite a blessing over it.

⁸⁰ The Gemara asks: Why was it taught specifically with regard to a child? Even if he were an adult, one would also need to investigate whether he was a Jew or a gentile in order to determine whether or not he may recite a blessing over the torch.

⁸¹ Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: Here we are dealing with a case where, although it was the conclusion of Shabbat, it was still soon after sunset. Therefore, in the case of an adult, it is self-evident that he is a gentile, as a Jew would not be so quick to take fire in his hand immediately after Shabbat. In the case of a child, however, say that perhaps he is a Jew and it happened that he took the torch.

⁸² And the Sages taught: One who was walking outside the city at the conclusion of Shabbat and saw a fire, if the fire is at least as thick as the opening of a furnace, one may recite a blessing over it, as a fire of that kind is kindled for the light it produces as well. And if it is not at least that thick, one may not recite a blessing over it.

⁸³ It was taught in one baraita: During havdala, one may recite a blessing over the fire of a furnace; and it was taught in another baraita: One may not recite a blessing over the fire of a furnace. There is an apparent contradiction between the baraitot.

⁸⁴ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult, as this baraita which prohibits reciting the blessing is speaking at the beginning when the furnace was just kindled and the fire is designated solely to heat the objects in the furnace; that baraita, which permits reciting the blessing, is speaking at the end,

when the fire is no longer needed to heat the objects in the furnace, and its light is used for other purposes.

⁸⁵ The Gemara cites a similar contradiction between baraitot: It was taught in one baraita: During havdala, one may recite a blessing over the fire of an oven or a stove; and it was taught in another baraita: One may not recite a blessing over it.

⁸⁶ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult, as a similar distinction between the baraitot may be suggested. This baraita, which prohibits reciting the blessing, is speaking at the beginning, when the oven or stove was just kindled and the fire is designated solely to heat the objects on the stove or in the oven; that baraita, which permits reciting the blessing, is speaking at the end, when the fire is no longer needed to heat the objects on the stove or in the oven and its light is used for other purposes.

⁸⁷ The Gemara cites another contradiction: It was taught in one baraita: During havdala, one may recite a blessing over the light of a synagogue or a study hall; and it was taught in another baraita: One may not recite a blessing over it.

⁸⁸ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult, as this baraita, which prohibits reciting the blessing, is speaking in a case where there is an important person in the synagogue and the fire is kindled in his honor and not to provide light; that baraita, which permits reciting the blessing, is speaking in a case where there is no important person present and the fire is kindled to provide light.

⁸⁹ And if you wish, say instead that this baraita and that baraita are speaking in a case where there is an important person present in the synagogue, and this is not difficult because the contradiction can be resolved as follows: This baraita, which permits reciting the blessing, is speaking in a case where there is a caretaker in the synagogue who uses the light; that baraita, which prohibits reciting the blessing, is speaking in a case where there is no caretaker and the light is kindled for purposes of honor.

⁹⁰ And if you wish, say instead that this baraita and that baraita are both referring to a case where there is a caretaker present in the synagogue, and this is not difficult because the contradiction can be resolved as follows: This baraita, which prohibits reciting the blessing, is speaking in a case where there is moonlight, so the caretaker did not light the fire to provide light as the moonlight is sufficient; that baraita, which permits reciting the blessing, is speaking in a case where there is no moonlight, and the caretaker lights the fire to provide light.

⁹¹ The Sages taught in a baraita: People were seated in the study hall and they brought fire before them at the conclusion of Shabbat. Beit Shammai say: Each and every individual recites a blessing for himself; and Beit Hillel say: One recites a blessing on behalf of everyone and the others answer amen. Beit Hillel's reasoning is as it is stated: "The splendor of the King is in the multitude of the people" (Proverbs 14:28). When everyone joins together to hear the blessing, the name of God is glorified.

⁹² The Gemara asks: Granted, Beit Hillel, they explain their reasoning, but what is the reason for the opinion of Beit Shammai to prohibit reciting the blessing communally? The Gemara answers: They hold that it is prohibited due to the fact that it will lead to suspension of study in the study hall. Waiting for someone to recite the blessing will interrupt Torah study for several minutes.

⁹³ This concern for disrupting Torah study was also taught in a baraita: The members of the house of Rabban Gamliel would not say good health when someone sneezed in the study hall, due to the fact that it would lead to suspension of study in the study hall.

⁹⁴ We learned in the mishna: One may neither recite a blessing over the candle nor over the spices designated to honor the dead. The Gemara explains: What is the reason? Because a candle of the dead is kindled for the purpose of honoring the dead, not for light; the spices are to neutralize the bad odor, not for their pleasant fragrance.

⁹⁵ And Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: Any deceased before whom a candle is taken out both by day and by night, it is evident that the candle is for the purpose of honoring the deceased; therefore, one may not recite a blessing over it. And any deceased before whom a candle is taken out only by night, it is evident that the purpose of the candle is for its light alone, and one may recite a blessing over it.

⁹⁶ Similarly, Rav Huna said: Over spices used to deodorize the bathroom and fragrant oil intended to remove filth, one may not recite a blessing as they are not used for their pleasant fragrance.

⁹⁷ The Gemara asks: Is that to say that any case where it is not used for its pleasant fragrance, one may not recite a blessing over it? The Gemara raises an objection based on the Tosefta: One who enters the store of a perfumer, and smelled a fragrance, even if he sat there throughout the entire day, he only recites a blessing once. However, if one entered and exited, entered and exited, he recites a blessing on each and every occasion. Isn't it a case here, where the spices are not intended for fragrance, as they are not used to improve the scent in the store, and, nevertheless, one recites a blessing?

⁹⁸ The Gemara responds: Yes, in this case the spices are also intended for fragrance; they are used to generate a scent in the store so that people will smell them and come and purchase from him.

⁹⁹ The Sages taught in a baraita: One who was walking outside a city and smelled a scent; if the majority of the town's residents are gentiles he may not recite a blessing over the scent, but if the majority are Jews, he may recite a blessing. Rabbi Yosei says: Even if the majority are Jews, one may not recite a blessing, as the daughters of Israel burn incense to witchcraft and the spices were certainly made for witchcraft, not for their fragrance.

¹⁰⁰ The Gemara asks: Is that to say that they all burn incense to witchcraft? Rather, there is a minority of people who burn incense to witchcraft, and a different minority who burn spices in order to perfume their garments with incense. A majority, therefore, exists that does not use it for fragrance, and in a case where the majority does not use it for fragrance, one does not recite a blessing.

¹⁰¹ Similarly, Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One who walks on Shabbat eve in Tiberias or at the conclusion of Shabbat in Tzipori, and smelled the scent of incense may not recite a blessing, as the presumption is that it was intended to perfume garments.

¹⁰² On a related note, the Gemara cites the following: The Sages taught in a baraita: One who was walking in the marketplace of idolators and willingly smelled the incense wafting there, he is a sinner, as he should not have the intention to smell it.

¹⁰³ We learned in the mishna: And one does not recite the blessing over the candle until he derives benefit from its light.

¹⁰⁴ Rav Yehuda says that Rav says: Derives benefit does not mean that the one reciting the blessing must actually derive benefit from the light of the candle. Rather, as long as if one were to stand close

to the candle he could utilize its light, if he sees it he may recite a blessing over it, even if he is now standing at a distance.

¹⁰⁵ The Gemara raises an objection from a Tosefta: One who had a candle hidden in his lap or placed inside an opaque lamp, or if he saw a flame and did not utilize its light, or if he utilized its light and did not see a flame, may not recite a blessing until he both sees the flame and utilizes its light.

¹⁰⁶ The Gemara first clarifies the content of the Tosefta itself: Granted, a case where one utilizes its light and did not see a flame, can be found where the flame is situated around a corner, illuminating the area but hidden from his view. But how can a case where one saw a flame and did not utilize its light be found? Is it not referring to a case where one is distant? Apparently, one must actually utilize the flame; merely having the potential to utilize it is not sufficient.

¹⁰⁷ The Gemara rejects this: No. This refers to a case where the flame is gradually dimming. One sees the flame, but is unable to utilize its light.

¹⁰⁸ The Sages taught in a baraita: One may recite a blessing over smoldering coals just as he does over a candle; however, over dimming [omemot] coals, one may not recite a blessing. The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances of smoldering coals? Rav Ḥisda said: Smoldering coals are any coals that, if one places a wood chip among them, it ignites on its own without fanning the flame.

¹⁰⁹ With regard to the wording of the baraita, the Gemara raises a dilemma: Does the baraita say omemot beginning with an alef, or omemot beginning with an ayin?

¹¹⁰ Come and hear a resolution, as Rav Ḥisda bar Avdimi said: The correct version is omemot beginning with an ayin, as it is stated: “The cedars in the garden of God could not dim it [amamuhu]” (Ezekiel 31:8).

¹¹¹ And with regard to the question whether or not one must actually benefit from the flame’s light in order to recite a blessing, Rava said: When the mishna said benefit, it meant that he must actually derive benefit from the light.

¹¹² The Gemara asks: And how adjacent must one be in order to be considered to have derived benefit from the flame? Ulla said: So that he can distinguish between an issar and a pundeyon, two coins of the period. Ḥizkiya said: So that he can distinguish between a weight used in Tiberias and a weight used in Tzipori, which were slightly different.

¹¹³ The Gemara relates that the amora’im conducted themselves in accordance with their above-stated opinions. At the conclusion of Shabbat, Rav Yehuda would recite a blessing over the light of the house of Adda, the servant, which was far from his house. Rava would recite a blessing over the light of the house of Gurya bar Ḥama, which was adjacent to his house. Abaye would recite a blessing over the light of the house of bar Avuh.

¹¹⁴ Rav Yehuda said that Rav said a general halakhic principle: One need not seek out light at the conclusion of Shabbat in the manner that one seeks out other mitzvot. If no flame is available over which to recite a blessing, it does not prevent one from reciting havdala. And Rav Zeira said: Initially I would seek out light, once I heard this halakha that Rav Yehuda said that Rav said, I too do not seek out light. However, if a candle happens to become available to me, I recite a blessing over it.

¹¹⁵ Our mishna cited a dispute regarding one who ate and forgot and did not recite a blessing; Beit Shammai say: He returns to the place where he ate and recites the blessing. Beit Hillel say: That is unnecessary. He recites the blessing at the place where he remembered. Rav Zevid said and some say

Rav Dimi bar Abba said: This dispute is only with regard to a case where one forgot to recite the blessing, but if he did so intentionally, everyone agrees that he must return to the place where he ate and recite a blessing.

¹¹⁶ The Gemara asks: This is obvious. We learned in the mishna: And forgot, not if he did so intentionally.

¹¹⁷ The Gemara explains: Lest you say that the same is true, that Beit Hillel permit one to recite a blessing without returning to the place where he ate, even in a case where he willfully did not recite a blessing, and that which was taught: And forgot, is to convey the far-reaching nature of the opinion of Beit Shammai, who require him to return to the place where he ate even if he forgot, Rav Zevid teaches us that there is no disagreement in that case.

¹¹⁸ It was taught in a baraita that Beit Hillel said to Beit Shammai: According to your statement, one who ate atop the Temple Mount, God's chosen place of residence, and forgot and descended without reciting a blessing, must he return to the top of the Temple Mount, God's chosen place of residence, to recite a blessing? Beit Shammai said to Beit Hillel: Why not? And according to your statement, one who forgot his purse atop the Temple Mount, God's chosen place of residence, would he not ascend to retrieve it? If one ascends in deference to his own needs, all the more so he should ascend in deference to Heaven.

¹¹⁹ The Gemara relates: There were these two students who ate and did not recite a blessing. One of them did so unwittingly, and, in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai, returned to where he ate, and found a purse of gold. One of them did so intentionally, and, in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, albeit in circumstances where they agree with Beit Shammai, did not return and a lion ate him.

¹²⁰ The Gemara further relates: Rabba bar bar Ḥana was once traveling with a caravan. He ate and forgot and did not recite a blessing. He said to himself: What shall I do? If I say to them: I forgot to recite a blessing, they will say to me to recite a blessing here, as wherever you recite a blessing, you recite a blessing to God. It is better that I say to them: I forgot a golden dove. Then they will wait for me while I retrieve it. He said to them: Wait for me, as I forgot a golden dove. He went and recited a blessing and found a golden dove.

¹²¹ The Gemara asks: What is different about a dove, that he specifically said that that was the object that he forgot? The Gemara answers: Because the community of Israel is likened to a dove, as it is written: "The wings of a dove, covered in silver, and its pinions with the shimmer of gold" (Psalms 68:14). The Gemara explains the parable: Just as a dove is saved from its enemies only by its wings, so too, Israel is saved only by the merit of the mitzvot.

¹²² We learned in the mishna: And until when does he recite the blessing? Until the food is digested in his intestines.

¹²³ The Gemara asks: What is the duration of digestion? Rabbi Yoḥanan said: As long as he is not yet hungry again. And Reish Lakish said: As long as he is thirsty due to his eating.

¹²⁴ Rav Yeimar bar Shelamya said to Mar Zutra, and some say that it was Rav Yeimar bar Sheizevi who said to Mar Zutra: Did Reish Lakish say that? Didn't Rav Ami say that Reish Lakish said: What is the duration of digestion? As long as it takes to walk four mil?

¹²⁵ The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. Here, where Reish Lakish said the duration is as long as it takes to walk four mil, is in a case where he ate a sizable meal, here, where Reish Lakish said the duration is as long as he remains thirsty, is in a case where he ate a meager meal.

¹²⁶ We learned in the mishna a tannaitic dispute with regard to a case where wine came before the diners after the meal, and we also learned in the mishna that one answers amen after a Jew recites a blessing even if he did not hear the entire blessing.

¹²⁷ The Gemara asks: Is that to say that if a Jew recites a blessing, even though one did not hear the entire blessing, he responds amen? If he did not hear the entire blessing, how did he fulfill his obligation?

¹²⁸ Ḥiyya bar Rav said: This is not a case where one seeks to fulfill his obligation by responding amen; rather, it is a case where he did not eat with them yet still wishes to answer amen to their blessing. And so Rav Naḥman said that Rabba bar Avuh said: It is a case where he did not eat with them. The Gemara relates: Rav said to his son, Ḥiyya: My son, seize the opportunity and recite a blessing quickly. And similarly Rav Huna said to his son, Rabba, seize the opportunity and recite a blessing.

¹²⁹ The Gemara asks: Is that to say that one who recites a blessing is preferable to one who answers amen? Wasn't it taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei says: The reward of the one who answers amen is greater than the reward of the one who recites the blessing?

¹³⁰ Rabbi Nehorai said to him: By Heavens, an oath in the name of God, it is so. Know that this is true, as the military assistants [gulyarin] descend to the battlefield and initiate the war and the mighty descend and prevail. The amen that follows a blessing is compared to the mighty who join the war after the assistants, illustrating that answering amen is more significant than reciting the initial blessing.

¹³¹ The Gemara responds: This is subject to a tannaitic dispute, as it was taught in a baraita: Both the one who recites a blessing and the one who answers amen are included among those who "stand up and bless" (Nehemiah 9:5), but they hurry to reward, i.e., the one who recites the blessing, more than they hurry to reward, i.e., the one who answers amen.

¹³² Shmuel raised a dilemma before Rav: What is the halakha with regard to answering amen after the blessings of schoolchildren? Rav said to him: One answers amen following everyone whom we hear recite a blessing, except for schoolchildren, as they recite blessings merely in order to learn them, not as expressions of thanksgiving. This applies specifically at a time when they are not fulfilling their obligation with the recitation of the blessing, but are simply learning. However, at a time when they are fulfilling their obligation through the recitation of a blessing, one answers amen after their blessing.

¹³³ The Sages taught in a baraita: If one does not have oil to spread on and cleanse his hands after eating, this prevents him from reciting the Grace after Meals blessing; this is the statement of Rabbi Zilai. Rabbi Zivai says: Lack of that oil does not prevent one from reciting Grace after Meals. Rav Aḥa says: Lack of fine oil prevents one from reciting Grace after Meals. One must wait until he rubs oil on his hands. Rav Zuhamai says: Just as one who is filthy is unfit for Temple service, so too are filthy hands unfit for reciting the Grace after Meals blessing.

¹³⁴ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said of this: I do not know of Zilai or Zivai or Zuhamai; rather, I know a baraita, as Rav Yehuda said that Rav said, and some say that it was taught in a baraita: It is stated: “And you shall sanctify yourselves, and you shall be holy, for holy am I, the Lord your God” (Leviticus 20:26). With regard to this verse, the Sages said: And you shall sanctify yourselves, these are the first waters with which one washes his hands before the meal; and you shall be holy, these are the final waters; for holy, this is oil which one spreads on his hands; am I, the Lord your God, this is the Grace after Meals blessing.

Chapter 9

¹ This mishna, which includes all of this chapter’s mishnayot, contains a series of blessings and halakhot that are not recited at specific times, but rather in response to various experiences and events. MISHNA: One who sees a place where miracles occurred on Israel’s behalf recites: Blessed...Who performed miracles for our forefathers in this place. One who sees a place from which idolatry was eradicated recites: Blessed...Who eradicated idolatry from our land.

² One who sees conspicuous natural occurrences recites a blessing. For zikin and zeva’ot, which the Gemara will discuss below, for thunder, gale force winds, and lightning, manifestations of the power of the Creator, one recites: Blessed...Whose strength and power fill the world. For extraordinary (Rambam) mountains, hills, seas, rivers, and deserts, one recites: Blessed...Author of creation. Consistent with his opinion that a separate blessing should be instituted for each individual species, Rabbi Yehuda says: One who sees the great sea recites a special blessing: Blessed...Who made the great sea. As with all blessings of this type, one only recites it when he sees the sea intermittently, not on a regular basis.

³ For rain and other good tidings, one recites the special blessing: Blessed...Who is good and Who does good. Even for bad tidings, one recites a special blessing: Blessed...the true Judge. Similarly, when one built a new house or purchased new vessels, he recites: Blessed...Who has given us life, sustained us, and brought us to this time. The mishna articulates a general principle: One recites a blessing for the bad that befalls him just as he does for the good. In other words, one recites the appropriate blessing for the trouble that he is experiencing at present despite the fact that it may conceal some positive element in the future. Similarly, one must recite a blessing for the good that befalls him just as for the bad.

⁴ The mishna states: And one who cries out over the past in an attempt to change that which has already occurred, it is a vain prayer. For example, one whose wife was pregnant and he says: May it be God’s will that my wife will give birth to a male child, it is a vain prayer. Or one who was walking on the path home and he heard the sound of a scream in the city, and he says: May it be God’s will that this scream will not be from my house, it is a vain prayer. In both cases, the event already occurred.

⁵ The Sages also said: One who enters a large city, the Gemara explains below that this is in a case where entering the city is dangerous, recites two prayers: One upon his entrance, that he may enter in peace, and one upon his exit, that he may leave in peace. Ben Azzai says: He recites four prayers,

two upon his entrance and two upon his exit. In addition to praying that he may enter and depart in peace, he gives thanks for the past and cries out in prayer for the future.

⁶ The mishna articulates a general principle: One is obligated to recite a blessing for the bad that befalls him just as he recites a blessing for the good that befalls him, as it is stated: “And you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your might” (Deuteronomy 6:5). The mishna explains this verse as follows: “With all your heart” means with your two inclinations, with your good inclination and your evil inclination, both of which must be subjugated to the love of God. “With all your soul” means even if God takes your soul. “And with all your might” means with all your money, as money is referred to in the Bible as might. Alternatively, it may be explained that “with all your might” means with every measure that He metes out to you; whether it is good or troublesome, thank Him.

⁷ The mishna teaches several Temple-related halakhot. One may not act irreverently or conduct himself flippantly opposite the eastern gate of the Temple Mount, which is aligned opposite the Holy of Holies. In deference to the Temple, one may not enter the Temple Mount with his staff, his shoes, his money belt [punda], or even the dust on his feet. One may not make the Temple a shortcut to pass through it, and through an a fortiori inference, all the more so one may not spit on the Temple Mount.

⁸ The mishna relates: At the conclusion of all blessings recited in the Temple, those reciting the blessing would say: Blessed are You Lord, God of Israel, until everlasting [haolam], the world. But when the Sadducees strayed and declared that there is but one world and there is no World-to-Come, the Sages instituted that at the conclusion of the blessing one recites: From everlasting [haolam] to everlasting [haolam].

⁹ The Sages also instituted that one should greet another in the name of God, i.e., one should mention God’s name in his greeting, as it is stated: “And presently Boaz came from Bethlehem and said to the harvesters, The Lord is with you, and they said to him, May the Lord bless you” (Ruth 2:4). And it says: “And the angel of God appeared to him and said to him, God is with you, mighty man of valor” (Judges 6:12). And it says: “And despise not your mother when she is old” (Proverbs 23:22), i.e., one must not neglect customs which he inherits. And lest you say that mentioning God’s name is prohibited, it says: “It is time to work for the Lord; they have made void Your Torah” (Psalms 119:126), i.e., it is occasionally necessary to negate biblical precepts in order to perform God’s will, and greeting another is certainly God’s will. Rabbi Natan says another interpretation of the verse: “Make void Your Torah” because “it is the time to work for the Lord,” i.e., occasionally it is necessary to negate biblical precepts in order to bolster the Torah.

¹⁰ GEMARA: With regard to the obligation to recite a blessing for a miracle, the Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived? Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The verse states: “And Jethro said: Blessed be the Lord, Who delivered you out of the hand of the Egyptians, and out of the hand of Pharaoh; Who delivered the people from under the hand of the Egyptians” (Exodus 18:10); a blessing is recited for a miracle.

¹¹ The Gemara asks: For a miracle that occurs for the multitudes we recite a blessing, but for a miracle that befalls an individual person we do not recite a blessing? Wasn’t there an incident where a certain man was walking along the right side of the Euphrates River when a lion attacked him, a miracle was performed for him, and he was rescued? He came before Rava, who said to him: Every

time that you arrive there, to the site of the miracle, recite the blessing, “Blessed...Who performed a miracle for me in this place.”

¹² And once when Mar, son of Ravina, was walking in a valley of willows and was thirsty for water, a miracle was performed for him and a spring of water was created for him, and he drank.

¹³ Furthermore, once when Mar, son of Ravina, was walking in the marketplace [risteka] of Mehoza and a wild camel [gamla peritza] attacked him. The wall cracked open, he went inside it, and he was rescued. Ever since, when he came to the willows he recited: Blessed...Who performed a miracle for me in the willows and with the camel. And, when he came to the marketplace of Mehoza he recited: Blessed...Who performed a miracle for me with the camel and in the willows, indicating that one recites a blessing even for a miracle that occurs to an individual. The Sages say: On a miracle performed on behalf of the multitudes, everyone is obligated to recite a blessing; on a miracle performed on behalf of an individual, only the individual is obligated to recite a blessing.

¹⁴ The Sages taught in a baraita a list of places where one is required to recite a blessing due to miracles that were performed there: One who sees the crossings of the Red Sea, where Israel crossed; and the crossings of the Jordan; and the crossings of the streams of Arnon; the hailstones of Elgavish on the descent of Beit Horon; the rock that Og, King of Bashan, sought to hurl upon Israel; and the rock upon which Moses sat when Joshua waged war against Amalek; and Lot's wife; and the wall of Jericho that was swallowed up in its place. On all of these miracles one must give thanks and offer praise before God.

¹⁵ The Gemara elaborates: Granted, the miracles at the crossings of the sea are recorded explicitly in the Torah, as it is stated: “And the Israelites went into the sea on dry ground and the water was a wall for them on their right and on their left” (Exodus 14:22). So too, the miracle at the crossings of the Jordan, as it is stated: “The priests who bore the ark of God's covenant stood on dry land within the Jordan, while all Israel crossed on dry land until the entire nation finished crossing the Jordan” (Joshua 3:17).

¹⁶ However, from where do we derive the miracle that occurred at the crossing of the streams of Arnon? As it is stated: “Wherefore it is said in the Book of the Wars of the Lord: Vahev in Sufa, and the valleys of Arnon. And the slope of the valleys that incline toward the seat of Ar, and lean upon the border of Moab” (Numbers 21:14–15). It was taught: “Vahev in Sufa”; there were two lepers, one named Et and the second named Hev, who were walking at the rear of the camp of Israel. As Israel passed, the Emorites came

¹⁷ and prepared caves for themselves and they hid in them. They said: When Israel passes here we will kill them. And they did not know that the Ark of the Covenant preceded the children of Israel and would flatten mountains before them. When the Ark came, the mountains adhered one to another and killed them; and their blood flowed down to the streams of Arnon. When Et and Hev, the lepers, arrived, they saw the blood that was emerging from between the mountains, and they came and told Israel what had happened. Israel recited a song of praise, as it is stated: “And at the cascade of the brooks that goes down to the dwelling of Ar, and lies upon the border of Moab” (Numbers 21:15). This refers to the cascade of the brooks where the mountain, which had once been a valley, spread out in the direction of the mountain in Ar, in Moab.

¹⁸ Among the sites enumerated in the baraita where one is obligated to recite a blessing in recognition of the miracles that occurred there, was the site of the hailstones of Elgavish. The Gemara asks: What are the hailstones of Elgavish?

¹⁹ It is taught in the midrash: They are the stones that remained suspended in the air and did not fall because of [al gav] a man [ish] and they fell down because of [al gav] a man [ish]. The Gemara explains: They remained suspended because of a man; that is Moses, whom the verse refers to as a man, as it is written: “And the man Moses was very modest” (Numbers 12:3), and it is written: “And Moses went out of the city from Pharaoh, and spread forth his hands unto the Lord; the thunders and hail ceased, and the rain was not poured upon the earth” (Exodus 9:33). Moses’ hailstones remained suspended. And the stones descended because of a man; that is Joshua, who was also called man, as it is written: “Take Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is spirit” (Numbers 27:18). And it is written that when Joshua and his people waged war against the army of the Emorite kings, God told him not to fear them because God would deliver them into his hands; and indeed, they died by means of these stones: “As they fled from before Israel, while they were at the descent of Beit Horon, that the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azeka, and they died; they were more who died with the hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew by sword” (Joshua 10:11).

²⁰ With regard to the rock that Og, King of Bashan, sought to throw upon Israel, there is no biblical reference, but rather a tradition was transmitted. The Gemara relates that Og said: How large is the camp of Israel? It is three parasangs. I will go and uproot a mountain three parasangs long and I will hurl it upon them and kill them. He went, uprooted a mountain three parasangs long, and brought it on his head. And The Holy One, Blessed be He, brought grasshoppers upon it and they pierced the peak of the mountain and it fell on his neck.

²¹ Og wanted to remove it from his head; his teeth were extended to one side of his head and to the other and he was unable to remove it. And that is what is written: “You break the teeth of the wicked” (Psalms 3:8). And this is in accordance with the homiletic interpretation of Rabbi Shimon Ben Lakish, as Rabbi Shimon Ben Lakish said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “You break the teeth of the wicked”? Do not read it as: You break [shibarta], but rather as: You lengthened [shirbavta].

²² The story concludes: How tall was Moses? He was ten cubits tall. He took an axe ten cubits long, jumped up ten cubits, and struck Og in the ankle and killed him.

²³ One must recite a blessing when he sees the rock upon which Moses sat, as it is written: “But Moses’ hands were heavy; and they took a stone and put it under him, and he sat thereon” (Exodus 17:12).

²⁴ And one must recite a blessing upon seeing Lot’s wife, as it is stated: “But his wife looked back from behind him, and she became a pillar of salt” (Genesis 19:26). And the wall of Jericho that was swallowed, as it is written: “And the wall fell down flat” (Joshua 6:20).

²⁵ The Gemara asks: Granted, that one recites a blessing on all of these. They are miracles; however, Lot’s wife is a tragedy. Why recite a blessing on a tragedy? The Gemara answers: One who sees that place recites: Blessed...the true Judge.

²⁶ The Gemara asks: But the baraita teaches that for all of these one must give thanks and offer praise? The Gemara answers: The language of the baraita should be emended and teach: Over Lot

and his wife one recites two blessings. Over his wife he recites: Blessed...the true Judge, and on Lot he recites: Blessed...Who remembers the righteous. As Rabbi Yoḥanan said: From the story of Lot it is possible to learn that even during a time of wrath of the Holy One, Blessed be He, He remembers the righteous, as it is stated: "And it came to pass, when God destroyed the cities of the plain, that God remembered Abraham and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when He overthrew the cities in which Lot dwelt" (Genesis 19:29).

²⁷ The baraita also taught that we recite a blessing for the wall of Jericho that was swallowed up in its place. The Gemara asks: Were the walls of Jericho swallowed up into the ground? Didn't they fall, as it is stated: "And it came to pass, when the people heard the sound of the shofar, that the people shouted with a great shout, and the wall fell down flat" (Joshua 6:20)? The Gemara explains: Since the width and height of the walls were equal to one another, therefore, they were swallowed. Had they merely fallen it would have had no effect, as their width was equal to their height.

²⁸ Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: Four must offer thanks to God with a thanks-offering and a special blessing. They are: Seafarers, those who walk in the desert, and one who was ill and recovered, and one who was incarcerated in prison and went out. All of these appear in the verses of a psalm (Psalms 107).

²⁹ The Gemara elaborates: From where do we derive that seafarers are required to thank God? As it is written: "They who go down to the sea in ships, who do business in great waters; they see the works of the Lord" (Psalms 107:23–24). And it says: "For He commands and raises the stormy wind which lifts up the waves thereof. They mount up to the heaven, they go down again to the depths: their soul is melted because of trouble" (Psalms 107:25–26). And it says: "They reel to and fro, and stagger like a drunken man, and are at their wits' end." And it says immediately thereafter: "Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble, and He brings them out of their distress" (Psalms 107:28). And it says: "He makes the storm calm, so the waves thereof are still" (Psalms 107:29), and it says: "Then are they glad because they be quiet; so He brings them unto their desired haven" (Psalms 107:30), and it says: "They are grateful to God for His loving-kindness and His wonders for mankind" (Psalms 107:31).

³⁰ The Gemara asks: From where do we derive that those who walk in the desert are required to thank God? The Gemara answers: As it is written in the same psalm: "They wandered in the wilderness in a solitary way; they found no city in which to dwell" (Psalms 107:4), "And then they cried unto the Lord in their trouble, and He delivered them out of their distresses. And He led them forth by the right way" (Psalms 107:6–7). After God guides them on the right way, it is said: "They are grateful to God for His goodness" (Psalms 107:8).

³¹ That one who was ill and recovered must offer thanks is derived, as it is written: "Fools, because of their transgression and because of their iniquities, are afflicted. Their soul abhors all manner of food and they draw near unto the gates of death" (Psalms 107:17–18), and: "Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble, and He saves them from their distress" (Psalms 107:19), and then: "He sent His word and healed them, and delivered them from their destructions" (Psalms 107:20). After they are healed: "They are grateful to God for His goodness" (Psalms 107:21).

³² From where do we derive that one who was incarcerated in prison must offer thanks? As it is written: "Such as sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, bound in affliction and iron. Because they rebelled against the words of God and scorned the counsel of the most High" (Psalms

107:10–11). And it says: “Therefore He brought down their heart with labor; they fell down, and there was none to help” (Psalms 107:12), and it says: “Then they cried unto the Lord in their trouble, and He saved them from their distresses” (Psalms 107:13), and it says: “He brought them out of darkness and the shadow of death, and broke their shackles” (Psalms 107:14). And after God takes them out from that darkness and shadow of death, it says: “They are grateful to God for His goodness.”

³³ The Gemara asks: What blessing does he recite? Rav Yehuda said: Blessed is...Who bestows acts of loving-kindness. Abaye said: And he must offer thanks before ten people, as it is written in the same chapter: “Let them exalt Him also in the congregation of the people and praise Him in the assembly of the elders” (Psalms 107:32), and congregation indicates a group of at least ten. Mar Zutra said: Two of them must be Sages, as it is stated there: “And praise Him in the assembly of elders.” These elders are the Sages, and the use of the plural indicates a minimum of two.

³⁴ Rav Ashi strongly objects to this: Say that all of them must be Sages. The Gemara rejects this: Is it written: In the congregation of elders? In the congregation of the people is written; and the Sages are among them. Yet there is still room to object: Say that ten are from the rest of the people, and in addition there must be two Sages. No satisfactory answer was found, and the question remains difficult, although the halakha was not rejected.

³⁵ The Gemara relates: Rav Yehuda fell sick and recovered, Rav Ḥana of Baghdad and the Sages entered to visit him. They said to him: Blessed is God Who gave you to us and did not give you to the dust. He said to them: You have exempted me from offering thanks, as your statement fulfilled my obligation to recite a blessing.

³⁶ The Gemara asks: But didn’t Abaye say that one must offer thanks before ten? The Gemara answers: There were ten people there when the Sages blessed God in Rav Yehuda’s presence. The Gemara raises another difficulty: But Rav Yehuda did not offer thanks himself; others offered thanks on his behalf. The Gemara answers: He did not need to recite it himself as he answered amen after their blessing. Answering amen after a blessing is tantamount to reciting the blessing himself.

³⁷ Incidental to Rav Yehuda’s earlier statement, which organized several cases into a single category, the Gemara cites similar statements of his. Rav Yehuda said: Three require protection from harm: A sick person, a bridegroom, and a bride. It was taught in a baraita: A sick person, a woman in childbirth, a bridegroom, and a bride require protection from harm. And some say: Even a mourner. And some say: Even Torah scholars at night. Those whose thoughts are focused elsewhere or are in a weakened physical state require protection.

³⁸ And Rav Yehuda said: There are three matters which, when one who prolongs their duration, they extend a person’s days and years. They are: One who prolongs his prayer, one who prolongs his mealtime at the table, and one who prolongs his time in the bathroom.

³⁹ The Gemara asks: And one who prolongs his prayer; is that a virtue? Didn’t Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba say that Rabbi Yoḥanan said:

⁴⁰ Anyone who prolongs his prayer and expects it to be answered, will ultimately come to heartache, as it is stated: “Hope deferred makes the heart sick” (Proverbs 13:12). Similarly, Rabbi Yitzḥak said: Three matters evoke a person’s sins, and they are: Endangering oneself by sitting or standing next to an inclined wall that is about to collapse, expecting prayer to be accepted, as that leads to an

assessment of his status and merit, and passing a case against another to Heaven, as praying for Heaven to pass judgment on another person causes one's own deeds to be examined and compared with the deeds of that other person. This proves that prolonging prayer is a fault.

⁴¹ The Gemara resolves the apparent contradiction: This is not difficult. This, where we learned that prolonging prayer is undesirable, refers to a situation when one expects his prayer to be accepted, while this, where Rav Yehuda says that prolonging prayer prolongs one's life, refers to a situation where one does not expect his prayer to be accepted. How does he prolong his prayer? By increasing his supplication.

⁴² As for the virtue of prolonging one's mealtime at the table, which Rav Yehuda mentioned, the Gemara explains: Perhaps a poor person will come during the meal and the host will be in a position to give him food immediately, without forcing the poor person to wait. The Sages elsewhere praised a person who acts appropriately at a meal, as it is written: "The altar, three cubits high and the length thereof, two cubits, was of wood, and so the corners thereof; the length thereof, and the walls thereof, were also of wood" (Ezekiel 41:22), and it is written in the continuation of that verse: "And he said unto me: This is the table that is before the Lord." The language of this verse is difficult, as it begins with the altar and concludes with the table. Rather, Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Elazar both say: As long as the Temple stood, the altar atoned for Israel's transgressions. Now that it is destroyed, a person's table atones for his transgressions.

⁴³ With regard to what Rav Yehuda said in praise of one who prolongs his time in the bathroom, the Gemara asks: Is that a virtue? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: Ten things bring a person to suffer from hemorrhoids: One who eats the leaves of bulrushes, grape leaves, tendrils of grapevines, the palate and tongue of an animal, as well as any other part of the animal which is not smooth and which has protrusions, the spine of a fish, a salty fish that is not fully cooked, and one who drinks wine dregs, and one who wipes himself with lime and clay, the materials from which earthenware is made, and one who wipes himself with a stone with which another person wiped himself. And some say: One who suspends himself too much in the bathroom as well. This proves that prolonging one's time in the bathroom is harmful.

⁴⁴ The Gemara responds: This is not difficult. This baraita, which teaches that doing so is harmful, refers to where one prolongs his time there and suspends himself, while this statement of Rav Yehuda refers to where one prolongs his time there and does not suspend himself.

⁴⁵ The Gemara relates the benefits of prolonging one's time in the bathroom. Like that incident when a matron [matronita] said to Rabbi Yehuda son of Rabbi El'ai: Your face is fat and full, like the faces of pig farmers and usurers who do not work hard and who make a plentiful living. He said to her: Honestly, those two occupations are prohibited to me; rather, why is it that my face is nice? Because there are twenty-four bathrooms between my lodging and the study hall, and when I walk I stop and examine myself in all of them.

⁴⁶ And Rav Yehuda said: Three things curtail a person's days and years: One who is invited and given the Torah scroll to read and he does not read, one who is given a cup of blessing over which to recite a blessing and he does not recite a blessing, and one who conducts himself with an air of superiority.

⁴⁷ The Gemara details the biblical sources for these cases: One who is given the Torah scroll to read and he does not read, as it is written of the Torah: "It is your life and the length of your days"

(Deuteronomy 30:20). A cup of blessing over which to recite a blessing and he does not recite a blessing, as it is written: “I will bless them that bless you” (Genesis 12:3); one who blesses is blessed and one who does not bless does not merit a blessing. And with regard to one who conducts himself with an air of superiority, as Rabbi Ḥama, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: Why did Joseph die before his brothers, as evidenced by the order in the verse: “And Joseph died, and all his brethren, and all that generation” (Exodus 1:6)? Because he conducted himself with an air of superiority, and those who did not serve in a leadership role lived on after he died.

⁴⁸ Rav Yehuda said in the name of Rav: Three matters require a plea for mercy to bring them about: A good king, a good year, and a good dream. These three, kings, years, and dreams, are all bestowed by God and one must pray that they should be positive and constructive. The Gemara enumerates the sources for these cases: A good king, as it is written: “The king’s heart is in the hand of the Lord as the watercourses: He turns it whithersoever He will” (Proverbs 21:1). A good year, as it is written: “The eyes of the Lord, thy God, are always upon it, from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year” (Deuteronomy 11:12). And a good dream, as it is written: “O Lord, by these things men live, and altogether therein is the life of my spirit; wherefore You will recover me [vataḥlimeni], and make me to live” (Isaiah 38:16). Due to their apparent etymological similarity, the word taḥlimeni is interpreted as deriving from the word ḥalom, dream.

⁴⁹ Similarly, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Three matters are proclaimed by the Holy One, Blessed be He, Himself: Famine, plenty, and a good leader. The Gemara enumerates the sources for these cases: Famine, as it is written: “For the Lord has called for a famine; and it shall also come upon the land seven years” (II Kings 8:1). Plenty, as it is written: “And I will call for the grain, and will increase it, and lay no famine upon you” (Ezekiel 36:29). And a good leader, as it is written: “And the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying: See, I have called by name Bezalel, son of Uri, son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah” (Exodus 31:1–2).

⁵⁰ With regard to Bezalel’s appointment, Rabbi Yitzḥak said: One may only appoint a leader over a community if he consults with the community and they agree to the appointment, as it is stated: “And Moses said unto the children of Israel: See, the Lord has called by name Bezalel, son of Uri, son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah” (Exodus 35:30). The Lord said to Moses: Moses, is Bezalel a suitable appointment in your eyes? Moses said to Him: Master of the universe, if he is a suitable appointment in Your eyes, then all the more so in my eyes. The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to him: Nevertheless, go and tell Israel and ask their opinion. Moses went and said to Israel: Is Bezalel suitable in your eyes? They said to him: If he is suitable in the eyes of the Holy One, Blessed be He, and in your eyes, all the more so he is suitable in our eyes.

⁵¹ Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: Bezalel was called by that name on account of his wisdom. When the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Moses: Go say to Bezalel, “Make a tabernacle, an ark, and vessels” (see Exodus 31:7–11), Moses went and reversed the order and told Bezalel: “Make an ark, and vessels, and a tabernacle” (see Exodus 25–26). He said to Moses: Moses, our teacher, the standard practice throughout the world is that a person builds a house and only afterward places the vessels in the house, and you say to me: Make an ark, and vessels, and a tabernacle. If I do so in the order you have commanded, the vessels that I make, where shall I put them? Perhaps God told you the following: “Make a tabernacle, ark, and vessels” (see Exodus 36).

Moses said to Bezalel: Perhaps you were in God's shadow [betzel El], and you knew precisely what He said. You intuited God's commands just as He stated them, as if you were there.

⁵² Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: Bezalel knew how to join the letters with which heaven and earth were created. From where do we derive this? It is written here in praise of Bezalel: "And I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship" (Exodus 31:3); and it is written there with regard to creation of heaven and earth: "The Lord, by wisdom, founded the earth; by understanding He established the heavens" (Proverbs 3:19), and it is written: "By His knowledge the depths were broken up and the skies drop down the dew" (Proverbs 3:20). We see that wisdom, understanding, and knowledge, the qualities with which the heavens and earth were created, are all found in Bezalel.

⁵³ On a similar note, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The Holy One, Blessed be He, only grants wisdom to one who already possesses wisdom, as it is stated: "He gives wisdom unto the wise, and knowledge to they who know understanding" (Daniel 2:21). Rav Taḥalisa, from the West, Eretz Yisrael, heard this and repeated it before Rabbi Abbahu. Rabbi Abbahu said to him: You learned proof for this idea from there; we learn it from here: As it is written in praise of the builders of the Tabernacle: "And in the hearts of all who are wise-hearted I have placed wisdom" (Exodus 31:6).

⁵⁴ Related to what was stated above, that one should pray for a good dream, the Gemara cites additional maxims concerning dreams and their interpretation. Rav Ḥisda said: One should see any dream, and not a fast. In other words, any dream is preferable to a dream during a fast. And Rav Ḥisda said: A dream not interpreted is like a letter not read. As long as it is not interpreted it cannot be fulfilled; the interpretation of a dream creates its meaning. And Rav Ḥisda said: A good dream is not entirely fulfilled and a bad dream is not entirely fulfilled. And Rav Ḥisda said: A bad dream is preferable to a good dream, as a bad dream causes one to feel remorse and to repent. And Rav Ḥisda said: A bad dream, his sadness is enough for him; a good dream, his joy is enough for him. This means that the sadness or joy engendered by the dream renders the actual fulfillment of the dream superfluous. Similarly, Rav Yosef said: Even for me, the joy of a good dream negates it. Even Rav Yosef, who was blind and ill, derived such pleasure from a good dream that it was never actually realized. And Rav Ḥisda said: A bad dream is worse than lashes, as it is stated: "God has so made it, that men should fear before Him" (Ecclesiastes 3:14), and Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: That is a bad dream that causes man to fear.

⁵⁵ With regard to the verse: "The prophet that has a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that has My word, let him speak My word faithfully. What has the straw to do with the grain? says the Lord" (Jeremiah 23:28), the Gemara asks: What do straw and grain have to do with a dream? Rather, Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon bar Yoḥai: Just as it is impossible for the grain to grow without straw, so too it is impossible to dream without idle matters. Even a dream that will be fulfilled in the future contains some element of nonsense.

⁵⁶ On a similar note, Rabbi Berekhya said: Even though part of a dream is fulfilled, all of it is not fulfilled. From where do we derive this? From the story of Joseph's dream, as it is written: "And he said: Behold, I have dreamed yet a dream: and, behold, the sun and the moon

⁵⁷ and eleven stars bowed down to me" (Genesis 37:9), and at that time his mother was no longer alive. According to the interpretation of the dream, the moon symbolizes Joseph's mother. Even this dream that was ultimately fulfilled contained an element that was not fulfilled.

⁵⁸ From the same source, Rabbi Levi said: One should always anticipate fulfillment of a good dream up to twenty-two years after the dream. From where do we derive this? From Joseph, as it is written in the story of Joseph's dream: "These are the generations of Jacob. Joseph, being seventeen years old, was feeding the flock with his brethren" (Genesis 37:2); and it is written: "And Joseph was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh King of Egypt" (Genesis 41:46). From seventeen to thirty how many years are they? Thirteen; and add seven years of plenty and two of famine; the total is twenty-two and only then was the dream fulfilled when his brothers came and bowed down to him.

⁵⁹ Rav Huna said: A good person is not shown a good dream and a wicked person is not shown a bad dream; rather, a good person is punished for his relatively few transgressions with bad dreams and a wicked person is rewarded for his relatively few merits with good dreams.

⁶⁰ That was also taught in a baraita: All of King David's life he never saw a good dream, and all of Ahitophel's life he never saw a bad dream.

⁶¹ The Gemara raises a difficulty: Is it not written: "No evil shall befall you, neither shall any plague come near your tent" (Psalms 91:10)? And Rav Ḥisda said that Rav Yirmeya bar Abba said in explanation of that verse: This means that you will be frightened neither by bad dreams nor by evil thoughts. Neither shall any plague come near your tent, means that you will never find your wife with the uncertain status of a menstruating woman when you return from a journey. This proves that it is impossible that a righteous person will experience bad dreams throughout his life. Rather, one might say that he does not see bad dreams; others see bad dreams about him.

⁶² The Gemara asks: And when he does not see a dream, is that a virtue? Didn't Rabbi Zeira say: Anyone who sleeps seven days without a dream is called evil, as it indicates that God does not wish to appear to him even in that indirect manner. Allusion to this is, as it is stated: "And he that has it shall lie satisfied [vesave'a], he shall not be visited with evil" (Proverbs 19:23). The Sages said: Do not read it as satisfied [vesave'a], rather read it as seven [vesheva], which is an allusion to the fact that one who sleeps seven times and does not experience a dream is considered evil. Rather, one must say that David saw dreams and the baraita says as follows: David certainly saw dreams, but he did not understand what he saw.

⁶³ Rav Huna bar Ami said that Rabbi Pedat said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One who sees a dream from which his soul is distraught, should go and have it interpreted before three. The Gemara is surprised by this: Interpreted? Didn't Rav Ḥisda say: A dream not interpreted is like a letter not read? If one is concerned about a dream, why would he actively promote its fulfillment? Rather, say as follows: He should better it before three. He should bring three people and say to them: I saw a good dream. And they should say to him: It is good, and let it be good, may God make it good. May they decree upon you from heaven seven times that it will be good, and it will be good. Afterwards they recite three verses of transformation from bad to good, three verses of redemption, and three verses which mention peace.

⁶⁴ The Gemara elaborates: Three transformations: "You transformed my mourning into dancing; You loosed my sackcloth, and girded me with gladness" (Psalms 30:12); "Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance, and the young men and the old together; for I will transform their mourning into joy, and will comfort them, and make them rejoice from their sorrow" (Jeremiah 31:12); and: "Nevertheless the Lord your God would not hearken unto Balaam; but the Lord your God transformed the curse into a blessing unto you" (Deuteronomy 23:6).

⁶⁵ And three redemptions, as it is written: “He has redeemed my soul in peace so that none came near me; for they were many that strove with me” (Psalms 55:19); “The redeemed of the Lord shall return, and come with singing unto Zion, and everlasting joy shall be upon their heads; they shall obtain gladness and joy, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away” (Isaiah 35:10); and: “The people said to Saul: Shall Jonathan die, who has wrought this great salvation in Israel? So the people rescued Jonathan, that he died not” (I Samuel 14:45).

⁶⁶ And three mentions of peace, as it is written: “Peace, peace, to him that is far off and to him that is near, says the Lord that creates the expression of the lips; and I will heal him” (Isaiah 57:19); “Then the spirit clothed Amasai, who was chief of the captains: Yours are we, David, and on your side, you son of Yishai; peace, peace be unto you, and peace be to your helpers” (I Chronicles 12:19); and: “Thus you shall say: All hail and peace be both unto you, and peace be to your house, and peace be unto all that you have” (I Samuel 25:6).

⁶⁷ The Gemara relates: Ameimar and Mar Zutra and Rav Ashi were sitting together. They said: Let each and every one of us say something that the other has not heard. One of them began and said: One who saw a dream and does not know what he saw should stand before the priests when they lift their hands during the Priestly Blessing and say the following: Master of the Universe, I am Yours and my dreams are Yours, I dreamed a dream and I do not know what it is. Whether I have dreamed of myself, whether my friends have dreamed of me or whether I have dreamed of others, if the dreams are good, strengthen them and reinforce them like the dreams of Joseph. And if the dreams require healing, heal them like the bitter waters of Mara by Moses our teacher, and like Miriam from her leprosy, and like Hezekiah from his illness, and like the bitter waters of Jericho by Elisha. And just as You transformed the curse of Balaam the wicked into a blessing, so transform all of my dreams for me for the best. And he should complete his prayer together with the priests so the congregation responds amen both to the blessing of the priests and to his individual request. And if he is not able to recite this entire formula, he should say: Majestic One on high, Who dwells in power, You are peace and Your name is peace. May it be Your will that You bestow upon us peace.

⁶⁸ Another began and said: One who enters a city and fears the evil eye should hold the thumb [zekafa] of his right hand in his left hand and the thumb of his left hand in his right hand and recite the following: I, so-and-so son of so-and-so, come from the descendants of Joseph, over whom the evil eye has no dominion, as it is stated: “Joseph is a fruitful vine, a fruitful vine by a fountain [alei ayin]; its branches run over the wall” (Genesis 49:22). Do not read it as alei ayin; but rather, read it as olei ayin, who rise above the eye and the evil eye has no dominion over him. Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: Derive it from here, from what is stated in Jacob’s blessing of Joseph’s sons: “And let them grow like fish into a multitude in the midst of the earth” (Genesis 48:16): Just as fish in the sea are covered by water and the evil eye has no dominion over them as they cannot be seen, so too the offspring of Joseph, the evil eye has no dominion over them. And if he is concerned about his own evil eye, lest it damage others, he should look at the side of his left nostril.

⁶⁹ Another began and said: One who is sick should not reveal it on the first day of his illness so that his luck should not suffer; from there on he may reveal it. Like that which Rava does when he falls ill; on the first day he does not reveal it, from there on he says to his servant: Go out and announce: Rava is sick. Those who love me will pray that God have mercy on me and those who hate me will rejoice over my distress. And it is written: “Rejoice not when your enemy falls, and let not your heart

be glad when he stumbles; lest the Lord see it, and it displease Him, and He turn away His wrath from him” (Proverbs 24:17–18). The joy of my enemy over my distress will also assist my healing.

⁷⁰ The Gemara relates: Shmuel, when he would see a bad dream, would say: “And the dreams speak falsely” (Zechariah 10:2). When he would see a good dream, he would say: And do dreams speak falsely? Isn’t it written: “I speak with him in a dream” (Numbers 12:6)?

⁷¹ Rava raised a contradiction between these verses: On the one hand, it is written: “I speak with him in a dream”; and on the other hand, it is written: “And the dreams speak falsely.” The Gemara resolves this contradiction: This is not difficult because there are two types of dreams. Here, the verse, “I speak with him in a dream,” refers to dreams that come by means of an angel; here, the verse, “And the dreams speak falsely,” refers to dreams that come by means of a demon.

⁷² In a long chain of those transmitting this statement, it is said that Rabbi Bizna bar Zavda said that Rabbi Akiva said that Rabbi Panda said that Rav Naḥum said that Rabbi Birayim said in the name of one elder, and who is he, Rabbi Bena’a: There were twenty-four interpreters of dreams in Jerusalem. One time, I dreamed a dream and went to each of them to interpret it. What one interpreted for me the other did not interpret for me, and, nevertheless, all of the interpretations were realized in me, to fulfill that which is stated: All dreams follow the mouth of the interpreter.

⁷³ The Gemara asks: Is that to say that all dreams follow the mouth is a verse cited as corroboration? The Gemara responds: Yes, and in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, as Rabbi Elazar said: From where is it derived that all dreams follow the mouth of the interpreter? As it is stated in the story of the dreams of Pharaoh’s two ministers. The butler said to Pharaoh: “And it came to pass, as he interpreted to us, so it was” (Genesis 41:13). Rava said, one must attach a caveat to this: This is only in a case where it is interpreted for him in a manner akin to the dream, where the interpretation is relevant to the dream, as it is stated in the story of Joseph’s interpretation of the dreams of Pharaoh’s two ministers: “Each man according to his dream he did interpret” (Genesis 41:12).

⁷⁴ With regard to Joseph’s interpretation of these dreams, the Gemara asks, it is written: “The baker saw that the interpretation was good” (Genesis 40:16); from where did the baker know that the interpretation was good? Rabbi Elazar said: This teaches that each of them was shown his dream and the interpretation of the other’s dream. That is how he knew that it was the correct interpretation.

⁷⁵ With regard to the veracity of dreams, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One who awakened in the morning and a specific verse happens into his mouth, it is a minor prophecy and an indication that the content of the verse will be fulfilled.

⁷⁶ Rabbi Yoḥanan also said: Three dreams are fulfilled: A dream of the morning, a dream that one’s fellow dreamed about him, and a dream that is interpreted within a dream. And some say that a dream that is repeated several times is also fulfilled, as it is stated: “And for that the dream was doubled unto Pharaoh twice, it is because the thing is established by God, and God will shortly bring it to pass” (Genesis 41:32).

⁷⁷ Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: A person is shown in his dream only the thoughts of his heart when he was awake, as evidenced by what Daniel said to Nebuchadnezzar, as it is stated: “As for you, O king, your thoughts came upon your bed, what should come to pass hereafter” (Daniel 2:29). And if you wish, say instead that it is derived from here, a related verse: “And that you may know the thoughts of your heart” (Daniel 2:30). How will you know the thoughts

of your heart? By their being revealed to you in a dream. Rava said: Know that this is the case, for one is neither shown a golden palm tree nor an elephant going through the eye of a needle in a dream. In other words, dreams only contain images that enter a person's mind.

⁷⁸ On a similar note, the Gemara relates that the Roman emperor said to Rabbi Yehoshua, son of Rabbi Ḥananya: You Jews say that you are extremely wise. If that is so, tell me what I will see in my dream. Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: You will see the Persians capture you, and enslave you, and force you to herd unclean animals with a golden staff. He thought the entire day about the images described to him by Rabbi Yehoshua and that night he saw it in his dream. King Shapur of Persia said to Shmuel: You Jews say that you are extremely wise. If that is so, tell me what I will see in my dream. Shmuel said to him: You will see the Romans come and take you into captivity and force you to grind date pits in mills of gold. He thought the entire day about the images described to him by Shmuel, and that night he saw it in his dream.

⁷⁹ The Gemara relates: Bar Haddaya was an interpreter of dreams. For one who gave him a fee, he would interpret the dream favorably, and for one who did not give him a fee, he would interpret the dream unfavorably. The Gemara relates: There was an incident in which both Abaye and Rava saw an identical dream and they asked bar Haddaya to interpret it. Abaye gave him money and paid his fee, while Rava did not give him money. They said to him: The verse: "Your ox shall be slain before your eyes and you shall not eat thereof" (Deuteronomy 28:31) was read to us in our dream. He interpreted their dream and to Rava he said: Your business will be lost and you will derive no pleasure from eating because of the extreme sadness of your heart. To Abaye he said: Your business will profit and you will be unable to eat due to the joy in your heart.

⁸⁰ They said to him: The verse, "You shall beget sons and daughters, but they shall not be yours; for they shall go into captivity" (Deuteronomy 28:41), was read to us in our dream. He interpreted their dreams, and to Rava he said its literal, adverse sense. To Abaye he said: Your sons and daughters will be numerous, and your daughters will be married to outsiders and it will seem to you as if they were taken in captivity.

⁸¹ They said to him: The verse: "Your sons and your daughters shall be given unto another people" (Deuteronomy 28:32), was read to us in our dream. To Abaye he said: Your sons and daughters will be numerous. You say, that they should marry your relatives and your wife says that they should marry her relatives and she will impose her will upon you and they will be given in marriage to her relatives, which is like another nation as far as you are concerned. To Rava he said: Your wife will die and your sons and daughters will come into the hands of another woman. As Rava said that Rabbi Yirmeya bar Abba said that Rav said: What is the meaning of that which is written in the verse: "Your sons and your daughters shall be given unto another people"? This refers to the father's wife, the stepmother.

⁸² They said to him: The verse: "Go your way, eat your bread with joy, and drink your wine with a merry heart" (Ecclesiastes 9:7) was read to us in our dream. To Abaye he said: Your business will profit and you will eat and drink and read the verse out of the joy of your heart. To Rava he said: Your business will be lost, you will slaughter but not eat, you will drink wine and read passages from the Bible in order to allay your fears.

⁸³ They said to him: The verse: "You shall carry much seed out into the field, and shall gather little in; for the locust shall consume it" (Deuteronomy 28:38), was read to us in our dream. To Abaye he

said from the beginning of the verse, that he will enjoy an abundant harvest. To Rava he said from the end of the verse, that his harvest will be destroyed.

⁸⁴ They said to him: The verse: “You shall have olive trees throughout all your borders, but you shall not anoint yourself with the oil; for your olives shall drop off” (Deuteronomy 28:40), was read to us in our dream. And again, to Abaye he said from the beginning of the verse. To Rava he said from the end of the verse.

⁸⁵ They said to him: The verse: “All the peoples of the earth shall see that the name of the Lord is called upon you; and they shall be afraid of you” (Deuteronomy 28:10), was read to us in our dream. To Abaye he said: Your name will become well-known as head of the yeshiva, and you will be feared by all. To Rava he said: The king’s treasury was broken into and you will be apprehended as a thief, and everyone will draw an a fortiori inference from you: If Rava who is wealthy and of distinguished lineage can be arrested on charges of theft, what will become of the rest of us? Indeed, the next day, the king’s treasury was burglarized, and they came and apprehended Rava.

⁸⁶ Abaye and Rava said to him: We saw lettuce on the mouth of the barrels. To Abaye he said: Your business will double like lettuce whose leaves are wide and wrinkled. To Rava he said: Your work will be bitter like a lettuce stalk.

⁸⁷ They said to him: We saw meat on the mouth of barrels. To Abaye he said: Your wine will be sweet and everyone will come to buy meat and wine from you. To Rava he said: Your wine will spoil, and everyone will go to buy meat in order to eat with it, to dip the meat in your vinegar.

⁸⁸ They said to him: We saw a barrel hanging from a palm tree. To Abaye he said: Your business will rise like a palm tree. To Rava he said: Your work will be sweet like dates which are very cheap in Babylonia, indicating that you will be compelled to sell your merchandise at a cheap price.

⁸⁹ They said to him: We saw a pomegranate taking root on the mouth of barrels. To Abaye he said: Your business will increase in value like a pomegranate. To Rava he said: Your work will go sour like a pomegranate.

⁹⁰ They said to him: We saw a barrel fall into a pit. To Abaye he said: Your merchandise will be in demand as the adage says: Bread falls in a pit and is not found. In other words, everyone will seek your wares and they will not find them due to increased demand. To Rava he said: Your merchandise will be ruined and you will throw it away into a pit.

⁹¹ They said to him: We saw a donkey foal standing near our heads, braying. To Abaye he said: You will be a king, that is to say, head of the yeshiva, and an interpreter will stand near you to repeat your teachings to the masses out loud. To Rava he said: I see the words *peter ḥamor*, first-born donkey, erased from your phylacteries. Rava said to him: I myself saw it and it is there. Bar Haddaya said to him: The letter *vav* of the word *peter ḥamor* is certainly erased from your phylacteries.

⁹² Ultimately, Rava went to bar Haddaya alone. Rava said to him: I saw the outer door of my house fall. Bar Haddaya said to him: Your wife will die, as she is the one who protects the house. Rava said to him: I saw my front and back teeth fall out. He said to him: Your sons and daughters will die. Rava said to him: I saw two doves that were flying. He said to him: You will divorce two women. Rava said to him: I saw two turnip heads [*gargelidei*]. He said to him: You will receive two blows with a club shaped like a turnip. That same day Rava went and sat in the study hall the entire day. He discovered these two blind people who were fighting with each other. Rava went to separate them

and they struck Rava two blows. When they raised their staffs to strike him an additional blow, he said: That is enough for me, I only saw two.

⁹³ Ultimately, Rava came and gave him, bar Haddaya, a fee. And then Rava said to him: I saw my wall fall. Bar Haddaya said to him: You will acquire property without limits. Rava said to him: I saw Abaye's house [appadna] fall and its dust covered me. Bar Haddaya said to him: Abaye will die and his yeshiva will come to you. Rava said to him: I saw my house fall, and everyone came and took the bricks. He said to him: Your teachings will be disseminated throughout the world. Rava said to him: I saw that my head split and my brain fell out. He said to him: A feather will fall out of the pillow near your head. Rava said to him: The Egyptian hallel, the hallel that celebrates the Exodus, was read to me in a dream. He said to him: Miracles will be performed for you.

⁹⁴ Bar Haddaya was going with Rava on a ship; bar Haddaya said: Why am I going with a person for whom miracles will be performed, lest the miracle will be that the ship will sink and he alone will be saved. As bar Haddaya was climbing onto the ship a book fell from him. Rava found it and saw: All dreams follow the mouth, written therein. He said to bar Haddaya: Scoundrel. It was dependent on you, and you caused me so much suffering. I forgive you for everything except for the daughter of Rav H̥isda, Rava's wife, whom bar Haddaya predicted would die. May it be Your will that this man be delivered into the hands of a kingdom that has no compassion on him.

⁹⁵ Bar Haddaya said to himself: What will I do? We learned through tradition that the curse of a Sage, even if baseless, comes true. And all the more so in the case of Rava, as he cursed me justifiably. He said to himself: I will get up and go into exile, as the Master said: Exile atones for transgression.

⁹⁶ He arose and exiled himself to the seat of the Roman government. He went and sat by the entrance, where the keeper of the king's wardrobe stood. The wardrobe guard dreamed a dream. He said to bar Haddaya: I saw in the dream that a needle pierced my finger. Bar Haddaya said to him: Give me a zuz. He did not give him the coin so bar Haddaya said nothing to him. Again, the guard said to him: I saw a worm that fell between my two fingers, eating them. Bar Haddaya said to him: Give me a zuz. He did not give him the coin, so bar Haddaya said nothing to him. Again, the guard said to him: I saw that a worm fell upon my entire hand, eating it. Bar Haddaya said to him: A worm fell upon and ate all the silk garments. They heard of this in the king's palace and they brought the wardrobe keeper and were in the process of executing him. He said to them: Why me? Bring the one who knew and did not say the information that he knew. They brought bar Haddaya and said to him: Because of your zuz, ruin came upon

⁹⁷ the king's silk garments. They tied two cedar trees together with a rope, and tied one of his legs to one cedar and one of his legs to the other cedar, and they released the rope until his head split open. Each tree went back and stood in its place and bar Haddaya split and fell completely split in two.

⁹⁸ The Gemara relates a story with regard to a Sage who interpreted dreams, Rabbi Yishmael. Ben Dama, son of Rabbi Yishmael's sister, asked his uncle, Rabbi Yishmael: I saw in a dream that my two cheeks fell off. What does my dream mean? Rabbi Yishmael said to him: Two Roman battalions spoke ill of you, and they died. Cheeks symbolize a mouth that speaks evil.

⁹⁹ Similarly, the Gemara relates: Bar Kappara said to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi: I saw in a dream that my nose fell off. What does my dream mean? He said to him: This is an allusion that anger [haron af] that had been directed against you has been removed from you. Bar Kappara said to him: I saw in a

dream that my two hands were cut off. Rabbi said to him: This dream means that you will not require the labor of your hands, as you will be rich and you will have considerable means without effort. Bar Kappara said to him: I saw my two legs were cut off. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: You are riding a horse. He said to him: I saw that they were saying to me that in the month of Adar I will die and I will not see Nisan. He said to him: You will die in glory [adruta] and you will not be brought to temptation [nissayon].

¹⁰⁰ The Gemara relates a different case of dream interpretation: A certain heretic said to Rabbi Yishmael: I saw in my dream that I was irrigating olives with olive oil. What is the interpretation of my dream? He said to him: It is a sign that you had relations with your mother, as oil comes from the olive, and he is returning the oil to the olives. That heretic said to Rabbi Yishmael: I saw that I was plucking a star. He said to him: You kidnapped an Israelite man, as Israel is likened to the stars. The heretic said to him: I saw that I swallowed a star. He said to him: You sold the Israelite man whom you kidnapped and spent the money that you received from the sale. The heretic said to him: I saw my eyes kissing one another. He said to him: You had relations with your sister, as siblings are like two eyes. The heretic said to him: I saw myself kissing the moon. He said to him: You slept with an Israelite woman, who is likened to the moon. He said to him: I saw that I was treading in the shade of a myrtle tree. He said to him: You slept with a betrothed young woman, as it was customary to make a canopy of myrtle for the betrothal. He said to him: I saw that the shade was above me, and the tree was below me. He said to him: Your bed is upside-down, your relations with the betrothed woman were unnatural. He said to him: I saw ravens circling my bed. He said to him: Your wife committed adultery with many men. He said to him: I saw doves circling around my bed. He said to him: You defiled many women. He said to him: I saw that I was holding two doves and they were flying. He said to him: You married two women and dismissed them from your house without a divorce.

¹⁰¹ He said to him: I saw myself peeling eggs. He said to him: You stripped dead people, because an egg is eaten at the meal of comfort after burying the dead. The same heretic said to him: Everything you have interpreted is true, with the exception of this one, the last interpretation, which is not true. Meanwhile, this woman came and said to him: This cloak that you are wearing belongs to such-and-such a man, who died and whom you stripped of his clothing.

¹⁰² He said to Rabbi Yishmael: I saw that they said to me in a dream: Your father left you property in Cappadocia. Rabbi Yishmael said to him: Do you have property in Cappadocia? The heretic said to him: No. Did your father ever go to Cappadocia? The heretic said to him: No. Rabbi Yishmael said to him: If so, it must be understood as follows: Kappa in Greek means beam; deka means ten. Go look at the tenth beam in your house and you will find that it is full of coins. He went and found that it was full of coins.

¹⁰³ The Gemara continues dealing with interpretations of the details of dreams: Rabbi Ḥanina said: One who sees a well in a dream sees peace, as it is said: “And Isaac’s servants dug in the valley and found there a well of living water” (Genesis 26:19), and ultimately there was peace. Rabbi Natan says: One who sees a well in his dream it is a symbol that he has found Torah, as the well symbolizes Torah. As it is stated with regard to the Torah: “For whoever finds me finds life” (Proverbs 8:35), and it is written here: “A well of living water,” and we see that a well is linked to Torah as both are associated with life. Rava said: The well in the dream symbolizes actual life.

¹⁰⁴ Rabbi Ḥanan said: There are three items seen in dreams that are indications of peace: A river, a bird and a pot. The Gemara elaborates: A river, as it is written: “I will extend peace to her like a river” (Isaiah 66:12); a bird, as it is written: “As birds hovering, so will the Lord of hosts protect Jerusalem” (Isaiah 31:5); and a pot, as it is written: “Lord, You will establish [tishpot] peace for us” (Isaiah 26:12). Peace is likened to a pot which is placed [shafat] on the fire. And Rabbi Ḥanina said: We learned that a pot in a dream is a sign of peace with regard to a pot that does not have meat in it, as a pot that has meat in it symbolizes calamity, as it is stated: “Yea, they chop them in pieces, as that which is in the pot, and as flesh within the cauldron” (Micah 3:3).

¹⁰⁵ Since rivers, birds, and pots have ambiguous connotations, it is recommended that someone who sees them in a dream recite a verse that interprets the dream positively. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One who sees something in a dream that may be interpreted ambiguously should quickly recite an appropriate verse suggestive of a positive interpretation. For example, one who sees a river in a dream should rise early and recite: “I will extend peace to her like a river,” before a different verse, with a negative connotation, can precede it in becoming reality: “For distress will come in like a river” (Isaiah 59:19). One who sees a bird in a dream should rise early and recite: “As birds hovering, so will the Lord of hosts protect Jerusalem,” before a different verse, with a negative connotation, can precede it in becoming reality: “As a bird that wanders from her nest, so is a man that wanders from his place” (Proverbs 27:8). One who sees a pot in a dream should rise early and recite: “Lord, You will establish peace for us,” before a different verse, which concludes with a wrathful prophecy, can precede it in becoming reality: “Set on the pot, set it on” (Ezekiel 24:3).

¹⁰⁶ Similarly, one who sees grapes in a dream should rise early and recite: “I found Israel like grapes in the wilderness” (Hosea 9:10), before a different verse, with a negative connotation, can precede it in becoming reality: “Their grapes are grapes of gall, their clusters are bitter” (Deuteronomy 32:32). One who sees a mountain in a dream should rise early and recite: “How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger of good tidings, that announces peace, the harbinger of good tidings, that announces salvation” (Isaiah 52:7), before a different verse, with a negative connotation, can precede it in becoming reality: “For the mountains will I take up a weeping and wailing” (Jeremiah 9:9).

¹⁰⁷ One who sees a shofar in a dream should rise early and recite: “And it shall come to pass in that day, that a great shofar shall be sounded; and they shall come that were lost in the land of Assyria, and they that were dispersed in the land of Egypt” (Isaiah 27:13), before a different verse, in which the shofar is a symbol of war, can precede it in becoming reality: “Blow you the horn [shofar] in Giva” (Hosea 5:8).

¹⁰⁸ One who sees a dog in a dream should rise early and recite: “But against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog whet his tongue” (Exodus 11:7), before a different verse, with a negative connotation, can precede it in becoming reality: “Yea, the dogs are greedy” (Isaiah 56:11). One who sees a lion in a dream should rise early and recite: “The lion has roared, who will not fear? The Lord God has spoken, who can but prophesy?” (Amos 3:8), before a different verse, with a negative connotation, can precede it in becoming reality: “A lion is gone up from his thicket, and a destroyer of nations is set out, gone forth from his place” (Jeremiah 4:7).

¹⁰⁹ One who sees a shave in a dream should rise early and recite: “And he shaved himself, and changed his raiment” (Genesis 41:14), which was said with regard to Joseph when he left prison and

rose to greatness, before a different verse, with a negative connotation, can precede it in becoming reality: “If I be shaven, then my strength will go from me, and I shall become weak” (Judges 16:17). One who sees a well in a dream should rise early and recite: “A well of living waters” (Song of Songs 4:15), before a different verse, with a negative connotation, can precede it in becoming reality: “As a cistern wells with her waters, so it wells in its wickedness” (Jeremiah 6:7). One who sees a reed in a dream should rise early and recite: “A bruised reed shall he not break” (Isaiah 42:3), in praise of the Messiah, before a different verse, with a negative connotation, can precede it in becoming reality: “Now, behold, you trust upon the staff of this bruised reed” (II Kings 18:21), which is a disparaging depiction of Egypt.

¹¹⁰ The Sages teach: One who sees a reed [kaneh] in a dream should expect wisdom, as it is stated: “Get [kene] wisdom” (Proverbs 4:7). One who sees several reeds [kanim] should expect understanding, as it said: “Yea, with all your acquisitions [kinyanekha] acquire understanding” (Proverbs 4:7). Rabbi Zeira said: Pumpkin [kara], heart of palm [kura], wax [kira], and reed [kanya], are all advantageous when one dreams about them. It was taught in a baraita: A pumpkin is only shown in a dream to one who fears Heaven with all his might, because pumpkins [delu'im] are interpreted as an acronym for *dalui einai lamarom*, “My eyes were raised on high” (Isaiah 38:14).

¹¹¹ One who sees an ox in a dream, should rise early and recite: “His firstling bullock, majesty is his” (Deuteronomy 33:17), before a different verse, with a negative connotation, can precede it in becoming reality: “And if an ox gore a man” (Exodus 21:28).

¹¹² The Sages taught in a baraita: Five matters are said about dreams with regard to the ox. One who dreams that he ate from its flesh will become wealthy. One who dreams that it gored him will have sons who are Torah scholars, who gore each other in an attempt to better understand Torah. One who dreams that it bit him, suffering is coming to him. One who dreams that it kicked him will be required to travel a great distance in the future. One who dreams that he was riding it, it is a sign that he will rise to greatness.

¹¹³ The Gemara challenges: Wasn't it taught in a baraita that one who dreams that he was riding it, it is a sign that he will die? The Gemara responds: This is not difficult. This, which taught that he will rise to greatness, refers to a case where he saw that he was riding the ox, while this, which taught that it is a sign of his imminent death, refers to a case where he saw that the ox was riding him.

¹¹⁴ One who sees a donkey in a dream should anticipate salvation, as it is said: “Behold, your king comes unto you; he is triumphant, and victorious, lowly, and riding upon a donkey” (Zechariah 9:9). One who sees a cat in a dream in a place where in Aramaic they call it *shunra*, a nice song [*shira na'a*] will be composed for him. If he sees a cat in a place where they call cats *shinra*, it is a sign that he will undergo a change for the worse [*shinui ra*]. One who sees grapes in a dream and they were white or light colored, regardless of whether it was in their season or not in their season, it is a good sign. One who sees black grapes in their season, it is a good omen. However, one who sees black grapes when it was not in their season, it is a bad omen. One who sees a white horse in a dream, regardless of whether the horse was walking or running, it is a good omen for him. One who sees a red horse walking, it is a good omen; running, it is a bad omen.

¹¹⁵ The Gemara says: One who sees Ishmael in a dream, it is an omen that his prayer will be heard, just as Ishmael's prayer was heard. The Gemara notes: This refers specifically to where one saw Ishmael, son of Abraham, but not if one saw a random Arab. One who sees a camel [*gamal*] in a

dream, it is an omen that death was decreed upon him from heaven but he was spared. Rabbi Ḥama, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: What verse alludes to this? “I will go down with you into Egypt; and I will also surely bring you up again [gam alo]” (Genesis 46:4), the acronym for which is gamal. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: The source for this is from here, another verse: “The Lord also [gam] has put away your sin; you shall not die” (II Samuel 12:13).

¹¹⁶ One who sees Pinehas in a dream, it is an omen that a miracle will be performed on his behalf, just as miracles were performed for Pinehas. One who sees an elephant [pil] in a dream it is an omen that miracles [pelaot] will be performed for him. One who sees multiple elephants in a dream, miracles upon miracles will be performed for him.

¹¹⁷ The Gemara asks: Was it not taught in a baraita: All species of animals are good omens in a dream, with the exception of an elephant and a monkey? The Gemara answers: This is not difficult.

¹¹⁸ This opinion, that seeing an elephant is a good omen, refers to a case where one saw it saddled, while this opinion, that it is a bad omen, refers to a case where the elephant is not saddled. One who sees a man named Huna in a dream, it is a sign that a miracle will be performed for him, because the letter nun in the name Huna represents the word nes, miracle. One who sees a man named Ḥanina, Ḥananya, or Yoḥanan, it is a sign that many miracles will be performed for him, since the letter nun appears twice in those names. One who sees a eulogy in a dream, it is a sign that the heavens had mercy upon him, and spared him from a divine death sentence and there will be no need to eulogize him in reality. The Gemara restricts this statement and says that this only applies if he saw the eulogy written and not yet delivered.

¹¹⁹ One who answers in a dream: May His great name be blessed from kaddish is assured that he is one who has a place in the World-to-Come. One who sees himself reciting Shema in a dream is worthy of having the Divine Presence rest upon him, but his generation is unworthy, and, therefore, the Divine Presence does not actually rest upon him.

¹²⁰ One who sees himself don phylacteries in a dream should anticipate greatness, as it is stated: “And all the peoples of the earth shall see that the name of the Lord is called upon you; and they shall be afraid of you” (Deuteronomy 28:10). And it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Eliezer the Great says: That the Name of the Lord is called upon you, refers to phylacteries of the head, as they represent God’s name upon man. One who sees himself pray in a dream, it is an auspicious omen. However, the Gemara adds a caveat and says: This only applies in a case where he saw in the dream that he had not yet finished his prayer and is therefore still close to God. If, in the dream, he had already finished his prayer, it is not an omen.

¹²¹ One who sees that he had relations with his mother [em] in a dream, he should anticipate attaining understanding, as it is stated: “Yea if [im] you call for understanding” (Proverbs 2:3), and in this homiletic interpretation im is considered to be the equivalent of em. One who sees that he had relations with a betrothed young woman in a dream, he should anticipate Torah, as it is stated: “Moses commanded us Torah, an inheritance [morasha] of the congregation of Jacob” (Deuteronomy 33:4). Do not read it as morasha; rather, read it as me’orasa, betrothed. One who sees that he had relations with his sister in a dream, should anticipate wisdom, as it is stated: “Say unto wisdom: You are my sister” (Proverbs 7:4). One who sees that he had relations with a married woman in a dream is assured that he is one who has a place in the World-to-Come. He receives his place as well as that of another person in the Garden of Eden, as the married woman represents a portion belonging to

someone else. However, the Gemara adds a caveat and says: This only applies in a case where he did not know her and was not thinking about her that evening; rather, he saw an unidentified woman in his dream by chance.

¹²² Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said: One who sees wheat in a dream has seen peace, as it is stated: “He makes your borders peace; He gives you in plenty the fat of wheat” (Psalms 147:14). And one who sees barley [se’orim] in a dream has received a sign that his iniquities are taken away, as it is stated: “And your iniquity is taken away [vesar avonekh], and your sin expiated” (Isaiah 6:7); se’orim is an acronym for sar avon. Rabbi Zeira said: I did not ascend from Babylonia to Eretz Yisrael until I saw barley in my dream.

¹²³ One who sees a vine laden with grapes in a dream, it is an omen that his wife will not miscarry, as it is stated: “Your wife shall be as a fruitful vine, in the innermost parts of your house” (Psalms 128:3). One who sees a planted vine branch in a dream should anticipate the Messiah, as it is stated: “Binding his foal unto the vine and his donkey’s colt unto the vine branch” (Genesis 49:11).

¹²⁴ One who sees a fig tree in a dream, it is a sign that his Torah is preserved within him, as it is stated: “One who keeps the fig tree shall eat the fruit thereof” (Proverbs 27:18). One who sees pomegranates in a dream, if they were small, his business will flourish like the seeds of the pomegranate, which are numerous; and if they were large, his business will increase like a pomegranate. One who saw slices of pomegranates in his dream, if he is a Torah scholar, he should anticipate Torah, as it is stated: “I would cause you to drink of spiced wine, of the juice of my pomegranate” (Song of Songs 8:2), which is traditionally understood as an allusion to Torah. And if the dreamer is an ignoramus, he should anticipate mitzvot, as it is stated: “Your temples are like a split pomegranate” (Song of Songs 4:3). As the Gemara previously interpreted homiletically: What is the meaning of the word “Your temples [rakatekh]”? Even the most ignorant [reikanin] among you, Israel, are full of mitzvot like a pomegranate.

¹²⁵ One who sees olives in a dream, and they were small, it is a sign that his business will flourish, increase and be durable like olives. However, the Gemara adds a caveat, saying that this applies only when he sees the fruit of an olive tree; but, one who sees olive trees, it is a sign that he will have many children, as it is stated: “Your children like olive plants, round about your table” (Psalms 128:3). Some say that one who sees an olive tree in a dream, it is a sign that a good reputation will spread for him, as it is stated: “The Lord called your name a leafy olive tree, fair with goodly fruit” (Jeremiah 11:16). One who sees olive oil in a dream should anticipate the light of Torah, as it is stated: “That they bring unto you pure olive oil beaten for the light” (Exodus 27:20). One who sees palm trees [temarim] in a dream has seen a sign that his transgressions have ceased, as it is stated: “Your iniquity is finished, O daughter of Zion” (Lamentations 4:22), as the Gemara likens temara, date, to tam ra, evil has ceased.

¹²⁶ Rav Yosef says: One who sees a goat in a dream, it is a sign that his year will be blessed; one who sees goats, his years will be blessed, as it is stated: “And there will be goats’ milk enough for your food, for the food of your household; and sustenance for your maidens” (Proverbs 27:27). One who sees myrtle in a dream, it is a sign that his property will be successful. And if he does not own property, it is a sign that he will receive an inheritance. Ulla said, and some say it was taught in a baraita: This applies exclusively to a case where he saw them on their stem. One who sees a citron [etrog] in a dream has seen a sign that he is honored [hadur] before his Creator, as it is stated with

regard to the citron: “The fruit of goodly trees [hadar], branches of palm trees” (Leviticus 23:40).

One who sees a palm branch [lulav] in a dream, it is a sign that he has but one heart for his Father in heaven. Lulav is interpreted homiletically as lo lev, he has a heart.

¹²⁷ One who sees a goose in a dream should anticipate wisdom, as it is stated: “Wisdoms cry aloud in the streets, she utters her voice in the broad places” (Proverbs 1:20); geese tend to sound their voices. One who dreams that he has relations with the goose will become head of the yeshiva. Rav Ashi said: I saw a goose and had relations with it in my dream and I ascended to greatness and became head of the yeshiva.

¹²⁸ One who sees a rooster in a dream should anticipate a male child. One who sees multiple roosters should expect male children. One who sees a hen [tarnegolet] should anticipate a beautiful garden and reason to rejoice [tarbitza na’a vegila], as tarnegolet is interpreted as an acronym for tarbitza na’a vegila. One who sees eggs in a dream, it is a sign that his request is pending, as egg in Aramaic is beya, which is similar to the term for request. If one saw that the eggs broke, it is a sign that his request has already been granted, as that which was hidden inside the shell was revealed. The same is true of nuts, and the same is true of cucumbers, and the same is true of all glass vessels, and the same is true of anything similarly fragile that broke in his dream, it is a sign that his request was granted.

¹²⁹ One who dreams that he entered a city, it is a sign that his desires will be fulfilled, as it is stated: “And He led them unto their desired haven” (Psalms 107:30). One who shaves his head in a dream, it is a good omen for him, as the removal of undesired hairs is a sign of renewal and greatness. If he shaved his head and his beard in a dream, it is a good omen for him and his entire family.

¹³⁰ One who sits in a small boat in a dream, it is a sign that a good reputation will spread for him. If he sees himself sitting in a large boat in a dream, a good reputation will spread for him and his entire family. The Gemara notes that this only applies where the boat was floating high on the waves.

¹³¹ One who defecates in a dream, it is a good omen for him, as it is stated: “He that is bent down shall speedily be loosed; and he shall not go down dying into the pit, neither shall his bread fail” (Isaiah 51:14). The Gemara notes that this only applies where he does not wipe and get his hands dirty.

¹³² One who climbs up to the roof in a dream, it is a sign that he will ascend to greatness. If, after he climbed up, he climbed back down, it is a sign that he will descend from the greatness he achieved. Abaye and Rava both said: Once one ascended to the roof in his dream, he ascended, and even if he dreams that he descended, it remains a good omen for him. One who rips his clothing in a dream, it is a sign that they rip up his sentence. One who stands naked in Babylonia in a dream, it is a sign that he stands free of transgression. Although living outside Israel is itself a transgression, his nakedness symbolizes that he has been absolved of that sin. If one dreamed that he stood naked in Eretz Yisrael, it is a sign that he is naked without mitzvot. One who dreams that he was apprehended and guarded by a soldier [sardeyot], it is a sign that protection was provided him by heaven. If he sees that he is wearing a neck chain [kolar], it is a sign that they have increased his level of protection. However, the Gemara notes that this only applies to a case where his neck was placed in a neck chain; if his neck was simply placed in a noose, it does not indicate heavenly protection.

¹³³ One who enters a marsh in a dream, it is a sign that he will become head of a yeshiva, as he appears to be standing alone with all the bulrushes, large and small, surrounding him like the head of a yeshiva, around whom all the students gather. One who dreams that he entered a forest and sees

only large trees around him, it is a sign that he will be made head of only the advanced students [kalla], where he will explain the lessons only to the outstanding students in the yeshiva, each of whom is himself a great tree, set apart from the others.

¹³⁴ The Gemara relates: Rav Pappa and Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, each saw a dream: Rav Pappa, who saw that he entered a marsh in his dream, was appointed head of a yeshiva. Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, who saw that he entered a forest in his dream, was appointed head of the advanced students. Some say that both of them dreamed that they entered a marsh, but Rav Pappa, who dreamed that a drum hung from his neck, was appointed head of the yeshiva, as banging a drum symbolizes the head of a yeshiva who sounds his voice in public. Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, who did not dream that a drum hung around his neck, was only appointed head of the advanced students. Rav Ashi said: I dreamed that I entered a marsh and hung a drum and beat it, and Rav Ashi became head of the yeshiva.

¹³⁵ The tanna who recited mishnayot before Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak taught: One who lets blood in a dream, it is a sign that his transgressions have been forgiven, because red, the color of blood, is a metaphor for sin: “Though your sins be as scarlet...though they be red like crimson” (Isaiah 1:18). Consequently, bloodletting can symbolize transgressions leaving him.

¹³⁶ The Gemara asks: Was it not taught in a baraita: One who sees that he is letting-blood in a dream, it is a sign that his transgressions are enumerated before him? The Gemara answers: What is meant by enumerated? This means that they are enumerated to be forgiven.

¹³⁷ The tanna who recited mishnayot before Rav Sheshet taught: One who sees a snake in a dream, it is a sign that his livelihood is accessible to him just as dust is readily accessible to a snake. If one saw that the snake bit him in his dream, it is a sign that his livelihood will double. If he killed the snake, it is a sign that he will lose his livelihood. Rav Sheshet said to the tanna: On the contrary, if one dreamed that he killed the snake it is a sign that all the more so his livelihood will double. The Gemara remarks: But that is not so. Rav Sheshet saw a snake in his dream and killed it, so he sought to interpret his dream positively.

¹³⁸ The tanna who recited mishnayot before Rabbi Yoḥanan taught: One who sees any kind of drink in a dream it is a good omen, except for wine, as there is one who drinks it in a dream and it is a good omen for him, and there is one who drinks it in a dream and it is a bad omen for him. The Gemara elaborates: There is one who drinks wine and it is a good omen for him, as it is stated: “And wine that makes glad the heart of man” (Psalms 104:15), and there is one who drinks it in a dream and it is a bad omen for him, as it is stated: “Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish and wine unto the bitter in soul” (Proverbs 31:6).

¹³⁹ Rabbi Yoḥanan said to the tanna: You should teach that for a Torah scholar, a dream of wine is always a good omen, as it is stated: “Come, eat of my bread and drink of the wine which I have mingled” (Proverbs 9:5).

¹⁴⁰ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One who awakened in the morning and a verse immediately falls into his mouth, it is a minor prophecy. The Sages taught: There are three kings whose appearance in a dream is significant. One who sees David in a dream should expect piety; one who sees Solomon should expect wisdom; and one who sees Ahab should be concerned about calamity.

¹⁴¹ There are also three books of Prophets whose appearance in a dream is meaningful: One who sees the book of Kings should anticipate greatness, royalty; one who sees the book of Ezekiel should anticipate wisdom, as the configuration of the Divine Chariot is described therein; one who sees the book of Isaiah should anticipate consolation; and one who sees the book of Jeremiah should be concerned about calamity, because Jeremiah prophesied extensively of impending calamity.

¹⁴² Similarly, there are three great books of Writings whose appearance in a dream has particular significance: One who sees the book of Psalms should anticipate piety; one who sees the book of Proverbs should anticipate wisdom; one who sees the book of Job should be concerned about calamity.

¹⁴³ There are also three minor books of Writings whose appearance in a dream is significant: One who sees Song of Songs in a dream should anticipate piety, as it describes God's love for Israel; one who sees Ecclesiastes should anticipate wisdom; one who sees Lamentations should be concerned about calamity; and one who sees the scroll of Esther, it is a sign that a miracle will be performed on his behalf.

¹⁴⁴ There are three Sages whose appearance in a dream is significant: One who sees Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi in a dream should anticipate wisdom; one who sees Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya should anticipate wealth, as he was particularly wealthy; and one who sees Rabbi Yishmael ben Elisha should be concerned about calamity, as he was one of the ten martyrs executed by the Romans.

¹⁴⁵ There are three Torah scholars who, despite their greatness in Torah, were never given the title Rabbi, and whose appearance in a dream is significant: One who sees Ben Azzai in a dream should anticipate piety; one who sees Ben Zoma should anticipate wisdom; and one who sees Aḥer, Elisha ben Avuya, should be concerned about calamity, as he strayed from the path of righteousness.

¹⁴⁶ The Gemara says: All types of animals are auspicious signs for a dream except for an elephant, a monkey and a long-tailed ape. The Gemara asks: Didn't the Master say: A miracle will be performed for one who sees an elephant in a dream? The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This statement that a vision of an elephant is a good omen refers to a case where it is saddled, while this statement that it is not a good omen refers to a case where it is not saddled.

¹⁴⁷ Similarly, the Gemara says: All types of metal utensils are auspicious signs for a dream, except for a hoe, a chisel, and an axe, as these are instruments of destruction. The Gemara notes that this applies specifically when they are seen on their handles. On a similar note, the Gemara says: All kinds of fruit are auspicious signs for a dream except for unripe dates. All kinds of vegetables are auspicious signs for a dream except for turnip heads. The Gemara challenges: Didn't Rav say: I did not become wealthy until I saw turnip heads in my dream? Apparently turnip heads are a good omen. The Gemara responds: When Rav saw them, he saw them on their stems; if one sees turnip heads already picked, it is a bad omen. Similarly, all kinds of colors are auspicious signs for a dream, except for sky-blue [tekhelet]. All kinds of birds are auspicious signs in a dream except for an eagle-owl, and an owl, and a kurferai, all of which are nocturnal and have strange and frightening appearances.

¹⁴⁸ The words: The body, the body, microcosm, ease, and comfort are mnemonics for matters that the Gemara will discuss, each of which represents a list with shared qualities, similar to the lists cited above.

¹⁴⁹ The Gemara says: Three food items enter the body yet the body does not benefit from them: Cherries, bad dates, and unripe dates. In contrast: Three matters do not enter the body yet the body benefits from them, and they are: Washing, anointing, and usage [tashmish], commonly used as a euphemism for conjugal relations. Three matters are microcosms of the World-to-Come, and they are: Sabbath, the sun and usage.

¹⁵⁰ The Gemara asks: Usage of what benefits the body and is a microcosm of the World-to-Come? If you say that it refers to conjugal relations, doesn't that weaken the body? Rather, it refers to usage of his orifices, relieving oneself.

¹⁵¹ Three matters ease one's mind, and they are: Voice, sight, and smell, when they are pleasant and aesthetic. Three matters give a person comfort, and they are: A beautiful abode, a beautiful wife, and beautiful vessels.

¹⁵² The numbers five, six, and ten are mnemonics for the categories to follow. The Gemara says: There are five matters in our world which are one-sixtieth of their most extreme manifestations. They are: Fire, honey, Shabbat, sleep, and a dream. The Gemara elaborates: Our fire is one-sixtieth of the fire of Gehenna; honey is one-sixtieth of manna; Shabbat is one-sixtieth of the World-to-Come; sleep is one-sixtieth of death; and a dream is one-sixtieth of prophecy.

¹⁵³ Similarly: Six matters are good omens for the sick: Sneezing, sweating, diarrhea, a seminal emission, sleep, and a dream. These are all alluded to in Scripture: Sneezing, as it is written: "His sneezes flash forth light" (Job 41:10), indicating that by means of a sneeze one comes to see the light of the world. Sweat, as it is written: "In the sweat of your face shall you eat bread" (Genesis 3:19). Diarrhea, as it is written: "He that is bent down shall speedily be loosed; and he shall not go down dying into the pit" (Isaiah 51:14). A seminal emission, as it is written: "That he might see his seed, prolong his days" (Isaiah 53:10). Sleep, as it is written: "I should have slept; then had I been at rest" (Job 3:13). A dream, as it is written: "Wherefore You recover me [vatahalimeni], and make me to live" (Isaiah 38:16); vatahalimeni is interpreted as etymologically similar to halom, dream.

¹⁵⁴ Similarly: Six matters cure a sick person from his illness, and their cure is an effective cure. They are: Cabbage, beets, dried foley, a medicinal plant, the stomach, the placenta, and the diaphragm of an animal. Some say that small fish also possess these qualities. Furthermore, small fish cause one's entire body to flourish and become healthy.

¹⁵⁵ In contrast, there are ten matters that cause a sick person who has recovered to suffer a relapse of his illness, and his illness is even more severe, and they are: Eating ox meat, eating fatty meat in general, eating roasted meat, eating poultry, eating a roasted egg, shaving, eating cress, drinking milk, eating cheese, and bathing in a bathhouse. And some say eating nuts, and some say even eating cucumbers.

¹⁵⁶ It was taught in the school of Rabbi Yishmael: Why are they called cucumbers [kishu'im]? Because they are as harmful [kashim] to the body as swords. The Gemara asks: Is that really so? Is it not written: "And the Lord said unto her: Two nations [goyim] are in your womb" (Genesis 25:23) and the Gemara says: Do not read it as goyim, rather read it as gayim, proud ones. And Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: This verse was fulfilled in these two great individuals who descended from Rebecca: Antoninus and Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, whose tables, because of their wealth, never lacked for radish, lettuce or cucumbers, neither in summer nor in the rainy season. Apparently, cucumbers are good and are even a delicacy of kings.

¹⁵⁷ The Gemara resolves: This is not difficult. This that says they are harmful to the body refers to large ones, while this that says they were always served on the table of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and Antoninus refers to small ones.

¹⁵⁸ With regard to dreams, the Sages taught: One who dreams that he sees a corpse in his house, it is a sign of peace in his house. If the corpse ate and drank in the house, it is good omen for the house. If the corpse removed vessels from the house, it is a bad omen for the house, as it suggests that the corpse is taking someone from the house with him. Rav Pappa explained this only if the dream was with regard to a shoe and a sandal, as that indicates that someone from the house is going to embark on a long journey. As the Sages said: Everything that a corpse takes in a dream is a good omen except a shoe and a sandal; everything that a corpse gives in a dream is a good omen except dust and mustard, which looks like dust, as they portend burial.

¹⁵⁹ We learned in the mishna that one who sees a place from which idolatry was eradicated should recite the blessing: Blessed...Who eradicated idolatry from our land. On this topic the Sages taught in the Tosefta: One who sees the idol called Mercury [Markulis] recites: Blessed...who has shown patience to those who violate His will, as each day new rocks would be thrown upon the pile constructed in Mercury's honor (Tosafot). One who sees a place from which idolatry was eradicated should recite: Blessed...Who eradicated idolatry from our land. And just as it was eradicated from this place, so too may it be eradicated from all places of Israel, and restore the hearts of their worshippers to worship You. Outside of Eretz Yisrael, one need not recite: And restore the hearts of their worshippers to worship You, since it is predominantly populated by gentiles. Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: Even outside of Eretz Yisrael one is required to recite that formula because in the end of days all nations will convert, as it is stated: "For then will I turn to the peoples a pure language, that they may all call upon the Name of the Lord, to serve Him with one consent" (Zephaniah 3:9).

¹⁶⁰ The Gemara goes on to discuss special blessings instituted by the Sages to be recited upon seeing extraordinary sights. Rav Hamnuna taught: One who sees the wicked Babylonia must recite five blessings. The Gemara elaborates: One who saw the ruins of Babylonia, recites: Blessed...Who destroyed the wicked Babylonia. One who saw the ruins of Nebuchadnezzar's house, recites: Blessed...Who destroyed the house of wicked Nebuchadnezzar. One who saw the lion's den into which Daniel was thrown (see Daniel ch. 6) or the furnace into which Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah were thrown (see Daniel ch. 3), recites: Blessed...Who performed miracles for our ancestors in this place. One who saw Mercury, recites: Blessed...Who has shown patience to those who violate His will. One who saw a place from which earth is taken, as over the generations earth was taken from certain places and used as fertilizer or for construction in the surrounding areas, recites: Blessed...Who speaks and acts, decrees and fulfills.

¹⁶¹ The Gemara relates that when Rava would see donkeys carrying earth from Babylonia, he would slap their backs with his hand and say to them: Run, righteous ones, and fulfill the will of your Master. When Mar, son of Ravina, would arrive in Babylonia he would take earth in his kerchief and throw it outside, to fulfill that which is said: "And I will sweep it with the broom of destruction" (Isaiah 14:23). Rav Ashi said: I never heard the statement of Rav Hamnuna, that one who sees Babylonia the wicked must recite five blessings. However, based on my independent reasoning, I recited all of the blessings.

¹⁶² With regard to Babylonia, the Gemara cites what Rabbi Yirmeya ben Elazar said: When Babylonia was cursed, its neighbors were cursed along with it. When Samaria was cursed, its neighbors were blessed. When Babylonia was cursed its neighbors were cursed along with it, as it is written: "I will also make it a possession for the bittern, a wading bird, and pools of water" (Isaiah 14:23); not only will it be destroyed, but the site will become a habitat for destructive, environmentally harmful creatures. When Samaria was cursed, however, its neighbors were blessed, as it is written: "Therefore I will make Samaria a heap in the field, a place for the planting of vineyards" (Micah 1:6); although destroyed, it will serve a beneficial purpose.

¹⁶³ And Rav Hamnuna said: One who sees multitudes of Israel, six hundred thousand Jews, recites: Blessed...Who knows all secrets. One who sees multitudes of gentiles recites: "Your mother shall be sore ashamed, she that bore you shall be confounded; behold, the hindermost of the nations shall be a wilderness, a dry land, and a desert" (Jeremiah 50:12).

¹⁶⁴ The Sages taught in a Tosefta: One who sees multitudes of Israel recites: Blessed...Who knows all secrets. Why is this? He sees a whole nation whose minds are unlike each other and whose faces are unlike each other, and He Who knows all secrets, God, knows what is in each of their hearts. The Gemara relates: Ben Zoma once saw a multitude [okhlosa] of Israel while standing on a stair on the Temple Mount. He immediately recited: Blessed...Who knows all secrets and Blessed...Who created all these to serve me.

¹⁶⁵ Explaining his custom, he would say: How much effort did Adam the first man exert before he found bread to eat: He plowed, sowed, reaped, sheaved, threshed, winnowed in the wind, separated the grain from the chaff, ground the grain into flour, sifted, kneaded, and baked and only thereafter he ate. And I, on the other hand, wake up and find all of these prepared for me. Human society employs a division of labor, and each individual benefits from the service of the entire world. Similarly, how much effort did Adam the first man exert before he found a garment to wear? He sheared, laundered, combed, spun and wove, and only thereafter he found a garment to wear. And I, on the other hand, wake up and find all of these prepared for me. Members of all nations, merchants and craftsmen, diligently come to the entrance of my home, and I wake up and find all of these before me.

¹⁶⁶ Ben Zoma would say: A good guest, what does he say? How much effort did the host expend on my behalf, how much meat did the host bring before me. How much wine did he bring before me. How many loaves [geluskaot] did he bring before me. All the effort that he expended, he expended only for me. However, a bad guest, what does he say? What effort did the host expend? I ate only one piece of bread, I ate only one piece of meat and I drank only one cup of wine. All the effort that the home owner expended he only expended on behalf of his wife and children.

¹⁶⁷ With regard to a good guest, what does he say? "Remember that you magnify his work, whereof men have sung" (Job 36:24); he praises and acknowledges those who helped him. With regard to a bad guest it is written: "Men do therefore fear him; he regards not any who are wise of heart" (Job 37:24).

¹⁶⁸ On the topic of multitudes, the Gemara cites another verse: "And the man in the days of Saul was old, and came among men" (I Samuel 17:12). Rava, and some say Rav Zevid, and some say Rav Oshaya, said: This refers to Yishai, father of David, who always went out with multitudes, and

entered with multitudes, and taught Torah with multitudes. Ulla said: We hold there is no multitude in Babylonia. The Sage taught: A multitude is no fewer than six hundred thousand people.

¹⁶⁹ The Sages taught: One who sees the Sages of Israel recites: Blessed...Who has shared of His wisdom with those who revere Him. One who sees Sages of the nations of the world recites: Blessed...Who has given of His wisdom to flesh and blood. One who sees kings of Israel recites: Blessed...Who has shared of His glory with those who revere Him. One who sees kings of the other nations of the world recites: Blessed...Who has given of His glory to flesh and blood.

¹⁷⁰ Rabbi Yoḥanan said: One should always strive to run toward kings of Israel to greet them. And not only should he run toward kings of Israel, but also toward kings of the nations of the world, so that if he will be privileged to witness the glory of the Messiah (Rashi) and the World-to-Come, he will distinguish between the kings of Israel and the kings of the nations of the world.

¹⁷¹ The Gemara relates: Rav Sheshet was blind. Everyone was going to greet the king and Rav Sheshet stood up and went along with them. This heretic found him there and said to him: The intact jugs go to the river, where do the broken jugs go? Why is a blind person going to see the king? Rav Sheshet said to him: Come see that I know more than you do. The first troop passed, and when the noise grew louder, this heretic said to him: The king is coming. Rav Sheshet said to him: The king is not coming. The second troop passed, and when the noise grew louder, this heretic said to him: Now the king is coming. Rav Sheshet said to him: The king is not coming. The third troop passed, and when there was silence, Rav Sheshet said to him: Certainly now the king is coming.

¹⁷² This heretic said to him: How do you know this? Rav Sheshet said to him: Royalty on earth is like royalty in the heavens, as it is written with regard to God's revelation to Elijah the Prophet on Mount Horeb: "And He said: Go forth, and stand upon the mount before the Lord. And, behold, the Lord passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and broke in pieces the rocks before the Lord; but the Lord was not in the wind; and after the wind an earthquake; but the Lord was not in the earthquake; and after the earthquake a fire; but the Lord was not in the fire; and after the fire a still small voice. And it was so, when Elijah heard it, that he wrapped his face in his mantle and went out, and stood in the entrance of the cave" (I Kings 19:11–13). God's revelation was specifically at the moment of silence.

¹⁷³ When the king came, Rav Sheshet began to bless him. The heretic mockingly said to him: Do you bless someone you do not see? The Gemara asks: And what ultimately happened to this heretic? Some say that his friends gouged out his eyes, and some say that Rav Sheshet fixed his gaze upon him, and the heretic became a pile of bones.

¹⁷⁴ As for the connection between divine and earthly royalty, the Gemara cites another story: Rabbi Sheila ordered that a man who had relations with a gentile woman be flogged. That man went to inform the king and said: There is one man among the Jews who renders judgment without the king's authority [harmana]. The king sent a messenger [peristaka] for Rabbi Sheila to bring him to trial. When Rabbi Sheila came, they said to him: Why did you order flogging for this man? He said to them: Because he had relations with a female donkey. According to Persian law this was an extremely heinous crime, so they said to him: Do you have witnesses that he did so? He replied: Yes, and Elijah the prophet came and appeared as a person and testified. They said to Rabbi Sheila: If so, he is liable for the death penalty; why did you not sentence him to death? He replied: Since the day

we were exiled from our land we do not have the authority to execute, but you, do with him as you wish.

¹⁷⁵ As they considered the sentence, Rabbi Sheila praised God for saving him from danger: “Yours, O Lord, is the greatness, power, glory, triumph, and majesty; for all that is in heaven and on earth is Yours; Yours is the kingdom, O Lord, and You are exalted as head above all” (I Chronicles 29:11). They asked him: What did you say? He told them: This is what I said: Blessed is the Merciful One who grants kingdom on earth that is a microcosm of the kingdom in heaven, and granted you dominion and love of justice. They said to him: Indeed, the honor of royalty is so dear to you. They gave him a staff to symbolize his license to sit in judgment and said to him: Judge.

¹⁷⁶ As he was leaving, that man said to Rabbi Sheila: Does God perform such miracles for liars? He replied: Scoundrel! Aren’t gentiles called donkeys? As it is written: “Whose flesh is as the flesh of donkeys” (Ezekiel 23:20). Rabbi Sheila saw that he was going to tell the Persian authorities that he called them donkeys. He said: This man has the legal status of a pursuer. He seeks to have me killed. And the Torah said: If one comes to kill you, kill him first. He struck him with the staff and killed him.

¹⁷⁷ Rabbi Sheila said: Since a miracle was performed on my behalf with this verse that I cited, I will interpret it homiletically: Yours, O Lord, is the greatness; that is the act of creation, and so it says: “Who does great things past finding out” (Job 9:10); And the power; that is the exodus from Egypt, as it is stated: “And Israel saw the great work which the Lord did to the Egyptians” (Exodus 14:31); And the glory; that is the sun and the moon that stood still for Joshua, as it is stated: “And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the nation had avenged themselves of their enemies” (Joshua 10:13); And the triumph; that is the downfall of Rome, and so it says describing the downfall of Edom, whom the Sages identified as the forefather of Rome: “Their lifeblood is dashed against My garments and I have stained all My raiment” (Isaiah 63:3); And the majesty; this is the war of the valleys of Arnon, as it is stated: “Wherefore it is said in the book of the Wars of the Lord: Vahev in Sufa, and the valleys of Arnon” (Numbers 21:14); For all that is in the heaven and in the earth is Yours; this is the war of Sisera, as it is stated: “They fought from heaven, the stars in their courses fought against Sisera” (Judges 5:20). Yours is the kingdom, O Lord; this is the war of Amalek, and so it says: “And he said: The hand upon the throne of the Lord: the Lord will have war with Amalek from generation to generation” (Exodus 17:16), as then God will sit on His throne. And you are exalted; this is the war of Gog and Magog, and so it says: “I am against you, O Gog, the chief prince of Meshekh and Tubal” (Ezekiel 38:3); and: As head above all; Rav Ḥanan bar Rava said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: All leadership and authority, even the most insignificant, the one responsible for distributing water, is appointed by heaven.

¹⁷⁸ It was taught in a baraita in the name of Rabbi Akiva: Yours, O Lord, is the greatness; this is the splitting of the Red Sea; the power; this is the plague of the firstborn; the glory; this is the giving of the Torah; the triumph; this is Jerusalem; and the majesty; this is the Temple.

¹⁷⁹ The Sages taught: One who sees the houses of Israel inhabited and tranquil recites: Blessed... Who establishes the border of the widow. One who sees them in ruins he recites: Blessed...the true Judge. One who sees the houses of the nations of the world inhabited recites: “The Lord will destroy the house of the proud, but He will establish the border of the widow” (Proverbs 15:25). And if he

sees them in ruins he recites: “God of vengeance, Lord, God of vengeance, shine forth” (Psalms 94:1).

¹⁸⁰ The Gemara relates that Ulla and Rav Ḥisda were once walking along the road when they came upon the doorway of the house of Rav Ḥana bar Ḥanilai. Rav Ḥisda groaned and sighed. Ulla asked him: Why are you sighing? Didn’t Rav say: Sighing breaks half of one’s body? As it is stated: “Sigh, therefore, you son of man; with the breaking of your loins” (Ezekiel 21:11); sighing breaks a person down to his loins. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said that sighing breaks even one’s entire body, as it is stated: “And it shall be, when they say unto you: Why are you sighing? That you shall say: Because of the tidings, for it comes; and every heart shall melt, and all hands shall be slack, and every spirit shall be faint, and all knees shall drip with water” (Ezekiel 21:12).

¹⁸¹ Rav Ḥisda said to Ulla: How can I not sigh? We see this house where there were sixty cooks during the day and sixty cooks at night who would cook for anyone in need, and Rav Ḥana never removed his hand from his pocket because he thought: Perhaps a well-born poor person might come and in the time that passed until he put his hand in his pocket to give him charity, the poor person would be embarrassed. Moreover, that house had four doors open in all four directions, and anyone who entered hungry left satiated. And they would scatter wheat and barley outside during years of drought so that anyone who was embarrassed to take the grain during the day could come and take it at night. Now that the house has fallen in ruins, how can I not sigh?

¹⁸² Ulla said to Rav Ḥisda: You have nothing about which to sigh, as Rabbi Yoḥanan said as follows: From the day that the Temple was destroyed a decree was issued upon the houses of the righteous that they would be destroyed, as it is stated: “In mine ears said the Lord of hosts: Of a truth many houses shall be desolate, even great and fair, without inhabitant” (Isaiah 5:9). And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: In the future, in the end of days, the Holy One, Blessed be He, will restore them to their original locations and their inhabited state, as it is stated: “A Song of Ascents of David. They who trust in the Lord are as Mount Zion, which cannot be moved but abides forever” (Psalms 125:1). From this verse one may infer that just as in the future the Holy One, Blessed be He, will restore Mount Zion to its inhabited state, so too, in the future the Holy One, Blessed be He, will restore the houses of the righteous to their inhabited state, so you have no reason to sigh. Seeing that he was still not satisfied, Ulla said to him: It is enough for a servant to be like his master. Since God leaves His home, the Holy Temple, in ruins, one should not be distraught over the destruction of the houses of the righteous.

¹⁸³ The Sages taught in a baraita: One who sees graves of Israel recites: Blessed...Who formed you in judgment, and Who nourished you in judgment, and Who sustained you in judgment, and collected your soul in judgment, and in the future will raise you from the dead in judgment. And Mar, son of Ravina, concludes the formula of this blessing in the name of Rav Naḥman: And Who knows the number of you all, and Who in the future will restore you to life and sustain you. Blessed...Who revives the dead. One who sees graves of gentiles recites: “Your mother shall be sore ashamed, she who bore you shall be confounded; behold, the hindermost of the nations shall be a wilderness, a dry land, and a desert” (Jeremiah 50:12).

¹⁸⁴ Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One who sees his friend after thirty days have passed since last seeing him recites: Blessed...Who has given us life, sustained us and brought us to this time. One who sees his friend after twelve months recites: Blessed...Who revives the dead. As Rav said: A dead

person is only forgotten from the heart after twelve months have elapsed, as it is stated: "I am forgotten as a dead man out of mind; I am like a lost vessel" (Psalms 31:13), and with regard to the laws of lost objects, it is human nature to despair of recovering a lost object after twelve months (see Bava Metzia 28a).

¹⁸⁵ The Gemara relates: Rav Pappa and Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, were once walking along the road when they met Rav Ḥanina the son of Rav Ika. They said to him: When we saw you we recited two blessings over meeting you: Blessed...Who has shared of His wisdom to those who revere Him, and: Who has given us life...as they had not seen him in over a month. He said to them: I too, once I saw you, considered you in my eyes as equivalent to six hundred thousand of the house of Israel, and I recited three blessings over you. I recited those two that you recited, as well as: Blessed...Who knows all secrets, which is the blessing recited upon seeing six hundred thousand Israelites. They said to him: Are you all that clever? They fixed their gaze upon him and he died.

¹⁸⁶ The Gemara continues to discuss the obligation to recite a blessing over unusual phenomena. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One who sees spotted people recites: Blessed...Who makes creatures different. The Gemara raises a challenge: One who saw a person with unusually black skin, a person with unusually red skin, a person with unusually white skin [lavkan], an unusually tall and thin person, a dwarf, or one with warts [darnikos] recites: Blessed...Who makes creatures different. However, one who sees an amputee, a blind person, a flat-headed person, a lame person, one afflicted with boils, or spotted people recites: Blessed...the true Judge, not: Who makes creatures different.

¹⁸⁷ The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This, where Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi says to recite: Who makes creatures different, refers to a case where the individual was spotted from when he was in his mother's womb, since birth. While this, where one recites: The true Judge, refers to a case where the individual only became spotted after he was born. The Gemara remarks: The language of the baraita is also precise as it draws a parallel to other cases, as it taught that a spotted person is similar to an amputee, which, in general, is a handicap incurred after birth. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, conclude from this.

¹⁸⁸ The Sages taught: One who sees an elephant, a monkey, or a vulture (Rashi) recites: Blessed...Who makes creatures different. One who saw beautiful or otherwise outstanding creatures or beautiful trees recites: Blessed...Who has such things in His world.

¹⁸⁹ We learned in the mishna that over zikin, one recites: Whose strength and power fill the world. The Gemara asks: What are zikin? Shmuel said: A comet. Shmuel also said: The paths of the sky are as clear to me as the paths of my city, Neharde'a, except for comets, that I do not know what they are. And we learn through tradition that a comet does not pass the Orion constellation, and if it does pass Orion, the world will be destroyed. The Gemara asks: Don't we see that comets pass Orion? The Gemara rejects this: The aura of the comet passes Orion and it appears as though the comet itself passes. Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said a different answer: It is merely that vilon, one of the firmaments, rips and furls and the light of the next firmament is seen, and this appears like a comet. Rav Ashi said another explanation: It is not a comet that passes Orion, but a star that is uprooted from one side of Orion, and another star, from the other side of Orion, sees it and gets startled and shudders, and appears as if it is passing.

¹⁹⁰ On the subject of stars, the Gemara notes that Shmuel raised a contradiction between the implications of two verses with regard to constellations. On the one hand it is written: "Who makes

Ursa Major, Orion, and Pleiades, and the chambers of the south” (Job 9:9); Orion precedes Pleiades. And on the other hand it is written: “He Who makes Pleiades and Orion” (Amos 5:8); Pleiades precedes Orion. So how is this reconciled? The Gemara replies: Were it not for Orion’s heat, the universe could not exist because of the cold of Pleiades; and conversely, were it not for the cold of Pleiades, the universe could not exist because of the heat of Orion.

¹⁹¹ And we learned a tradition that if the tail of the constellation Scorpio did not rest in the River of Fire, anyone stung by a scorpion would not survive. And that is what the All-Merciful said to Job of the relationship between heat and cold among the stars: “Can you bind the chains of the Pleiades or loosen the bands of Orion?” (Job 38:31); God alternates intensifying the power of different constellations in order to raise or lower the temperature.

¹⁹² With regard to Pleiades, the Gemara asks: What is Pleiades [Kima]? Why is it called by that name? Shmuel said: Because it is approximately a hundred [keme’a] stars, as that is the number of stars in that constellation; some say that they are concentrated and some say that they are dispersed.

¹⁹³ With regard to the verse: “Who makes Ursa Major, Orion, and Pleiades” (Job 9:9), the Gemara asks: What is Ursa Major [Ash]? Rav Yehuda said: It is the star called Yota. This name was unfamiliar as well, so the Gemara asks: What is Yota? There is disagreement; some say that Yota is the group of stars comprising the tail of Aries, while others say that Yota belongs to the head of Taurus. The Gemara concludes: And it stands to reason in accordance with the opinion of the one who said that Yota is the group of stars comprising the tail of Aries, as it is written: “Or can you guide Ursa Major with her sons?” (Job 38:32); apparently it was incomplete and the tail appears

¹⁹⁴ as if it was appended onto it. The Gemara explains: And the fact that Ursa Major follows Pleiades, it is as if Ursa Major is saying to Pleiades: Give me back my children, my two stars. As it is related: When the Holy One, Blessed be He, sought to bring a flood into the world, He took two stars from Pleiades and brought the flood upon the world. And afterward, when He wished to fill the void, He took two stars from Ursa Major and filled the void with them. Consequently, the constellation of Ursa Major attempts to persuade Pleiades, seeking to get its stars back.

¹⁹⁵ The Gemara asks: And return it, why did the Holy One, Blessed be He, not restore the original two stars to Pleiades? The Gemara answers: A pit cannot be filled by its own earth; when a pit is excavated, the earth that was excavated from it is insufficient to refill it. Alternatively, one could say that a prosecutor cannot become an advocate; since these stars caused the flood it is not appropriate that they facilitate the end of the flood.

¹⁹⁶ The Gemara argues: Then God should have created two other new stars for Pleiades. The Gemara responds: “There is nothing new under the sun” (Ecclesiastes 1:9). Rav Nahman said: In the future, the Holy One, Blessed be He, will restore those same stars to Ursa Major, as it is stated: “Or can you guide [tanhem] Ursa Major with her sons?” (Job 38:32), which is interpreted homiletically in the sense of consolation [tanhumim] apparently due to the restoration of those stars.

¹⁹⁷ And we learned in the mishna that over zeva’ot one recites the blessing: Whose strength and power fill the world. The Gemara asks: What are zeva’ot? Rav Ketina said: An earthquake. The Gemara relates: Rav Ketina was once walking along the road when he came to the entrance of the house of a necromancer and an earthquake rumbled. He said: Does this necromancer know what is this earthquake? The necromancer raised his voice and said: Ketina, Ketina, why would I not know? Certainly this earthquake occurred because when the Holy One, Blessed be He, remembers His

children who are suffering among the nations of the world, He sheds two tears into the great sea. The sound of their reverberation is heard from one end of the earth to the other. And that is an earthquake.

¹⁹⁸ Rav Ketina said: The necromancer is a liar and his statements are lies. If so, it would necessitate an earthquake followed by another earthquake, one for each tear. The Gemara remarks: That is not so, as it indeed causes an earthquake followed by another earthquake; and the fact that Rav Ketina did not admit that the necromancer was correct was so that everyone would not mistakenly follow him.

¹⁹⁹ Rav Ketina also stated his own explanation for the earthquake: Because God claps His hands together in anger, as it is stated: "I will also smite My hands together and I will satisfy My fury; I, the Lord, have spoken it" (Ezekiel 21:22). Rabbi Natan says: The earthquake is caused because God sighs over the dire straits in which Israel finds itself, as it is stated: "Thus shall My anger spend itself, and I will satisfy My fury upon them, and I will be eased" (Ezekiel 5:13). And the Rabbis say: An earthquake is caused when God kicks the firmament, causing a rumbling, as it is stated: "The Lord roars from on high, from His holy dwelling He makes His voice heard. He roars mightily over His dwelling place, He cries out like those who tread grapes, against all the inhabitants of the earth" (Jeremiah 25:30). Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: An earthquake is caused when God forces His feet beneath the throne of glory and the world quakes, as it is stated: "The heaven is My throne, and the earth is My footstool" (Isaiah 66:1).

²⁰⁰ We also learned in the mishna that over thunder one recites: Whose strength and power fill the world. The Gemara asks: What causes thunder? Shmuel said: When the clouds located in the curvature of the firmament collide with the firmament itself, they produce this sound, as it is stated: "The voice of Your thunder was in the whirlwind; the lightning lighted up the world; the earth trembled and shook" (Psalms 77:19). And the Rabbis say: Thunder is the sound of clouds pouring water into one another, as it is stated: "At the sound of His giving a multitude of waters in the heavens" (Jeremiah 10:13). Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: Thunder is caused by a powerful lightning bolt that flashes in the cloud and shatters the hailstones. Rav Ashi said: Because the clouds are hollow, and when the wind comes and blows across their mouths, it sounds like wind blowing in the mouth of a jug. The Gemara concludes: And it stands to reason in accordance with the opinion of Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov; as lightning flashes, the clouds rumble, and the rain comes.

²⁰¹ We also learned in the mishna that over wind one recites the blessing: Whose strength and power fill the world. The Gemara asks: What are these winds? Abaye said: These are gale force winds. Abaye said: We learned through tradition that there are no gale force winds at night. The Gemara asks: Don't we see that there are gale force winds at night? The Gemara answers: This gale force wind that blows at night does not begin blowing at night; rather, it begins blowing during the day. And Abaye said: We learned through tradition that a gale force wind does not last two hours, to fulfill that which is stated: "Trouble shall not rise up a second time" (Nahum 1:9). The Gemara asks: Don't we see that it does last longer than two hours? The Gemara answers: Actually, it does not last longer than two hours. The fact that we sense that it does last longer is due to cases where it does not blow uninterruptedly, but it briefly stops in between.

²⁰² We also learned in the mishna that over lightning one recites: Blessed...Whose strength and power fill the world. The Gemara asks: What is this lightning? Rava said: A bright light. And Rava said: A single bolt of lightning, white lightning, green lightning, clouds that rise in the western corner

and come from the southern corner, and two clouds that rise with one facing the other are all signs of trouble.

²⁰³ The Gemara asks: What practical difference is there in the knowledge that they are signs of trouble? The Gemara answers: So that we may pray for God's mercy, that they cause us no harm. The Gemara remarks that this only applies when these phenomena appear at night. In the morning, however, they are insignificant.

²⁰⁴ Rabbi Shmuel bar Yitzhak said: Morning clouds dissipate immediately so they have no substance, as it is written: "For your goodness is as a morning cloud, and as the dew that early passes away" (Hosea 6:4). With regard to this, Rav Pappa said to Abaye: But don't people say the maxim: If there is rain when people open their doors in the morning, donkey-driver, fold your sack and go to sleep, as rain will continue to fall all day. Apparently morning clouds indicate that there will be rain all day. The Gemara responds: This is not difficult, as this, that suggests that there will be considerable rain, refers to a case where the sky is covered with thick clouds, while this opinion, where Rabbi Shmuel bar Yitzhak said that morning clouds have no substance and will not produce much rain, refers to a case where the sky is covered with flimsy clouds which will certainly pass.

²⁰⁵ Rabbi Alexandri said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Thunder was created only to impose fear and straighten the crookedness of the heart, as it is stated: "And God has so made it, that men should fear before Him" (Ecclesiastes 3:14). And Rabbi Alexandri said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One who sees a rainbow in a cloud must fall upon his face, as it is stated: "As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord. And when I saw it, I fell upon my face" (Ezekiel 1:28). The colors of the rainbow symbolize the glory of God and one may not stare at them. Yet, in the West, Eretz Yisrael, they would curse one who fell upon his face when seeing a rainbow because it appears as one who is bowing to the rainbow. As far as blessing is concerned, however, all agree that one certainly recites a blessing. What blessing does one recite? Blessed...Who remembers the covenant with Noah. It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Beroka, says that the blessing is: Blessed...Who is faithful to His covenant and fulfills His word. Rav Pappa said: Therefore we will say them both combined: Blessed...Who remembers the covenant and is faithful to His covenant and fulfills His word.

²⁰⁶ We learned in the mishna that over mountains and hills one recites: Blessed...Author of creation. The Gemara asks: Is that to say that all those that we mentioned until now, such as lightning, are not acts of creation? Among God's praise for creation of the world and forming the mountains, is it not also written: "He makes lightning for the rain" (Psalms 135:7)? Abaye said: Combine the two statements and teach that in all the cases in our mishna, one recites these two blessings. Rava said: There, over lightning and thunder, one recites two blessings: Blessed...Whose power fills the world, and: Author of creation. Here, however, over mountains and hills, one recites the blessing: Author of creation, but need not recite: Whose power fills the world.

²⁰⁷ Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: One who sees the firmament in its purity recites: Blessed... Author of creation. The Gemara asks: When does the firmament appear in its purity? Abaye said: When rain falls all night and in the morning a northern wind blows, exposing the heavens.

²⁰⁸ The Gemara notes: And in this they disagree with Rafram bar Pappa who said that Rav Ḥisda said, as Rafram bar Pappa said that Rav Ḥisda said: Since the day the Temple was destroyed the

firmament has not been seen in its purity, as it is said: “I clothe the heavens with blackness and I make sackcloth their covering” (Isaiah 50:3).

²⁰⁹ The Sages taught: One who sees the sun in the beginning of its cycle, the moon in its might, the planets in their orbit, or the signs of the zodiac aligned in their order recites: Blessed...Author of creation. The Gemara asks: And when is it that the sun is at the beginning of its cycle? Abaye said: Every twenty-eight years when the cycle is complete and returns to its genesis, and the Nisan, vernal, equinox, when the spring days and nights are of equal length, falls within the constellation of Saturn on the night of the third and eve of the fourth day of the week, as then their arrangement returns to be as it was when the constellations were first placed in the heavens.

²¹⁰ We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda said: One who sees the great sea intermittently recites: Blessed...Who has made the great sea. The Gemara asks: How much is intermittently? Rami bar Abba said that Rav Yitzḥak said: Thirty days.

²¹¹ And Rami bar Abba said that Rav Yitzḥak said: One who sees the Euphrates River near the bridge of Babylonia recites: Blessed...Author of creation. The Gemara adds: And now that the Persians have rerouted the course of the river, one only recites the blessing from Beit Shavor upriver. Downriver, it no longer flows as it did at creation, so there one does not recite the blessing: Author of creation. Rav Yosef said: One only recites the blessing from Ihi Dekira upriver. And Rami bar Abba said: One who sees the Tigris on the bridge of Shabistana recites: Blessed...Author of creation.

²¹² The Gemara proceeds to explain the names of these rivers. What is the source of the name Ḥidekel [Tigris]? Rav Ashi said: Its name is an acronym derived from the fact that its waters are sharp [ḥadin] and light [kalin] and therefore good for drinking. What is the source of the name Perat [Euphrates]? It is so named because its waters are fruitful [parin] and multiply [ravin]; there are many fish in it.

²¹³ As for the Tigris River, Rava said: The inhabitants of the city Meḥoza are sharp because they drink the water of the Tigris; they are red because they engage in conjugal relations in the daytime; and their eyes move constantly because they live in dark houses.

²¹⁴ We learned in our mishna that over rain one recites the blessing: Blessed...Who is good and does good. The Gemara asks: And over rain does one really recite the blessing: Who is good and does good? Didn't Rabbi Abbahu say, and some say it was taught in a baraita: From when does one recite the blessing on rain? From when the groom went out to meet the bride. In other words, there are puddles of water on the ground. The groom, meaning the raindrops from above, cause the bride, meaning the water below, to splash.

²¹⁵ The Gemara asks: What blessing does one recite? Rav Yehuda said: The formula of the blessing is: We thank You for each and every drop that You have made fall for us. And Rav Yoḥanan concludes the blessing as follows: If our mouths were as full of song as the sea...we could not sufficiently praise You O Lord our God, and he continues with the formula of nishmat that is recited on Shabbat morning, until: Shall bow before You. Blessed are You, O Lord, to Whom abundant thanksgivings are offered.

²¹⁶ The Gemara asks: Does the blessing say: Abundant thanksgivings, and not: All thanksgivings? Certainly all thanksgivings are due to God. Rava said: Emend the formula of the blessing and say:

The God of thanksgivings. Rav Pappa said: Therefore, we will recite them both: Abundant thanksgivings, and: The God of thanksgivings.

²¹⁷ However, it is still difficult, as apparently the blessing for rain is not: Who is good and does good, as it appears in our mishna. The Gemara responds: This is not difficult. This, which we learned in our mishna, that one recites: Who is good and does good, refers to a case where one heard that rain fell. This, where we learned that one recites: We thank You, etc., refers to a case where one saw the rain fall.

²¹⁸ The Gemara asks: One heard that the rain fell; that is a case of good tidings. And we learned in the mishna that upon hearing good tidings one recites: Who is good and does good. Therefore, there is no reason for the mishna to mention rain separately.

²¹⁹ Rather, the difficulty can be otherwise resolved: This, Rabbi Abbahu's statement, and that, the mishna, both refer to a case where one saw the rain fall, and this is not difficult. This, Rabbi Abbahu's statement that one recites We thank You, etc., refers to a case where a little rain fell, while that, the mishna which says that one recites: Who is good and does good, refers to a case where a lot of rain fell. And if you wish, say instead that this and that refer to cases where a lot of rain fell, and this is not difficult. This, the mishna, refers to a case where one owns land, while that, Rabbi Abbahu's statement that one recites: We thank You, etc., refers to a case where one does not own land, so the rain does not benefit him directly.

²²⁰ The Gemara asks: One who owns land recites: Who is good and does good? Didn't we learn in the mishna: One who built a new house or purchased new vessels recites: Blessed...Who has given us life...and brought us to this time. However, if the land belonged to him and others in partnership, he recites: Who is good and does good? For rain falling onto land that one owns exclusively, he recites: Who has given us life and not: Who is good and does good.

²²¹ The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This, the mishna where we learned that one recites: Who is good and does good, refers to a case where one owns his land in partnership with another; that, Rabbi Abbahu's statement that one recites: Who has given us life, refers to a case where one owns the land exclusively and does not have a partnership. And indeed, this halakha was taught in a baraita: The gist of the matter is, for that which is exclusively his, he recites: Blessed...Who has given us life and sustained us; for that which belongs to him and to another in partnership, he recites: Who is good and does good.

²²² The Gemara challenges this principle: And in every case where others are not with him, one does not recite: Who is good and does good? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: If they told him that his wife gave birth to a male, he recites: Who is good and does good? The Gemara responds: There too, his wife is with him, as she is also happy that a male child was born.

²²³ The Gemara challenges further: Come and hear a contradiction from what was taught in a baraita: One whose father died and he is his heir, initially recites: Blessed...the true Judge, upon hearing of his father's death, and ultimately, upon receiving his inheritance, he recites: Blessed...Who is good and does good. Despite the fact that the son alone benefits, he nevertheless recites: Who is good and does good. The Gemara responds: There, too, it refers to a case where he has brothers who inherit along with him.

²²⁴ The Gemara cites an additional challenge: Come and hear a contradiction based on what was taught in a baraita: In the case of a change in the type of wine during a meal, one need not recite the blessing: Who creates fruit of the vine, a second time. However, in the case of a change in place, one must recite a second blessing over the wine. And Rabbi Yosef bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Although the Sages said that in the case of a change in the type of wine one need not recite a second blessing over the wine, he does recite: Blessed...Who is good and does good. The Gemara responds: There, too, it refers to a case where he is not alone, but where members of the group are drinking with him.

²²⁵ We learned in the mishna: One who built a new house or purchased new vessels recites: Blessed...Who has given us life, sustained us and brought us to this time. With regard to this blessing, Rav Huna said: They only taught that one recites: Who has given us life, upon purchasing a new vessel when he does not already have something similar, i.e., something he inherited. However, if he already has something similar he need not recite a blessing, as it is not new to him. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even if one already has something similar that he inherited, he must recite a blessing because he never before purchased a vessel of that kind.

²²⁶ The Gemara deduces: This proves by inference that if he purchases a new object and then purchases a similar object, everyone agrees that he is not required to recite a blessing, as he has already recited a blessing over the purchase of that type of item.

²²⁷ Some say a different version of this dispute: Rav Huna said: They only taught that one recites the blessing: Who has given us life, on a new vessel if he did not purchase that item in the past and purchased the item now, for the first time. However, if he purchased that item in the past and purchased the item again, he need not recite a blessing. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even if one purchased that item in the past and purchased a similar item again, he must recite a blessing. This proves by inference that if one already has a vessel and then purchased similar vessels, everyone agrees that he must recite a blessing.

²²⁸ The Gemara raises an objection based on what was taught in a baraita: One who built a new house and does not already own a similar house, or purchased new vessels and does not already own similar vessels, must recite a blessing. However, if he already owns a similar one, he need not recite a blessing, this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda, on the other hand, says: In either case, he must recite a blessing.

²²⁹ The Gemara asks: Granted, according to the first version of the dispute between Rav Huna and Rabbi Yoḥanan, one could say that Rav Huna holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, and that Rabbi Yoḥanan holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. However, according to the latter version of the dispute, granted, Rav Huna holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, but in accordance with whose opinion did Rabbi Yoḥanan state his opinion? His statement is neither in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir nor in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda.

²³⁰ The Gemara responds: Rabbi Yoḥanan could have said to you: The same is true according to Rabbi Yehuda's opinion; in a case where one has purchased an item in the past and purchased a similar item again, he must recite a blessing. The fact that they only disagreed with regard to a case where he already owned similar vessels and he purchased new ones does not indicate that this is their only disagreement. The dispute was presented in this way to convey the far-reaching nature of Rabbi

Meir's opinion; even in a case where one purchased an item while owning a similar item, he need not recite a blessing; all the more so in a case where he purchased an item and then purchased a similar item again, he need not recite a blessing.

²³¹ The Gemara asks: And if that is the reason for presenting the dispute in this manner, let them disagree with regard to a case where one purchased an item in the past and then purchased a similar item again, where according to Rabbi Meir one need not recite a blessing, in order to convey the far-reaching nature of Rabbi Yehuda's opinion; as Rabbi Yehuda requires a blessing in that case. The Gemara responds: The Gemara preferred the version before us in order to demonstrate the extent to which Rabbi Meir was lenient in not requiring a blessing because the strength of leniency is preferable.

²³² We learned in the mishna: One recites a blessing for the bad that befalls him just as he does for the good. This is to say that one recites the blessing appropriate for the present situation even if it is bad, despite the fact that it may develop into a positive situation in the future.

²³³ The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances? The Gemara explains: In a case where a dam was breached and water flowed onto one's land, despite the fact that this will ultimately be beneficial for him, for his land will be covered with sediment from the flowing water which will enhance the quality of his soil, it is nonetheless bad at present.

²³⁴ One must recite a blessing for the good that befalls him just as for the bad.

²³⁵ The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances? The Gemara explains: In a case where one found a lost object, despite the fact that it is ultimately bad for him because if the king heard about it, he would certainly take it from him. At that time, the law deemed all found objects the property of the king's treasury and one who did not report such an object would be punished. Nevertheless, it is favorable at present.

²³⁶ We learned in the mishna: One whose wife was pregnant and he said: May it be God's will that my wife will give birth to a male child, it is a vain prayer.

²³⁷ Is a prayer in that case ineffective? Rav Yosef raises an objection based on a baraita: It is stated: "And afterwards she bore a daughter, and called her name Dina" (Genesis 30:21). The Gemara asks: What is meant by the addition of the word: Afterwards? What does the verse seek to convey by emphasizing that after the birth of Zebulun she gave birth to Dina? Rav said: After Leah passed judgment on herself and said: Twelve tribes are destined to descend from Jacob, six came from me and four from the maidservants, that is ten, and if this fetus is male, my sister Rachel will not even be the equivalent of one the maidservants; immediately the fetus was transformed into a daughter, as it is stated: And she called her name Dina; meaning she named her after her judgment [din]. The Gemara rejects this: One does not mention miraculous acts to teach general halakha.

²³⁸ The Gemara introduces an alternative explanation: And if you wish, say instead that the story of Leah and her prayer with regard to the fetus was within forty days of conception. As it was taught in a baraita: During the first three days after intercourse, one should pray that the seed not putrefy, that it will fertilize the egg and develop into a fetus. From the third day until the fortieth, one should pray that it will be male. From the fortieth day until three months, one should pray that it will not be deformed, in the shape of a flat fish, as when the fetus does not develop it assumes a shape somewhat similar to a flat sandal fish. From the third month until the sixth, one should pray that it will not be

stillborn. And from the sixth month until the ninth, one should pray that it will be emerge safely. Therefore, during the first forty days from conception, one may still pray to affect the gender of the fetus.

²³⁹ The Gemara asks: Is prayer effective for that purpose? Didn't Rav Yitzhak, son of Rav Ami, say: The tradition teaches that the gender of the fetus is determined at the moment of conception. If the man emits seed first, his wife gives birth to a female; if the woman emits seed first, she gives birth to a male, as it is stated: "When a woman emitted seed and bore a male" (Leviticus 12:2). The Gemara answers: With what are we dealing here? We are dealing with a case where they both emit seed simultaneously. In that case, the gender is undetermined and prayer may be effectual.

²⁴⁰ We learned in the mishna: One who was walking along the way and heard a scream from the city, and says: May it be God's will that this scream will not be from my house, it is a vain prayer.

²⁴¹ The Sages taught: There was an incident involving Hillel the Elder, who was coming on the road when he heard a scream in the city. He said: I am certain that the scream is not coming from my house. And of him, the verse says: "He shall not be afraid of evil tidings; his heart is steadfast, trusting in the Lord" (Psalms 112:7). Rava said: Any way that you interpret this verse, its meaning is clear. It can be interpreted from beginning to end or it can be interpreted from end to beginning. The Gemara explains: It can be interpreted from beginning to end: Why is it that: He shall not be afraid of evil tidings? Because his heart is steadfast, trusting in the Lord. The Gemara continues: And it can be interpreted from end to beginning: One whose heart is steadfast, trusting in the Lord is a person who shall not be afraid of evil tidings.

²⁴² The Gemara relates: This student was once walking after Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yosei, in the marketplace of Zion. Rabbi Yishmael saw that the student was afraid. He said to him: You are a sinner, as it is written: "The transgressors in Zion are afraid, trembling has seized the ungodly" (Isaiah 33:14). The student replied: And is it not written: "Happy is the man that fears always" (Proverbs 28:14)? Rabbi Yishmael said to him: That verse is written with regard to matters of Torah, that one should be afraid lest he forget them. For everything else, one must trust in God.

²⁴³ In a similar vein, the Gemara relates: Yehuda bar Natan was coming and going after Rav Hamnuna. Yehuda bar Natan sighed; Rav Hamnuna said to him: Do you wish to bring suffering upon yourself; as it is stated: "For that which I did fear is come upon me, and that which I was afraid of has overtaken me" (Job 3:25)? He responded: Is it not said: "Happy is the man who fears always"? Rav Hamnuna answered: That verse is written with regard to matters of Torah.

²⁴⁴ We learned in the mishna: One who enters a large city recites two prayers; Ben Azzai says he recites four prayers.

²⁴⁵ The Sages taught the details of Ben Azzai's teaching in a baraita: Upon his entrance to the city what does he recite? May it be Your will, O Lord my God, that You bring me into this city to peace. After he entered the city, he recites: I thank You, O Lord my God, that You brought me into this city to peace. When he seeks to leave the city, he recites: May it be Your will, O Lord my God and God of my ancestors, that You take me out of this city to peace. After he left, he recites: I give thanks before You, O Lord my God, that You took me out of this city to peace; and just as You took me out to peace, so too lead me to peace, support me to peace, direct my steps to peace, and rescue me from the hand of any enemy or those lying in ambush along the way.

²⁴⁶ Rav Mattana said: This was taught only with regard to a city where criminals are not tried and executed, as in a place like that he may be killed without trial. However, in a city where criminals are tried and executed, these prayers do not apply, as if one is not guilty he will not be harmed.

²⁴⁷ Some say that Rav Mattana said the opposite: Even in a city where criminals are tried and executed one must pray for mercy, as sometimes he may not encounter a person who will plead in his favor.

²⁴⁸ The Sages taught: One who enters a Roman bathhouse, where a fire burns beneath the pool of water used for bathing, and where there is the risk of collapse, says: May it be Your will, O Lord my God, that you save me from this and similar matters, and do not let ruin or iniquity befall me, and if ruin or iniquity does befall me, let my death be atonement for all of my transgressions.

²⁴⁹ Abaye said: One should not say: If ruin befalls me, so as not to open his mouth to Satan and provoke him. As Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said and as it was taught in a baraita in the name of Rabbi Yosei: One should never open his mouth to Satan by raising, at his own initiative, the possibility of mishap or death.

²⁵⁰ Rav Yosef said: What is the verse that alludes to this? As it is written: “We should have almost been as Sodom, we should have been like unto Gomorrah” (Isaiah 1:9), after which what did the prophet reply to them? “Hear the word of the Lord, rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, people of Gomorrah” (Isaiah 1:10). After the analogy to Sodom was raised, it was realized.

²⁵¹ Returning to the subject of the Roman bathhouse, the Gemara asks: When he emerges from the bathhouse, what does he say? Rav Aḥa said: I give thanks to You, Lord, that You saved me from the fire.

²⁵² The Gemara relates: Rabbi Abbahu entered a bathhouse when the bathhouse floor collapsed beneath him and a miracle transpired on his behalf. He stood on a pillar and saved one hundred and one men with one arm. He held one or two people in his arm, with others holding on them and so on, so that all were saved. He said: This is confirmation of the statement of Rav Aḥa, who said that one should offer thanks upon leaving the bathhouse safely.

²⁵³ As Rav Aḥa said: One who enters to let blood says: May it be Your will, O Lord my God, that this enterprise be for healing and that You should heal me. As You are a faithful God of healing and Your healing is truth. Because it is not the way of people to heal, but they have become accustomed. Rav Aḥa is saying that people should not practice medicine as they lack the ability to heal; rather, healing should be left to God.

²⁵⁴ Abaye responded and said: One should not say this, as it was taught in the school of Rabbi Yishmael that from the verse, “And shall cause him to be thoroughly healed” (Exodus 21:19), from here we derive that permission is granted to a doctor to heal. The practice of medicine is in accordance with the will of God.

²⁵⁵ As for bloodletting, the Gemara asks: When one stands after having let blood, what does he say? Rav Aḥa said: He recites in gratitude: Blessed...Who heals without payment.

²⁵⁶ One who enters a bathroom says to the angels who accompany him at all times: Be honored, honorable holy ones, servants of the One on High, give honor to the God of Israel, leave me until I enter and do my will and come back to you. Abaye said: A person should not say this, lest they abandon him and go. Rather he should say: Guard me, guard me, help me, help me, support me,

support me, wait for me, wait for me until I enter and come out, as this is the way of man. Upon exiting, one says: Blessed...Who formed man in wisdom, and created in him many orifices and cavities. It is revealed and known before the throne of Your glory that were one of them to be ruptured or blocked, it would be impossible to survive and stand before You.

²⁵⁷ The Gemara asks: With what should one conclude this blessing? Rav said: One should conclude: Blessed...Healer of the sick. Shmuel said: Abba, Rav, has rendered everyone sick. Rather, one should say: Healer of all flesh. Rav Sheshet said: One should conclude: Who performs wondrous deeds. Rav Pappa said: Therefore, let us say them both: Healer of all flesh, Who performs wondrous deeds.

²⁵⁸ The Gemara proceeds to cite additional blessings recited as part of one's daily routine. One who enters to sleep on his bed recites Shema in his bed from Shema Yisrael to VeHaya Im Shamo. Then he recites: Blessed...Who makes the bands of sleep fall upon my eyes and slumber upon my eyelids, and illuminates the pupil of the eye. May it be Your will, O Lord my God, that You make me lie down in peace and give me my portion in Your Torah, accustom me to mitzvot and do not accustom me to transgression, lead me not into error, nor into iniquity, nor into temptation nor into disgrace. May the good inclination have dominion over me and may the evil inclination not have dominion over me. Save me from an evil mishap and evil diseases. Let neither bad dreams nor troubling thoughts disturb me. May my bed be flawless before You, that my progeny should not be flawed. Enlighten my eyes in the morning lest I sleep the sleep of death, never to awaken. Blessed are You, O Lord, Who gives light to the whole world in His glory.

²⁵⁹ When one awakens, he recites: My God, the soul You have placed within me is pure. You formed it within me, You breathed it into me, and You guard it while it is within me. One day You will take it from me and restore it within me in the time to come. As long as the soul is within me, I thank You, O Lord my God and God of my ancestors, Master of all worlds, Lord of all souls. Blessed are You, O Lord, who restores souls to lifeless bodies.

²⁶⁰ Upon hearing the sound of the rooster, one should recite: Blessed...Who gave the heart [sekhvi] understanding to distinguish between day and night. Upon opening his eyes, one should recite: Blessed...Who gives sight to the blind. Upon sitting up straight, one should recite: Blessed...Who sets captives free. Upon dressing, one should recite: Blessed...Who clothes the naked, as they would sleep unclothed. Upon standing up straight, one should recite: Blessed...Who raises those bowed down. Upon descending from one's bed to the ground, one should recite: Blessed...Who spreads the earth above the waters, in thanksgiving for the creation of solid ground upon which to walk. Upon walking, one should recite: Blessed...Who makes firm the steps of man. Upon putting on his shoes, one should recite: Blessed...Who has provided me with all I need, as shoes are a basic necessity. Upon putting on his belt, one should recite: Blessed...Who girds Israel with strength. Upon spreading a shawl upon his head, one should recite: Blessed...Who crowns Israel with glory.

²⁶¹ Upon wrapping himself in ritual fringes, one should recite: Blessed...Who has made us holy through His commandments and has commanded us to wrap ourselves in a garment with ritual fringes. Upon donning his phylacteries on his arm, one should recite: Blessed...Who has made us holy through His commandments and has commanded us to don phylacteries. Upon donning phylacteries on his head one should recite: Blessed...Who has made us holy through His commandments and has commanded us with regard to the mitzva of phylacteries. Upon ritually washing his hands: Blessed...Who has made us holy through His commandments and has

commanded us with regard to the washing of the hands. Upon washing his face, one recites: Blessed...Who removes the bands of sleep from my eyes and slumber from my eyelids. And may it be Your will, O Lord my God, to accustom me in Your Torah, attach me to Your mitzvot, and lead me not into transgression, nor into error, nor into iniquity, nor into temptation nor into disgrace. Bend my evil inclination to be subservient to You, and distance me from an evil person and an evil acquaintance. Help me attach myself to the good inclination and to a good friend in Your world. Grant me, today and every day, grace, loving-kindness, and compassion in Your eyes and the eyes of all who see me, and bestow loving-kindness upon me. Blessed are You, O Lord, Who bestows loving-kindness on His people, Israel.

²⁶² We learned in the mishna: One is obligated to recite a blessing for the bad that befalls him just as he recites a blessing for the good that befalls him. The Gemara asks: What does it mean: One is obligated to recite a blessing for the bad just as for the good? If we say this means that just as one recites a blessing for a positive event with the formula: Who is good and does good, so too one recites a blessing for a calamity with the formula: Who is good and does good, didn't we learn in our mishna that over good tidings one recites: Who is good and does good, while over bad tidings one recites: Blessed...the true Judge? Rather, Rava said: The mishna's statement was only necessary to instruct us to accept bad tidings with the same joy with which we accept good tidings, not to instruct with regard to which blessing to recite.

²⁶³ Rav Aḥa said in the name of Rabbi Levi: What is the verse that alludes to this? "I will sing of loving-kindness and justice; unto You, O Lord, will I sing praises" (Psalms 101:1). Rav Aḥa explains: If it is loving-kindness, I will sing, and if it is justice, I will sing. I will thank God in song for the bad just as for the good.

²⁶⁴ Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said: The proof is from here, as it is stated: "In God, I will praise His word; in the Lord, I will praise His word" (Psalms 56:11). The Gemara explains that In God, I will praise His word; that is the revelation of God's attribute of benevolence, while: In the Lord, I will praise His word; that is the attribute of suffering; even if God brings suffering to bear upon me, I will still praise Him.

²⁶⁵ Rabbi Tanḥum said: The proof is from here, as it is stated: "I will lift up the cup of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord" (Psalms 116:13), and: "I found trouble and sorrow, but I called upon the name of the Lord" (Psalms 116:3-4).

²⁶⁶ And the Rabbis said: The proof is from here, as it is stated: "The Lord has given and the Lord has taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord" (Job 1:21).

²⁶⁷ Rav Huna said that Rav said that Rabbi Meir said; and so it was taught in a baraita in the name of Rabbi Akiva: One must always accustom oneself to say: Everything that God does, He does for the best.

²⁶⁸ The Gemara relates: Like this incident, when Rabbi Akiva was walking along the road and came to a certain city, he inquired about lodging and they did not give him any. He said: Everything that God does, He does for the best. He went and slept in a field, and he had with him a rooster, a donkey and a candle. A gust of wind came and extinguished the candle; a cat came and ate the rooster; and a lion came and ate the donkey. He said: Everything that God does, He does for the best. That night, an army came and took the city into captivity. It turned out that Rabbi Akiva alone, who was not in the

city and had no lit candle, noisy rooster or donkey to give away his location, was saved. He said to them: Didn't I tell you? Everything that God does,

²⁶⁹ He does for the best.

²⁷⁰ And Rav Huna said that Rav said in the name of Rabbi Meir: One's words should always be few before the Holy One, Blessed be He, as it is stated: "Be not rash with your mouth and let not your heart be hasty to utter a word before God; for God is in heaven, and you upon earth. Therefore, let your words be few" (Ecclesiastes 5:1).

²⁷¹ Rav Naḥman bar Rav Ḥisda interpreted homiletically: What is the meaning of that which is written: "Then the Lord God formed [vayyitzer] man" (Genesis 2:7), with a double yod? This double yod alludes to that fact that the Holy One, Blessed be He, created two inclinations; one a good inclination and one an evil inclination.

²⁷² Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak strongly objects to this: If that is so, does an animal, with regard to whom vayyitzer is not written with a double yod, not have an inclination? Don't we see that it causes damage and bites and kicks? Rather, interpret the double yod homiletically, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi, as Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi said: This alludes to the difficulty of human life; woe unto me from my Creator [yotzri] and woe unto me from my inclination [yitzri]. If one opts to follow either his Creator or his inclination, woe unto him from the other.

²⁷³ Alternatively, this duplication in the language of creation can be explained in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yirmeya ben Elazar, as Rabbi Yirmeya ben Elazar said: The Holy One, Blessed be He, created two faces [du partzufin] on Adam the first man; he was created both male and female in a single body, as it is stated: "You have formed me [tzartani] behind and before" (Psalms 139:5); tzartani is derived from the word tzura [face]. God formed two faces on a single creation, back and front.

²⁷⁴ It is stated: "And the tzela which the Lord, God, had taken from the man, He made a woman, and brought her unto the man" (Genesis 2:22).

²⁷⁵ Rav and Shmuel disagree over the meaning of the word tzela: One said: It means face. Eve was originally one face or side of Adam. And one said: It means tail, which he explains to mean that the tzela was an appendage, i.e., one of the ribs in Adam's chest.

²⁷⁶ The Gemara analyzes this dispute: Granted, according to the one who said that tzela means face; that is why it is written: "You have formed me [tzartani] behind and before." However, according to the one who said that tzela means tail, what is meant by the verse: "You have formed me [tzartani] behind and before"? The Gemara answers: It can be explained in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Ami, as Rabbi Ami said: Behind means Adam was created at the end of the act of creation; and before means that he was first for punishment.

²⁷⁷ The Gemara asks: Granted, Adam was behind, or last, in the act of creation, meaning that he was not created until the sixth day, Shabbat eve; however, before, or first, for punishment, to what punishment does this refer? If you say that he was first for punishment in the wake of the episode with the snake, wasn't it taught in a baraita that, with regard to punishment, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: In conferring honor, one begins with the greatest; in cursing, one begins with the least significant.

²⁷⁸ The Gemara explains: In conferring honor, one begins with the greatest, as it is written: “And Moses said unto Aaron, and Elazar and Itamar, his remaining sons: Take the meal-offering that remains” (Leviticus 10:12). Aaron, who was the greatest among those involved, is mentioned first. And in cursing, one begins with the least significant, as first the snake was cursed, then Eve was cursed, and ultimately Adam himself was cursed. The punishment did not begin with Adam.

²⁷⁹ Rather, this refers to the punishment of the flood, as it is written: “And He blotted out every living substance which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle, creeping things and fowl of the heaven” (Genesis 7:23); the punishment began with man, then the animals, and ultimately all the other creatures.

²⁸⁰ Returning to interpretation of vayyitzer, the Gemara asks: Granted, according to the one who said that Eve was originally a face or side of Adam; that is why it is written vayyitzer, with a double yod, which allude to the two formations. However, according to the one who said that she was a tail, or appendage, of Adam, what is conveyed by spelling vayyitzer with a double yod?

²⁸¹ The Gemara responds: This is interpreted homiletically in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi, as Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi said: This comes to emphasize that which a person says to himself in every circumstance: Woe unto me from my Creator and woe unto me from my inclination.

²⁸² Granted, according to the one who said that Eve was a face, that is why it is written: “Male and female, He created them” (Genesis 5:2). However, according to the one who said that Eve was a tail, what is the meaning of the verse: “Male and female, He created them”? The Gemara answers: It can be explained in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Abbahu. As Rabbi Abbahu raised a contradiction between the verses: On the one hand it is written: “Male and female, He created them,” and on the other hand it is written: “For in the image of God He made man” (Genesis 9:6), indicating that man was created alone. How, then, does he resolve the contradiction? At first, the thought entered God’s mind to create two, and ultimately, only one was actually created.

²⁸³ The Gemara asks: Granted, according to the one who said that Eve was a face, that is why it is written: “And He took one of his sides and closed up the place with flesh in its place” (Genesis 2:21), as it was necessary to close the side that was open. However, according to the one who said that Eve was originally a tail, what is meant by the verse: “And closed up the place with flesh in its place”? Rabbi Yirmeya said, and some say Rav Zevid said, and some say Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: It was necessary to say that only with regard to the place of the incision.

²⁸⁴ The Gemara challenges the other opinion: Granted, according to the one who said that Eve was a tail, that is why it is written: “And the Lord God built the tzela” (Genesis 2:22); it was a completely new building. However, according to the one who said that Eve was a complete face or side, what is the meaning of: “And He built”? What needed to be built?

²⁸⁵ The Gemara responds: This must be interpreted homiletically, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya, as Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya interpreted homiletically: What is the meaning of that which is written: “And the Lord God built the tzela”? This verse teaches that the Holy One, Blessed be He, braided Eve’s hair, and then brought her to Adam, as in the coastal towns, they call braiding hair, building.

²⁸⁶ Alternatively, the verse: And He built, could be understood as a description of her basic shape, as Rav Hisda said, and some say that it is taught in a baraita: This verse teaches that the Holy One, Blessed be He, built Eve like the structure of a storehouse. Just as a storehouse is built narrow on top and wide on the bottom, in order to hold produce without collapsing; so too a woman is created narrow on top and wide on the bottom, in order to hold the fetus.

²⁸⁷ With regard to the verse: “And brought her unto the man” (Genesis 2:22), Rabbi Yirmeya ben Elazar said: This verse teaches that the Holy One, Blessed be He, was Adam the first man’s best man. From here, the Torah taught that it is a desired mode of behavior for a greater individual to seek out a lesser individual to assist him and serve as his best man. The greater individual should help the lesser and should not feel badly about it, that it might be beneath his dignity.

²⁸⁸ The Gemara asks: And according to the one who said that Eve was a face or side of Adam, which one of them walked in front? Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: It is reasonable to say that the man walked in front, as it is taught in a baraita: A man should not walk behind a woman on a path, as he will look at her constantly, even if it is his wife. If a woman happens upon him along a bridge, he should walk quickly in order to move her to the sides so that she will not walk in front of him. And anyone who walks behind a woman in a river in order to see her exposed skin when she lifts her clothing as she passes through the water has no portion in the World-to-Come.

²⁸⁹ The Sages taught: One who counts money for a woman from his hand to her hand in order to look upon her, even if he has accumulated Torah and good deeds like Moses our teacher, he will not be absolved from the punishment of Gehenna, as it is stated: “Hand to hand, the evil man shall not go unpunished” (Proverbs 11:21); one who hands money from his hand to her hand, even if he received the Torah from God’s hand to his own, like Moses, he will not be absolved from the punishment of Gehenna, which is called evil.

²⁹⁰ Rav Naḥman said: From the following verse we know that Samson’s father, Manoah, was an ignoramus, as it is written: “And Manoah...went after his wife” (Judges 13:11).

²⁹¹ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak strongly objects to this: If that is so that you understand the verse literally, what do you say about the verse with regard to Elkana, the father of the prophet Samuel, as it is written: “And Elkana walked after his wife,” and what of the verse with regard to the prophet Elisha, as it is written: “And he arose and followed her” (II Kings 4:30)? Does this verse mean that he literally walked after her? Rather, certainly this verse means that he followed her words and advice. Here, too, then the verse concerning Manoah may be similarly interpreted; he followed his wife’s words and followed her advice, and did not literally walk behind her.

²⁹² Rav Ashi said: And according to what Rav Naḥman said, that Manoah was an ignoramus; he did not even learn to read the basic Torah stories that even children learn in school, as it is stated: “Rebecca arose, and her damsels, and they rode upon the camels, and followed the man” (Genesis 24:61); they followed him and did not walk before the man.

²⁹³ On this topic, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: It is preferable to walk behind a lion and not behind a woman, and preferable to walk behind a woman and not behind idolatry, for then it will appear as if he is accompanying the idolatry. It is preferable to walk behind idolatry and not behind a synagogue when the congregation is praying, as he appears to separate himself from the community in that he does not wish to join them in prayer.

²⁹⁴ This last halakha has numerous caveats: And we only said this in a case where he is not carrying something, and if he is carrying something, this does not apply, as everyone will understand why he did not enter the synagogue. And we only said this in a case where there is no other entrance to the synagogue, and if there is another entrance, this does not apply. And we only said this in a case where he is not riding a donkey, and if he is riding a donkey, this does not apply. And we only said this in a case where he is not donning phylacteries, but if he is donning phylacteries, this does not apply.

²⁹⁵ Rav said: The evil inclination is like a fly and it sits between the two entrances of the heart, as it is stated: “Dead flies make the ointment of the perfumer fetid and putrid” (Ecclesiastes 10:1). And Shmuel said: The evil inclination is like a type of wheat, as it is stated: “Transgression [ḥatat] couches at the door” (Genesis 4:7); ḥatat is interpreted homiletically as related to ḥitta, wheat.

²⁹⁶ The Sages taught in a baraita: A person has two kidneys; one advises him to do good and one advises him to do evil. And it stands to reason that the one advising him to do good is to his right and the one that advises him to do evil is to his left, as it is written: “A wise man’s understanding is at his right hand, but a fool’s understanding is at his left” (Ecclesiastes 10:2).

²⁹⁷ Tangential to the subject of kidneys, the Gemara cites that which the Sages taught in a baraita with regard to the roles of various organs: The kidneys advise, the heart understands, the tongue shapes the sounds that emerge from the mouth, the mouth completes the shaping of the voice, the esophagus takes in and lets out all kinds of food, the trachea produces the voice,

²⁹⁸ and the lungs draw all kinds of liquids, the liver becomes angry, the gall bladder injects a drop of gall into the liver and allays anger, the spleen laughs, the maw grinds the food, and the stomach brings sleep, and the nose awakens. If they reversed roles such that the organ which brings on sleep were to awaken, or the organ which awakens were to bring on sleep, the individual would gradually deteriorate. It was taught: If both bring on sleep or both awaken, the person immediately dies.

²⁹⁹ With regard to one’s inclinations, it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: The good inclination rules the righteous, as it is stated: “And my heart is dead within me” (Psalms 109:22); the evil inclination has been completely banished from his heart. The evil inclination rules the wicked, as it is stated: “Transgression speaks to the wicked, there is no fear of God before his eyes” (Psalms 36:2). Middling people are ruled by both the good and evil inclinations, as it is stated: “Because He stands at the right hand of the needy, to save him from them that rule his soul” (Psalms 109:31).

³⁰⁰ Rabba said: People like us are middling. Abaye, his student and nephew, said to him: If the Master claims that he is merely middling, he does not leave room for any creature to live. If a person like you is middling, what of the rest of us?

³⁰¹ And Rava said: The world was created only for the sake of the full-fledged wicked or the full-fledged righteous; others do not live complete lives in either world. Rava said: One should know of himself whether or not he is completely righteous, as if he is not completely righteous, he knows that his life will be a life of suffering. Rav said: The world was created only for the wicked Ahab ben Omri and for Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa. The Gemara explains: For Ahab ben Omri, this world was created, as he has no place in the World-to-Come, and for Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa, the World-to-Come was created.

³⁰² We learned in our mishna the explanation of the verse: “And you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and all your soul and all your might” (Deuteronomy 6:5). This was elaborated upon when it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Eliezer says: If it is stated: “With all your soul,” why does it state: “With all your might”? Conversely, if it stated: “With all your might,” why does it state: “With all your soul”? Rather, this means that if one’s body is dearer to him than his property, therefore it is stated: “With all your soul”; one must give his soul in sanctification of God. And if one’s money is dearer to him than his body, therefore it is stated: “With all your might”; with all your assets. Rabbi Akiva says: “With all your soul” means: Even if God takes your soul.

³⁰³ The Gemara relates at length how Rabbi Akiva fulfilled these directives. The Sages taught: One time, after the bar Kokheva rebellion, the evil empire of Rome decreed that Israel may not engage in the study and practice of Torah. Pappos ben Yehuda came and found Rabbi Akiva, who was convening assemblies in public and engaging in Torah study. Pappos said to him: Akiva, are you not afraid of the empire?

³⁰⁴ Rabbi Akiva answered him: I will relate a parable. To what can this be compared? It is like a fox walking along a riverbank when he sees fish gathering and fleeing from place to place. The fox said to them: From what are you fleeing? They said to him: We are fleeing from the nets that people cast upon us. He said to them: Do you wish to come up onto dry land, and we will reside together just as my ancestors resided with your ancestors? The fish said to him: You are the one of whom they say, he is the cleverest of animals? You are not clever; you are a fool. If we are afraid in the water, our natural habitat which gives us life, then in a habitat that causes our death, all the more so. The moral is: So too, we Jews, now that we sit and engage in Torah study, about which it is written: “For that is your life, and the length of your days” (Deuteronomy 30:20), we fear the empire to this extent; if we proceed to sit idle from its study, as its abandonment is the habitat that causes our death, all the more so will we fear the empire.

³⁰⁵ The Sages said: Not a few days passed until they seized Rabbi Akiva and incarcerated him in prison, and seized Pappos ben Yehuda and incarcerated him alongside him. Rabbi Akiva said to him: Pappos, who brought you here? Pappos replied: Happy are you, Rabbi Akiva, for you were arrested on the charge of engaging in Torah study. Woe unto Pappos who was seized on the charge of engaging in idle matters.

³⁰⁶ The Gemara relates: When they took Rabbi Akiva out to be executed, it was time for the recitation of Shema. And they were raking his flesh with iron combs, and he was reciting Shema, thereby accepting upon himself the yoke of Heaven. His students said to him: Our teacher, even now, as you suffer, you recite Shema? He said to them: All my days I have been troubled by the verse: With all your soul, meaning: Even if God takes your soul. I said to myself: When will the opportunity be afforded me to fulfill this verse? Now that it has been afforded me, shall I not fulfill it? He prolonged his uttering of the word: One, until his soul left his body as he uttered his final word: One. A voice descended from heaven and said: Happy are you, Rabbi Akiva, that your soul left your body as you uttered: One.

³⁰⁷ The ministering angels said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: This is Torah and this its reward? As it is stated: “From death, by Your hand, O Lord, from death of the world” (Psalms 17:14); Your hand, God, kills and does not save. God said the end of the verse to the ministering angels: “Whose portion is in this life.” And then a Divine Voice emerged and said: Happy are you,

Rabbi Akiva, as you are destined for life in the World-to-Come, as your portion is already in eternal life.

³⁰⁸ We learned in the mishna that one may not act irreverently opposite the Eastern Gate, which is aligned with the Holy of Holies. Limiting this halakha, Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: They only said this halakha with regard to irreverent behavior from Mount Scopus [Tzofim] and within, and specifically areas from where one can see the Temple. It is also stated: Rabbi Abba, son of Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba, said: Rabbi Yoḥanan said the following: They only said this halakha with regard to Mount Scopus and within, when one can see, and when there is no fence obstructing his view, and when the Divine Presence is resting there, i.e., when the Temple is standing.

³⁰⁹ In this context, the Sages taught: One who defecates in Judea should not defecate when facing east and west, for then he is facing Jerusalem; rather he should do so facing north and south. But in the Galilee which is north of Jerusalem, one should only defecate facing east and west. Rabbi Yosei permits doing so, as Rabbi Yosei was wont to say: They only prohibited doing so when one can see the Temple, where there is no fence, and when the Divine Presence is resting there. And the Rabbis prohibit doing so.

³¹⁰ The Gemara argues: But the opinion of the Rabbis, who prohibit this, is identical to that of the first anonymous tanna, who also prohibits doing so. The Gemara replies: The practical difference between them is with regard to the sides, i.e., a place in Judea that is not directly east or west of Jerusalem, or a place in the Galilee that is not directly north of Jerusalem. According to the first tanna, it is prohibited; according to the Rabbis, it is permitted.

³¹¹ It was taught in another baraita: One who defecates in Judea should not defecate when facing east and west; rather, he should only do so facing north and south. And in the Galilee, defecating while facing north and south is prohibited, while east and west is permitted. And Rabbi Yosei permitted doing so, as Rabbi Yosei was wont to say: They only prohibited doing so when one can see the Temple. Rabbi Yehuda says: When the Temple is standing, it is prohibited, but when the Temple is not standing, it is permitted. The Gemara adds that Rabbi Akiva prohibits defecating anywhere while facing east and west.

³¹² The Gemara challenges this: Rabbi Akiva's position is identical to that of the first, anonymous tanna, who also prohibits doing so. The Gemara responds: The practical difference between them is with regard to places outside of Eretz Yisrael, as according to Rabbi Akiva, even outside of Eretz Yisrael, defecating while facing east and west is prohibited.

³¹³ The Gemara relates that in Rabba's bathroom, the bricks were placed east and west in order to ensure that he would defecate facing north and south. Abaye went and placed them north and south, to test if Rabba was particular about their direction or if they had simply been placed east and west incidentally. Rabba entered and fixed them. He said: Who is the one that is upsetting me? I hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who said: It is prohibited everywhere.

³¹⁴ It was taught in a baraita in tractate Derekh Eretz that Rabbi Akiva said: I once entered the bathroom after my teacher Rabbi Yehoshua, and I learned three things from observing his behavior: I learned that one should not defecate while facing east and west, but rather while facing north and south; I learned that one should not uncover himself while standing, but while sitting, in the interest of modesty; and I learned that one should not wipe with his right hand, but with his left. Ben Azzai, a

student of Rabbi Akiva, said to him: You were impertinent to your teacher to that extent that you observed that much? He replied: It is Torah, and I must learn.

³¹⁵ Similarly, we learned in a baraita: Ben Azzai said: I once entered a bathroom after Rabbi Akiva, and I learned three things from observing his behavior: I learned that one should not defecate while facing east and west, but rather while facing north and south; I learned that one should not uncover himself while standing, but while sitting; and I learned that one should not wipe with his right hand, but with his left. Rabbi Yehuda said to him: You were impertinent to your teacher to that extent? He replied: It is Torah, and I must learn.

³¹⁶ On a similar note, the Gemara relates that Rav Kahana entered and lay beneath Rav's bed. He heard Rav chatting and laughing with his wife, and seeing to his needs, i.e., having relations with her. Rav Kahana said to Rav: The mouth of Abba, Rav, is like one whom has never eaten a cooked dish, i.e., his behavior was lustful. Rav said to him: Kahana, you are here? Leave, as this is an undesirable mode of behavior. Rav Kahana said to him: It is Torah, and I must learn.

³¹⁷ The Gemara asks: Why must one not wipe himself with his right hand, but with his left? Rava said: Because the Torah was given with the right hand, as it is stated: "At His right hand was a fiery law unto them" (Deuteronomy 33:2). Rabba bar bar Ḥana said: Because the right hand is close to the mouth, i.e., people eat with the right hand. And Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: Because one ties the phylacteries onto his left hand with his right hand. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: Because one points to the cantillation notes of the Torah with his right hand.

³¹⁸ The Gemara notes that this is parallel to a tannaitic dispute: Rabbi Eliezer says: One is forbidden to wipe himself with his right hand because he eats with it. Rabbi Yehoshua says: Because he writes with it. Rabbi Akiva says: Because he points to the notes of the Torah with it.

³¹⁹ Rabbi Tanḥum bar Ḥanilai said: Anyone who is modest in the bathroom will be saved from three things: From snakes, from scorpions and from demons. And some say that even his dreams will be settling for him.

³²⁰ The Gemara relates: There was a particular bathroom in the city of Tiberias, where, when two would enter it, even during the day, they would be harmed by demons. When Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi would each enter alone, they were not harmed. The Sages said to them: Aren't you afraid? Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi said to them: We have learned through tradition: The tradition to avoid danger in the bathroom is to conduct oneself with modesty and silence. The tradition to end suffering is with silence and prayer.

³²¹ Because fear of demons in bathrooms was pervasive, the Gemara relates: Abaye's mother raised a lamb to accompany him to the bathroom. The Gemara objects: She should have raised a goat for him. The Gemara responds: A goat could be interchanged with a goat-demon. Since both the demon and the goat are called sa'ir, they were afraid to bring a goat to a place frequented by demons.

³²² Before Rava became the head of the yeshiva, his wife, the daughter of Rav Ḥisda, would rattle a nut in a copper vessel for him. This was in order to fend off demons when he was in the bathroom. After he was chosen to preside as head of the yeshiva, he required an additional degree of protection, so she constructed a window for him, opposite where he would defecate, and placed her hand upon his head.

³²³ With regard to where one may or may not go to defecate, Ulla said: Behind a fence, one need not distance himself from people and may defecate immediately. In a valley or open field, one must distance himself sufficiently so that if he passes wind, no one will hear him. Isi bar Natan taught as follows: Behind a fence one must distance himself sufficiently so that if he passes wind another does not hear him, and in a valley, one must distance himself sufficiently so that no one can see him.

³²⁴ The Gemara raises an objection based on what we learned in a mishna in Teharot: Physical laborers, who usually fall into the category of am ha'aretz and are not generally cautious with regard to the laws of ritual purity, exit from the entrance of the olive press, defecate behind the fence, and are ritually pure. There is no reason to be concerned that they might become impure in the interim. This indicates that a greater distance is unnecessary.

³²⁵ The Gemara responds: With regard to the laws of ritual purity, they were lenient. To ensure maintenance of purity, they were lenient and did not require a greater distance.

³²⁶ Come and hear from what we learned: How far may workers distance themselves, and the fruit and oil will remain pure? They may distance themselves only so far that he still sees him. This contradicts the opinion of Isi bar Natan, who required them to distance themselves sufficiently that they may not be seen. The Gemara responds: Those who eat in purity are different, as the Sages were lenient with them.

³²⁷ Rav Ashi said: What is the meaning of: So long as another does not see him, which was the standard that Isi bar Natan said? Sufficient that another person cannot see his nakedness, although he does see him.

³²⁸ The Gemara relates: There was a particular eulogizer who went to eulogize an important person in the presence of Rav Naḥman. Of the deceased, he said: This man was modest in his ways. Rav Naḥman said to him: Did you go to the bathroom with him and know whether or not he was modest? As we learned in a baraita: One can only describe as modest one who is modest even in the bathroom, when no one else is there.

³²⁹ The Gemara asks: And what difference did it make to Rav Naḥman, that he was so insistent upon the details of whether or not this man was modest? The Gemara answers: Because it was taught in a baraita: Just as the deceased are punished, so too are the eulogizers and those who answer after them. The deceased are punished for transgressions committed in their lifetimes. The eulogizers and those who answer are punished for accepting the attribution of virtues that the deceased did not possess.

³³⁰ The Sages taught in a baraita: Who is a modest person? One who defecates at night where he defecates during the day, i.e., who distances himself at night, in order to relieve himself, no less than he distances himself during the day.

³³¹ The Gemara challenges: Is that so? Didn't Rav Yehuda say that Rav said: One must always accustom himself to defecate in the morning and at night, when it is dark, so that he will not need to distance himself? Moreover, during the day, Rava would go up to a mil outside the city, and at night he would tell his servant: Clear a place for me in the city street. And so too, Rabbi Zeira told his servant: See who is behind the study hall, as I need to defecate. These Sages did not defecate at night in the same place where they defecated during the day. Rather, emend the statement and say as

follows: In the manner that one defecates during the day, i.e. he should conduct himself at night with the same degree of modesty with which he removes his clothing when defecating during the day.

³³² Rav Ashi said: Even if you say that the text can remain as it was: Where he defecates during the day, it was only necessary in the case of a corner, where one may conceal himself. In the interest of modesty, he should go around the corner at night, just as he does during the day.

³³³ The Gemara discusses the matter itself. Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: One must always accustom himself to defecate early in the morning and late at night so that he will not need to distance himself.

³³⁴ That opinion was also taught in a baraita: Ben Azzai said: Rise early in the morning and go defecate, wait for evening and go defecate, so that you will not need to distance yourself. He also said: Touch around the anus first to assist in the opening of orifices and then sit; do not sit and then touch, for anyone who sits and then touches, even if sorcery is performed in a distant place like Aspamia, the sorcery will come upon him.

³³⁵ The Gemara says: And if one forgets and sits and then touches, what is his remedy? When he stands, he should recite the following incantation: Not for me, not for me, neither taḥim nor taḥtim, types of sorcery, neither these nor from these, neither the sorcery of a sorcerer nor the sorcery of a sorceress.

³³⁶ Continuing with the subject of health, it was taught in a baraita: Ben Azzai says: On all beds, lie, except for the ground. On all seats, sit, except for a beam, lest you fall off. Shmuel said: Sleeping at dawn is as effective as forging [istema] is to iron. A bowel movement at dawn is as beneficial as forging is to iron.

³³⁷ Similarly, the Gemara relates: Bar Kappara would sell sayings for dinars; he would express his ideas in brief maxims. For example: If you are hungry, eat; do not delay eating, as the hunger may pass and your food will be of no benefit. So too, if you are thirsty, drink; while the pot is still boiling, pour it out before it cools off. This is a metaphor for relieving oneself. Bar Kappara also said: When the horn is sounded in Rome, signifying that there is demand for figs in the Roman market, son of a fig seller, sell your father's figs, even without his permission, so as not to miss the opportunity.

³³⁸ Abaye said to the Sages: When you enter the paths of the city of Meḥoza in order to go out and defecate in a field, look neither to one side nor to the other, as perhaps women are sitting there and it is improper to look at them.

³³⁹ The Gemara relates: Rav Safra once entered a bathroom, when Rabbi Abba came along. To determine if he could enter, Rabbi Abba coughed next to the door. Rav Safra said to him: Enter, master. When he came out, Rabbi Abba said to him: Until now, you never entered Seir, the land of the Edomites, who are not strict in their practice of modesty, and yet you already learned the customs of Seir? Didn't we learn in the mishna concerning the Temple: There was a fire next to the ritual bath, and a bathroom of honor. And this was its honor: If one found it locked, it was known that someone was inside; if he found it open, it was known that no one was inside. Speaking in the bathroom is not a desired mode of behavior.

³⁴⁰ The Gemara explains the opinion of Rav Safra, who told Rabbi Abba that he could enter while in the bathroom: Rav Safra held that it was dangerous for Rabbi Abba. If he waited and was uncertain whether or not he could enter, he would endanger himself. As it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi

Shimon ben Gamliel says: A column of feces that is held back because one cannot relieve himself causes dropsy [hidrokan]. A stream [silon] of urine that is held back causes jaundice.

³⁴¹ The Gemara relates that Rabbi Elazar entered a bathroom. This Roman came and pushed him away. Rabbi Elazar stood and left, and a serpent came and ripped out the intestines of the Roman. Rabbi Elazar recited the following verse about the Roman: “Therefore I will give man [adam] for you” (Isaiah 43:4); do not read it as adam, but rather read it as Edom, meaning a Roman.

³⁴² With regard to modesty in a bathroom, the Gemara cites an additional biblical allusion. When David found Saul in the cave and spared him, tearing the corner of his coat, he said to him: “Behold this day, your eyes have seen how the Lord has delivered you today into my hand in the cave, and he said to kill you; and you spared you” (I Samuel 24:10).

³⁴³ The Gemara asks: Why does the verse say: And he said? It should say: And I said. Why does the verse say: And you spared? It should say: And I spared. Rather, Rabbi Elazar said: David said to Saul: By Torah law, you should be killed, as you are a pursuer who seeks to kill me, and the Torah says: If one comes to kill you, kill him first. But it was the modesty that you displayed that spared you.

³⁴⁴ And what is this modesty? As it is written: “And he came to the sheepcotes by the way, where there was a cave, and Saul went in to cover his feet, to defecate. Now David and his men were sitting in the innermost parts of the cave” (I Samuel 24:3). It was taught that the Sages said: There was a fence within a fence, and a cave within a cave, and Saul entered to defecate in the interest of modesty. With regard to the use of the term, to cover his feet, Rabbi Elazar said: This teaches that, even there, he covered himself with his garment like a sukka.

³⁴⁵ The Gemara continues with a homiletic interpretation of the verse: “Then David arose, and cut off the corner of Saul’s robe privily” (I Samuel 24:4). Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: Anyone who treats clothing with contempt, like David who tore Saul’s robe for no reason, will be punished in that ultimately he will not benefit from his garments, as it is stated: “Now King David was old and stricken in years; and they covered him with clothes, but he could get no heat” (I Kings 1:1).

³⁴⁶ As for David’s statement to Saul: “If it be the Lord that has incited you against me, let Him accept an offering” (I Samuel 26:19), Rabbi Elazar said that the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to David: Do you call Me an inciter? In retribution, I will cause you to fail in a matter that even schoolchildren know, as it is written: “When you take the sum of the children of Israel, according to their number, then shall they give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord, when you number them; that there be no plague among them, when you number them” (Exodus 30:12). Immediately after God said this to David, “Satan stood up against Israel and incited David to number Israel” (I Chronicles 21:1). Moreover, it is written: “And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and He incited David against them, saying: Go, number Israel and Judea” (II Samuel 24:1). The proportional response to David’s calling God an inciter was that He incited David. And when he counted them, he did not take a ransom from them, and he was punished, as it is written: “So the Lord sent a pestilence upon Israel from the morning even to the appointed time” (II Samuel 24:15).

³⁴⁷ The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the appointed time? Shmuel the elder, father-in-law of Rabbi Ḥanina, said in the name of Rabbi Ḥanina: It means from when the daily offering is slaughtered until when its blood is sprinkled. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: It means precisely until noon.

³⁴⁸ It is also stated there: “The Lord repented Him of the evil and said to the angel that destroyed the many [rav] people: It is enough; now stay your hand” (II Samuel 24:16). Explaining the meaning of the word rav, Rabbi Elazar said that the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to the angel: Take for me a great one [rav] from among them, who is worthy of defraying several of Israel’s debts. As a result, at that moment Avishai ben Tzeruya, who was equivalent to the majority of the Sanhedrin, died. His death atoned for the entire nation.

³⁴⁹ On a parallel note, it is said: “The Lord beheld, and He repented him of the evil” (I Chronicles 21:15). The Gemara asks: What did the Lord behold?

³⁵⁰ Rav said: He saw and remembered the patriarch, Jacob, about whom the term seeing is used: “And Jacob said when he saw them [ra’am]: This is God’s camp” (Genesis 32:3). And Shmuel said: He saw and remembered Isaac’s ashes, as it is said in the portion of the binding of Isaac: “God will provide [yireh] Himself the lamb for a burnt-offering” (Genesis 22:8).

³⁵¹ Rabbi Yitzḥak Nappaḥa said: He saw the money of atonement that Israel gave when they were counted during the Exodus from Egypt, as it is stated: “And you shall take the atonement money from the children of Israel, and shall appoint it for the service of the tent of meeting, that it may be a memorial for the children of Israel before the Lord, to make atonement for your souls” (Exodus 30:16). Rabbi Yoḥanan said: He saw the Temple, as it is written: “On the mount where the Lord is seen [yera’e]” (Genesis 22:14).

³⁵² Additional amora’im, Rabbi Ya’akov bar Idi and Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani, differed in their opinions of what God saw. One said: He saw the money of atonement, and one said: He saw the Temple. And it stands to reason like the one who says that he saw the Temple, as it is stated: “And Abraham called the name of that place: The Lord will see; as it is said to this day: On the mount where the Lord is seen” (Genesis 22:14); generations later, they will recall the initial revelation on Mount Moria, as the angel also appeared to David on this mountain.

³⁵³ We learned in the mishna that, in deference to the Temple, a person may not enter the Temple Mount with his staff and his shoes. He may not make it a kappandarya. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of kappandarya? Rava said: Kappandarya, as its name implies; a shortcut. Rav Ḥana bar Adda in the name of Rav Sama, son of Rav Mari, said: One may interpret this as an acrostic, as people say: Instead of circumventing the rows of houses [ademakifna adarei], I will enter this [ei’ol beha] one. Rav Naḥman said that Rabba bar Avuh said: This halakha applies in a synagogue as well. However, one who enters a synagogue not intending to make it a shortcut is permitted to make it a shortcut if he later changed his mind.

³⁵⁴ Similarly, Rabbi Abbahu said: If it was originally a path that passed through the site where the synagogue was erected, one is permitted to pass through, as the public right of passage is not negated by the construction of a synagogue. Rabbi Ḥelbo said that Rav Huna said: One who enters a synagogue to pray is permitted to make it a shortcut, as it is stated: “But when the people of the land shall come before the Lord in the appointed seasons, he that enters by way of the north gate to worship shall go forth by the way of the south gate” (Ezekiel 46:9).

³⁵⁵ We learned in the mishna that spitting on the Temple Mount is prohibited through an a fortiori inference. Rav Beivai said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Anyone who spits on the Temple Mount, even today, it is as if he spit in the pupil of God’s eye, as it is stated: “And My eyes and My heart shall be there perpetually” (I Kings 9:3).

³⁵⁶ Rava said: Spitting in a synagogue is permitted, just as in the case of shoes. Just as wearing shoes is prohibited on the Temple Mount but permitted in a synagogue, so, too, spitting is prohibited on the Temple Mount but permitted in a synagogue.

³⁵⁷ Rav Pappa said to Rava, and some say that Ravina said to Rava, and some say that Rav Adda bar Mattana said to Rava: Instead of deriving this from the case of wearing a shoe, derive it from the case of a shortcut. Just as a shortcut through a synagogue is prohibited, so too is spitting prohibited.

³⁵⁸ Rava said to him: The tanna derives the prohibition of spitting from the case of a shoe, and you say that it should be derived from the case of a shortcut? The Gemara elaborates: What is this derivation from the case of a shoe? As it was taught in a baraita: One may neither enter the Temple Mount with his staff in his hand, nor with his shoes on his feet, nor with money tied in his cloth and with his money-belt slung behind him, nor should one make it a shortcut. All the more so, spitting is prohibited a fortiori from the halakha with regard to wearing a shoe. Just as with regard to a shoe, which is generally not considered contemptuous, the Torah said: “Put off your shoes from off your feet, for the place upon which you stand is holy ground” (Exodus 3:5), all the more so spitting, which is considered contemptuous, should be prohibited.

³⁵⁹ Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda, says: This a fortiori inference is unnecessary. It could be otherwise derived. It says: “For none may enter within the king’s gate clothed with sackcloth” (Esther 4:2). This matter can be inferred a fortiori: Just as sackcloth, which is generally not considered repulsive before one who is flesh and blood, is forbidden within the king’s gate, all the more so spitting, which is repulsive, should be forbidden before the King of Kings.

³⁶⁰ The one who challenged him, Rav Pappa or Ravina, said to Rava: I intended to say the following: Let us say, be stringent here, with regard to the Temple Mount, and be stringent here, with regard to the synagogue,

³⁶¹ and say as follows: With regard to the Temple Mount, where one is prohibited from wearing shoes, let us derive the prohibition of spitting from the case of shoes. However, with regard to a synagogue, where one is permitted to wear shoes, instead of deriving the law with regard to spitting from the case of shoes and permitting it, derive it from the case of a shortcut, and prohibit it.

³⁶² Rather, Rava said a different reason: The synagogue is like one’s house. Just as one objects to a person using his house as a shortcut, but does not mind spitting and wearing shoes therein, so too in the case of a synagogue, a shortcut is prohibited while spitting and wearing shoes are permitted.

³⁶³ We learned in the mishna: At the conclusion of all blessings recited in the Temple, the one reciting the blessing would say: Blessed are You Lord, God of Israel, until everlasting.

³⁶⁴ The Gemara explains: Why were they insistent upon this formula to that extent? Because one does not answer amen in the Temple. Because there is a unique response to the blessings in the Temple, a unique formula for their conclusion was instituted. From where is it derived that one does not answer amen in the Temple? As it is stated: “Stand up and bless the Lord, your God, from everlasting to everlasting” (Nehemiah 9:5), which refers to the conclusion. The verse in Nehemiah continues: “And let them say: Blessed be Your glorious name, that is exalted above all blessing and praise” (Nehemiah 9:5). The response is exalted above other blessings.

³⁶⁵ From the beginning of the verse, I might have thought that all of the blessings there will have only a single expression of praise, amen. Therefore, the verse teaches: “That is exalted above all

blessing and praise”; for every blessing, a unique praise is offered. Therefore, the appropriate response to a blessing in the Temple is: Blessed are You Lord, God of Israel, from everlasting until everlasting.

³⁶⁶ We learned in the mishna that the Sages instituted that a person will greet another with the name of God, and several biblical sources were cited. The Gemara asks: Why is it necessary for the mishna to cite all of those sources, introduced with the phrase: And it says? Why was the proof from Boaz’s statement to the harvesters: The Lord is with you, insufficient?

³⁶⁷ The Gemara explains: And if you say: Boaz said this on his own, and it proves nothing with regard to normative practice, come and hear a proof from the verse: “The Lord is with you, mighty man of valor” (Judges 6:12). And if you say that it was an angel who said this to Gideon, that perhaps this verse was the angel informing Gideon that the Lord is with him, but it is not the standard formula of a greeting, come and hear proof from the verse: “And despise not your mother when she is old” (Proverbs 23:22); the customs of the nation’s elders are an adequate source from which to derive halakha.

³⁶⁸ And the verse states: “It is time to work for the Lord; they have made void Your Torah” (Psalms 119:126). Of this, Rava said: This verse can be interpreted from beginning to end, and can be interpreted from end to beginning.

³⁶⁹ The Gemara elaborates: This verse can be interpreted from beginning to end: It is time to work for the Lord; what is the reason? Because they have made void Your Torah, so it must be remedied. Conversely, it can be interpreted from end to beginning as follows: They have made void Your Torah; what is the reason? Because it is time to work for the Lord. By means of violating the Torah, it is possible to fundamentally rectify the situation.

³⁷⁰ With regard to this verse, it was taught in a baraita that Hillel the Elder says: At the time of gathering, if the Sages of the generation see to it that the Torah remains the purview of the few, disseminate it to the public at large. At the time of dissemination, gather, and leave it to others to disseminate the Torah. And if you see a generation for whom Torah is beloved, disseminate, as it is stated: “There is who scatters, and yet increases” (Proverbs 11:24). However, if you see a generation for whom Torah is not beloved, gather; do not cause the Torah to be disgraced, as it is stated: “It is time to work for the Lord; they have made void Your Torah.” Preventing Torah study in that situation is a manifestation of work for the Lord.

³⁷¹ On a similar note, bar Kappara taught: If the price of the merchandise has declined, jump and purchase from it; and where there is no man, there be a man; where there is no one to fill a particular role, accept that role upon yourself. Abaye said: Infer from this that where there is a man, there do not be a man.

³⁷² The Gemara asks: Isn’t Abaye’s conclusion obvious? The Gemara explains: This statement is only necessary in a case where there are two who are equal. Although you, too, are suited to fill that role, since another qualified person is already filling that role, allow him to succeed.

³⁷³ Bar Kappara taught: Which is a brief passage upon which all fundamental principles of Torah are dependent? “In all your ways acknowledge Him, and He will direct your paths” (Proverbs 3:6). Rava said: One must apply this principle even to acts of transgression, as even then one must adhere to God and refrain from sinning excessively.

³⁷⁴ Bar Kappara taught: A person should always teach his child a clean and simple craft. The Gemara asks: What craft is considered clean and simple? Rav Ḥisda said: Cutting precious stones.

³⁷⁵ Several ethical tenets and guidelines for life were taught in a baraita. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: One should never have too many friends in his house, i.e., people should not become accustomed to being overly intimate in his house, as it is stated: “There are friends that one has to his own hurt” (Proverbs 18:24); one with friends of that kind will ultimately come to quarrel.

³⁷⁶ It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: Do not appoint an administrator [apitropos] within your house, as had Potiphar not appointed Joseph as administrator within his house, Joseph would not have come to that incident involving him in allegations of sexual impropriety.

³⁷⁷ It was taught in a baraita, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: Why is the portion of the Nazirite (Numbers ch. 6) juxtaposed with the portion of the sota (Numbers ch. 5)? They are juxtaposed to tell you that anyone who sees a sota in her disgrace, her transgression, should renounce wine, as wine is one of the causes of that transgression.

³⁷⁸ Ḥizkiya, son of Rabbi Parnakh, said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Why is the portion of sota juxtaposed with the portion of terumot and tithes (Numbers ch. 5)? They are juxtaposed to tell you: Anyone who has terumot and tithes and does not give them to a priest, will ultimately require the services of a priest by means of his wife, as it is stated: “And every man’s hallowed things shall be his” (Numbers 5:10). This refers to one who keeps those hallowed items for himself. To this the Torah juxtaposed: “If any man’s wife go aside and act unfaithfully against him” (Numbers 5:12). And it is written: “Then shall the man bring his wife unto the priest” (Numbers 5:15). Moreover, ultimately that man will require assistance from the tithe given to the poor, as it is stated: “And every man’s hallowed things shall be his” (Numbers 5:10). He will himself need those very hallowed items that he was unwilling to give to others.

³⁷⁹ Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: And if he gave them, ultimately he will become wealthy, as it is said: “Whatsoever any man gives the priest, it shall be his” (Numbers 5:10); much property shall be his.

³⁸⁰ Rav Huna bar Berekhya said in the name of Rabbi Elazar HaKappar: Anyone who includes the name of heaven in his distress, i.e., who turns and prays to God in his time of trouble, his livelihood will ultimately be doubled, as it is stated: “And the Almighty be your treasure, and precious [toafot] silver unto you” (Job 22:25). If you include God in your trouble, your silver will be doubled. Eif, which in Aramaic means double, is etymologically similar to toafot.

³⁸¹ Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said a different explanation: This means that his sustenance flies [meofefet] to him like a bird, as it is stated: “And precious silver [toafot] unto you.”

³⁸² Rabbi Tavi said in the name of Rabbi Yoshiya: Anyone who is lax in his study of matters of Torah will ultimately lack the strength to stand on a day of adversity, as it is stated: “If you faint in the day of adversity, your strength is small indeed” (Proverbs 24:10). Rav Ami bar Mattana said that Shmuel said: And even if he was lax in the performance of a single mitzva, as it is stated: If you faint; this applies in any case, even in the case of a single mitzva.

³⁸³ Rav Safra said: Rabbi Abbahu would relate: When Ḥanina, son of Rabbi Yehoshua’s brother, went to the Diaspora, Babylonia, he would intercalate years and establish months outside of Eretz

Yisrael. Because Judaism in Eretz Yisrael had declined in the wake of the bar Kokheva rebellion, he considered it necessary to cultivate the Jewish community in Babylonia as the center of the Jewish people. Among other things, he intercalated the years and established the months even though the halakha restricts those activities to Eretz Yisrael.

³⁸⁴ Eventually, the Sages of Eretz Yisrael sent two Torah scholars after him, Rabbi Yosei ben Keifar and the grandson of Zekharya ben Kevutal. When Ḥanina saw them, he asked them: Why did you come? They responded: We came to study Torah. Since he saw his standing enhanced by the Sages of Eretz Yisrael coming to study Torah from him, he proclaimed about them: These people are eminent scholars of our generation, and their fathers served in the Temple. As we learned in tractate Yoma: Zekharya ben Kevutal says: Many times I read before the High Priest from the book of Daniel on the eve of Yom Kippur.

³⁸⁵ These two scholars, however, began to dispute every decision Ḥanina rendered in response to questions raised in the study hall. He ruled it impure and they ruled it pure; he prohibited it and they permitted it. Eventually, he proclaimed about them: These people are worthless. They are good for nothing and they know nothing. They said to him: You have already built up our names and glorified us; you cannot now demolish. You have already built a fence and you cannot break through it.

³⁸⁶ He said to them: Why is it that when I rule something impure, you rule it pure; when I prohibit it, you permit it? They said to him: We do this because you intercalate the years and establish the months outside of Eretz Yisrael.

³⁸⁷ He said to them: Didn't Rabbi Akiva ben Yosef also intercalate years and establish months outside of Eretz Yisrael? They replied to him: Leave the case of Rabbi Akiva, as, when he left, he did not leave behind anyone as great in Torah as he in Eretz Yisrael. Rabbi Ḥanina said to them: I also did not leave behind anyone as great as me in Eretz Yisrael. They said to him: The kids who you left behind have grown into goats with horns; they are greater than you are. And they sent us to you, and this is what they said to us: Go and tell him in our name: If he obeys, fine; and if he does not obey, he will be ostracized.

³⁸⁸ And in order to underscore this, tell our brethren in exile: If they obey the Sages of Eretz Yisrael to excommunicate Ḥanina, fine; and if they do not obey us, it is as if they are seceding from the Jewish people. They should climb a mountain; Aḥiya, one of the leaders of the Babylonian Jewish community, will build an altar, Ḥananya, son of Rabbi Yehoshua's brother, who was a Levite, will play the lute, and all will proclaim heresy and say that they have no portion in the God of Israel.

³⁸⁹ This message had a profound impact on the people, and immediately the entire nation burst into tears, saying: God forbid. We do have a portion in the God of Israel. They reconsidered their plans to establish Babylonia as the center of the Jewish people.

³⁹⁰ The Gemara asks: Why did the Sages of Eretz Yisrael go to that extent to stop Ḥanina? The Gemara answers: Because it is stated: "For out of Zion shall go forth the Torah, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Isaiah 2:3).

³⁹¹ The Gemara considers the details of this event: Granted, Ḥanina would rule an item pure and the Sages from Eretz Yisrael would rule it impure; they ruled stringently. But in a case where he ruled an item impure and they ruled it pure, what are the circumstances? How could they rule pure that which he ruled impure? Was it not taught in a baraita: If a Sage ruled an item impure, his colleague is not

permitted to rule it pure; if he prohibited it, his colleague may not permit it? The Gemara explains: They held that they must do so in this case, so that people would not be drawn after him; due to the exigencies of the time they overturned his rulings.

³⁹² The Sages taught: When our Rabbis, the Sages of the Mishna, entered the vineyard, the academy, in Yavne, Rabbi Yehuda, Rabbi Yosei, Rabbi Neḥemya, and Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, were there presiding over the Sages. They all began to speak in honor of their hosts, the local population hosting them and their students as guests, and they taught.

³⁹³ Rabbi Yehuda, head of the speakers in every place, opened his speech in honor of Torah, and taught: It is stated: “Now Moses used to take the tent and pitch it outside the camp, far off from the camp; and he called it the Tent of Meeting. And it came to pass, that every seeker of God went out unto the Tent of Meeting, which was outside the camp” (Exodus 33:7). He said: Isn’t this an a fortiori inference? Just as the Torah says of the ark of God, which was only twelve mil from the camp: “Every seeker of God went out unto the Tent of Meeting”; all the more so should Torah scholars, who wander great distances and go from city to city and country to country to study Torah, be called seekers of God.

³⁹⁴ The Gemara continues: It is stated: “And the Lord spoke unto Moses, face to face” (Exodus 33:11). Rabbi Yitzḥak said: The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Moses: Moses, you and I will show cheerful faces in the study of halakha to those who come to study. Some say that the Holy One, Blessed be He, told Moses: Just as I showed you a cheerful face, so too you will show Israel a cheerful face and restore the tent to its place in the camp.

³⁹⁵ It is said: “And he would return into the camp; but his minister, Joshua bin-Nun, a young man, departed not out of the Tent” (Exodus 33:11). Rabbi Abbahu said: The Holy One, Blessed be He, told Moses: Now, they will say: The Master, God, is angry and the student, Moses, is also angry, and what will happen to Israel? Rather, you must restore the tent to its place among the people. If you restore the tent to its place, fine; and if not, Joshua bin-Nun, your student, will serve as Israel’s leader in your place.

³⁹⁶ And that is what is written: “And he would return into the camp; but his minister, Joshua bin-Nun, a young man, departed not out of the Tent.” Rava said: Nevertheless, though Moses obeyed and restored the tent, the statement written with regard to the role of Joshua was not uttered for naught. Joshua bin-Nun remained as deputy to Moses, and ultimately served in his place, as it is stated: “But his minister, Joshua bin-Nun, a young man, departed not out of the Tent.”

³⁹⁷ And Rabbi Yehuda again began to speak in honor of Torah and taught: When Moses took leave of Israel on his last day in this world, he said: “Keep silence [hasket] and hear, Israel; this day you have become a people unto the Lord your God” (Deuteronomy 27:9). This is surprising: Was the Torah given to Israel on that day? Wasn’t that day at the end of forty years since the Torah was given? Rather, it comes to teach that each and every day the Torah is as dear to those who study it, as it was on the day it was given from Mount Sinai.

³⁹⁸ Rabbi Tanḥum, son of Rabbi Ḥiyya, of the village of Akko, said: Know that the Torah is indeed beloved, as one who recites Shema, morning and evening, for his entire life, and does not recite it one evening, it is as if he never recited Shema. He cannot compensate for what he missed.

³⁹⁹ The Gemara interprets the word *hasket* in this verse homiletically, as an acronym of the words *as*, *make*, and *kat*, group. Form [asu] many groups [kitot] and study Torah, for the Torah is only acquired through study in a group. This is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina; as Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “A sword is upon the boasters [habaddim], and they shall become fools [noalu]” (Jeremiah 50:36)? This verse can be interpreted homiletically: A sword upon the enemies of Torah scholars, a euphemism for the Torah scholars themselves, who sit alone [bad bevad] and study Torah. And furthermore, those who study alone grow foolish, as it is written here, *noalu*, and elsewhere it is written that after Miriam was afflicted with leprosy, Aaron told Moses: “For that we have done foolishly [noalnu]” (Numbers 12:11). And furthermore, they sin due to that ignorance, as at the end of that same verse it is stated: “For that we have done foolishly, and for that we have sinned.”

⁴⁰⁰ If you wish, say instead that it is derived from here: “The princes of Tzoan are become fools [noalu]” (Isaiah 19:13).

⁴⁰¹ The Gemara offers an alternative explanation of this verse: “Keep silence [hasket] and hear, Israel”; break [kattetu] yourselves over words of the Torah. This is in accordance with the opinion of Reish Lakish, as Reish Lakish said: From where is it derived that matters of Torah are only retained by one who kills himself over it? As it is stated: “This is the Torah: When one dies in a tent” (Numbers 19:14); true Torah study demands the total devotion of one who is willing to dedicate his life in the tent of Torah.

⁴⁰² The Gemara offers yet another alternative explanation of this verse: “Keep silence [hasket] and hear, Israel”; first be silent [has] and listen and then study intensively in order to analyze [kattet] and clarify the details. This is in accordance with the opinion of Rava, as Rava said: One must always study Torah and gain expertise in it, and only then analyze and delve into it.

⁴⁰³ In the school of Rabbi Yannai they said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “For the churning of milk brings forth curd, and the wringing of the nose [af] brings forth blood, so the forcing of wrath [appayim] brings forth strife” (Proverbs 30:33)?

⁴⁰⁴ With regard to the beginning of the verse: For the churning of milk brings forth curd; in whom do you find the cream of Torah? With one who spits out the milk that he nursed from his mother’s breasts over it; one who struggles with all his might to study Torah.

⁴⁰⁵ With regard to: And the wringing of the nose brings forth blood, any student whose rabbi is angry [af] with him the first time and he is silent and does not react, will merit to be able to distinguish between blood that is ritually impure and blood that is ritually pure.

⁴⁰⁶ As for: And the forcing of wrath [appayim] brings forth strife; any student whose rabbi is angry with him for the first and second times, *appayim* being the plural of *af*, and he is silent, merits to distinguish between monetary cases, strife, and capital cases, as that is the highest level of learning. As we learned in a mishna: Rabbi Yishmael says: One who seeks to become wise should engage in monetary laws, as there is no greater discipline in Torah, as they are like a flowing well in which innovations constantly spring forth.

⁴⁰⁷ Similarly, Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “If you have done foolishly in lifting up yourself, or if you have planned devices [zamota], lay your hand over your mouth” (Proverbs 30:32)? Anyone who abases himself over matters of Torah, asking

questions despite the shame he feels for his ignorance, will ultimately be exalted. And if he muzzles [zamam] himself due to embarrassment, he will end up with his hand over his mouth, unable to answer.

⁴⁰⁸ The Gemara returns to the homilies offered by the Sages in the vineyard of Yavne. Rabbi Neḥemya began to speak in honor of the hosts and taught: What is the meaning of that which is written: “And Saul said unto the Kenites: Go, depart, get you down from among the Amalekites lest I destroy you with them, for you showed kindness to all the Children of Israel when they came up out of Egypt” (I Samuel 15:6)? Isn’t this an a fortiori inference: Just as Jethro, the forbearer of the Kenite tribe, who only befriended Moses for his own honor, is treated in this way and rewarded that his merit would protect his descendants; all the more so should one who hosts a Torah scholar in his home, providing him with food and drink and availing him of his possessions, be rewarded with that protection.

⁴⁰⁹ Rabbi Yosei began to speak in honor of the hosts, and taught: It is said: “You shall not abhor an Edomite, for he is your brother; you shall not abhor an Egyptian, because you were a stranger in his land” (Deuteronomy 23:8). Isn’t this an a fortiori inference: Just as the Egyptians, who only befriended Israel, even when they hosted them, for their own benefit, as Pharaoh said to Joseph, as it is stated: “And if you know any able men among them, then make them rulers over my cattle” (Genesis 47:6), are treated this way, all the more so should one who hosts a Torah scholar in his home, providing him with food and drink and availing him of his possessions without concern for personal gain, be treated this way.

⁴¹⁰ Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, began to speak in honor of the hosts, and taught: It is stated: “The Lord has blessed the house of Oved-edom...because of the ark of God” (II Samuel 6:12). Isn’t this an a fortiori inference: Just as in reward for honoring the ark, which neither ate nor drank, but before which Oved-edom simply swept and sprinkled water to settle the dust, he was treated this way and merited a blessing, all the more so should one who hosts a Torah scholar in his home, providing him with food and drink and availing him of his possessions without concern for his personal gain, be rewarded with such a blessing.

⁴¹¹ The Gemara asks: What is that blessing with which Oved-edom was blessed? Rav Yehuda bar Zevida said: This is Ḥamot and her eight daughters-in-law, each of whom bore six in a single womb,

⁴¹² as it is stated: “And Oved-edom had sons...Peulletai the eighth,” and in the continuation of the same verse it is written: “For God blessed him” (I Chronicles 26:4-5); apparently, these eight children were the blessing, as it is stated: “All these were of the sons of Oved-edom; they and their sons and their brethren, able men in strength for the service; sixty-two of Oved-edom” (I Chronicles 26:8). Each of the nine women gave birth to six sons, for a total of fifty-four. If one adds the original eight, there were sixty-two altogether.

⁴¹³ Rabbi Avin HaLevi said: If one forces the moment and attempts to take advantage of an undeserved opportunity, the moment forces him and he is pushed aside. If one yields to the moment and relinquishes an opportunity that presents itself, the moment yields to him.

⁴¹⁴ This may be derived from an incident involving Rabba and Rav Yosef, as Rav Yosef was Sinai, extremely erudite, and Rabba was one who uproots mountains, extremely sharp. The moment arrived when they were needed; one of them was to be chosen as head of the yeshiva. They sent the following question there, to the Sages of Eretz Yisrael: Which takes precedence, Sinai or one who

uproots mountains? They sent to them in response: Sinai takes precedence, for everyone needs the owner of the wheat, one who is expert in the sources. Nevertheless, Rav Yosef did not accept the appointment, as the Chaldean astrologers told him: You will preside as head of the yeshiva for two years.

⁴¹⁵ Rabba presided as head of the yeshiva for twenty-two years. After he died, Rav Yosef presided for two and a half years. Though he did not take advantage of the opportunity that presented itself, he ultimately fulfilled that for which he was destined.

⁴¹⁶ The Gemara relates that all those years that Rabba presided, Rav Yosef did not even call a bloodletter to his home. Rav Yosef did not assume even the slightest air of authority, and would go to seek out the bloodletter rather than call upon the bloodletter to accommodate him.

⁴¹⁷ And Rabbi Avin HaLevi said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “The Lord will answer you on the day of distress; the name of the God of Jacob set you upon high” (Psalms 20:2)? Is God specifically the God of Jacob and not the God of Abraham and Isaac? Rather, from here the general principle is derived: One who owns a beam should approach carrying the thick portion of the beam. A builder, carrying a beam in order to affix it in a building, must calibrate it and measure carefully so that the thick part of the beam fits in its place; so too must Jacob, who fathered and raised the children who would become the people of Israel, continue to pray for them and complete the task of nation-building.

⁴¹⁸ And Rabbi Avin HaLevi said: One who partakes of a meal at which a Torah scholar is present, it is as if he enjoyed the radiant splendor of the Divine Presence, as it is stated: “And Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses’ father-in-law before God” (Exodus 18:12). Did they actually eat before God? Didn’t they eat before Moses?

⁴¹⁹ Rather, this verse comes to tell you that one who partakes in a meal at which a Torah scholar is present, it is as if he enjoyed the radiant splendor of the Divine Presence.

⁴²⁰ And Rabbi Avin HaLevi said: One who takes leave from another should not say to him: Go in peace, but rather, he should say: Go to peace. As we see that, on the one hand, Jethro said to Moses: “Go to peace” (Exodus 4:18), and Moses ascended and was successful. On the other hand, David said to his son, Absalom: “Go in peace” (II Samuel 15:9), and Absalom went and was ultimately hanged.

⁴²¹ Rabbi Avin HaLevi also said: One who takes leave from a dead person should not say to him: Go to peace, but rather, one should say: Go in peace, as it is stated: “But you shall go to your fathers in peace” (Genesis 15:15).

⁴²² Rabbi Levi bar Ḥiyya said: One who leaves the synagogue and immediately enters the study hall and engages in Torah study, is privileged to receive the Divine Presence, as it is stated: “They go from strength to strength, every one of them appears before God in Zion” (Psalms 84:8); those who go from a place of prayer to a place of Torah study are privileged to receive a divine revelation in Zion.

⁴²³ With regard to that same verse, Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Ashi said that Rav said: Torah scholars have rest neither in this world nor in the World-to-Come, as in both worlds they are constantly progressing, as it is stated: “They go from strength to strength, every one of them appears before God in Zion.”

⁴²⁴ Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Ḥanina said: Torah scholars increase peace in the world, as it is said: “And all your children [banayikh] shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of your children” (Isaiah 54:13). If all the children of Israel are taught of the Lord, there will be peace for all.

⁴²⁵ The Sages interpreted this verse homiletically: Do not read your children [banayikh], but your builders [bonayikh]. Torah scholars are those who build peace for their generation. As it is stated: “Those who love Your Torah have great peace; there is no stumbling block for them” (Psalms 119:165); and “May there be peace within your walls, prosperity within your palaces” (Psalms 122:7), because: “For the sake of my brothers and friends, I shall say: Peace be within you. For the sake of the House of the Lord, our God, I will seek your good” (Psalms 122:8–9), and “May the Lord give strength to His people; the Lord will bless His people with peace” (Psalms 29:11).