

מתני' ארבעה עשר שחל להיות בשבת – מבערין את הכל מלפני השבת, דברי רבי מאיר. וחכמים אומרים: בזמנו. רבי אליעזר בר צדוק אומר: תרומה – מלפני השבת, וחולין – בזמן.

גמ' תנא, רבי אליעזר בר צדוק אומר: פעם אחת שבת אבא ביבנה, וכל ארבעה עשר להיות בשבת, ובא זמין ממנה של רבן גמליאל, ואמר: הגיע עת לבער את החמץ. והלכתני אחר אבא, וביערו את החמץ.

מתני' ההולך לשחוט את פסחו ולמול את בנו, ולאכול סעודת אירוסין בבית חמיו, ונזכר שיש לו חמץ בתוך ביתו. אם יכול לחזור ולבער ולחזור למצותו – יחזור ויבער, ואם לאו – מבטלו בלבו.

להציל מן הגוים, ומן הנזר, ומן הלסטים, ומן הדליקה, ומן המפולת יבטל בלבו. ולשבות שביתת הרשות – יחזור מיד.

MISHNA With regard to the fourteenth of Nisan that occurs on Shabbat,^H one removes all leaven from his possession, whether it is *teruma* or non-sacred food, before Shabbat,^N except for that which will be eaten during the first part of Shabbat. In that case, one cannot remove leaven from his possession on the fourteenth of Nisan itself as he does in other years. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Rabbis say:^N One may remove the leaven at its usual time^N on the fourteenth of Nisan by throwing it away or declaring it ownerless. Rabbi Eliezer bar Tzadok says: *Teruma* should be removed before Shabbat, as only a few people are permitted to eat it and therefore one can presume that it will remain uneaten during Shabbat. However, non-sacred foods should be removed at their usual time, on the fourteenth of Nisan itself.

GEMARA It was taught in the *Tosefta* that Rabbi Eliezer bar Tzadok, spent Shabbat in Yavne,^B and the fourteenth of Nisan occurred on that Shabbat. Zonin,^P who was the appointee of Rabban Gamliel, came and said: The time has come to remove leavened bread; and I went with my father and we removed the leavened bread. This story serves as anecdotal evidence that leaven is removed at the usual time on the fourteenth of Nisan, even on Shabbat.

MISHNA One who is traveling on the eve of Passover to slaughter his Paschal lamb, to circumcise his son, or to eat a betrothal feast^{HN} in his father-in-law's house, and he remembers that he has leavened bread in his house, if he is able to return to his house and remove the leaven and afterward return to the mitzva toward which he was traveling, he should return home and remove his leaven. But if there is not enough time for him to go home and remove the leaven, and still complete the mitzva that he already began, he should nullify it in his heart, as by Torah law this is sufficient.

If one was traveling to save Jews from an attack by gentiles,^N from a flooding river, from bandits, from a fire, or from a collapsed building, he should not even attempt to return, and instead he should nullify the leaven in his heart. This applies even if he could remove his leaven and still return to his previous activity. If he went to establish his Shabbat residence in order to adjust his Shabbat limit for an optional purpose,^N rather than in order to fulfill a commandment, he should return immediately to remove his leaven.

NOTES

One removes all leaven before Shabbat – מבערין את הכל מלפני השבת: Some interpret this phrase literally, meaning that one should remove all leaven from his possession before Shabbat and not leave any for consumption on Shabbat. According to this interpretation, one would be required to eat *matza* for Shabbat meals, with the added assumption that the prohibition against eating *matza* on Passover eve applies only after midday (Rabbi Zerahya HaLevi; *ge'onim*).

The dispute between Rabbi Meir and the Rabbis – מתלוקת: רבי מאיר וחכמים: Some explain the basis for this dispute as follows: Rabbi Meir contends that the only acceptable method for removing leaven from one's possession is through burning, which is a prohibited labor on Shabbat. The Rabbis contend that other methods of removing leaven are acceptable, and therefore one may eliminate it on Shabbat itself (Rabbi Zerahya HaLevi).

Before Shabbat... at its usual time – בזמנו: Some suggest a completely different explanation of this dispute: Rabbi Meir states that one must eliminate leaven before nightfall on Friday, whereas the Rabbis disagree and state that a person must eliminate leaven on Friday before midday, as one would be required to do on Passover eve during an ordinary year. According

to this explanation, Rabbi Eliezer bar Tzadok claims that one should eliminate non-sacred leaven on Friday before midday; however, *teruma* should be eliminated just prior to nightfall (*Tzafnat Pane'ah*).

Betrothal feast – סעודת אירוסין: The Sages of the Jerusalem Talmud note the significance attributed here to peace and harmony between people, as the mishna compares a betrothal feast to commandments such as the Paschal lamb and circumcision, the violation of which carries the punishment of *karet*.

To save Jews from an attack by gentiles – להציל מן הגוים: Even if one is traveling to save only Jewish property, rather than Jewish lives, he is not required to return (*Me'iri*). Even if he has enough time to accomplish both tasks, he should not return, lest he be delayed and prevented from performing the mitzva (Rabbeinu Yehonatan).

To establish his Shabbat residence for an optional purpose – לשבות שביתת הרשות: In the Jerusalem Talmud it is explained that in this case, the person is planning to travel in order to study with his master. Although this is a mitzva, it is considered optional relative to fulfilling the requirement to eliminate leaven.

HALAKHA

The fourteenth of Nisan that occurs on Shabbat – ארבעה עשר שחל להיות בשבת: When Passover eve occurs on Shabbat, one must remove leaven from his possession before Shabbat, leaving only enough food for the first two Shabbat meals. This is the ruling of the Rambam and some of the *ge'onim*, in accordance with the opinions of Rabbi Eliezer bar Tzadok in the mishna and Rabbi Elazar of Bartota in the *baraita* on daf 13a (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 444:7*).

One who is traveling to perform a mitzva on Passover eve – ההולך למצוה בערב פסח: If one is traveling on Passover eve to perform a mitzva, such as circumcising his son or participating in a feast that constitutes or celebrates a mitzva, and he remembers that he has some leaven in his house, he should return home to remove it, provided he will have enough time afterward to fulfill the mitzva he had already begun. However, if he will not have time to do so, he should nullify the leaven to himself. If the time for removing leaven has already passed, he is required to return home in any case, as he can no longer nullify it to himself (*Be'er Heitev*). If one is traveling to save people from a dangerous situation, such as a flood, he should not go back for the leaven even if he will have enough time to remove the leaven and save the people. If he is traveling for his own optional needs, he should return home (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 444:7*).

BACKGROUND

Yavne – יבנה: Yavne, a town in Judea, was a center of Torah study during the Second Temple period. After the destruction of the Temple, Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai reestablished the Sanhedrin there and the town attained great prominence as an important Torah center. As the seat of the Sanhedrin, Yavne was the spiritual center of the entire Jewish population in Eretz Yisrael. The Yavne Yeshiva, initially headed by Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai and later by Rabban Gamliel II of Yavne, attracted many of the greatest Torah scholars of that era. At Yavne, many ordinances were enacted to restore Jewish religious and spiritual life after the destruction of the Temple. It remained an important center until the time of the bar Kokheva rebellion.

PERSONALITIES

Zonin – זונין: Zonin, from the Greek name Ζήνων, Zeno, apparently ran the internal affairs of the household of the *Nasi*. Baitos ben Zonin (see above, 37a) was apparently his son, and he also had strong ties to the household of the *Nasi*. Zonin was wealthy and very scrupulous in his observance of mitzvot, as is evident from several incidents the Talmud relates about him.

HALAKHA

And remembered that there was consecrated meat in his hand – וְנָכַר שֵׁשׁ בֵּידוֹ בֶּשֶׂר קֹדֶשׁ: If one leaves Jerusalem with sacrificial meat and remembers only after he passes the area of Tzofim that he has it, he must burn it in the place where he remembers. However, if he has not yet reached that point, he must return and burn it in Jerusalem (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 19:8).

For how much is one required to return – יעד כמה הן חוזרין: If one leaves Jerusalem with an olive-bulk of sacrificial meat, he is required to return and burn it in Jerusalem. With regard to leaven, one must return to his house to destroy an egg-bulk, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 19:8; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 444:7).

A Torah scholar and an optional feast – תלמיד חכם בסעודת רשות: It is fitting for a Torah scholar to eat optional meals only in his home and to avoid eating in the company of ignoramuses. He should not eat excessively, even in the company of scholars. It is proper for him to participate in public feasts only when they constitute a mitzva, such as at the wedding of a Torah scholar and the daughter of a Torah scholar (Rambam *Sefer HaMadda, Hilkhot Deot* 5:2).

BACKGROUND

Mount Scopus [Tzofim] – צופים: Authorities disagree as to whether this refers to a specific location near Jerusalem or more generally to any place from which it is possible to see [litzpot] the city. Some say Tzofim refers to Mount Scopus [*Har HaTzofim*]. Others claim that it refers to what is today known as Shuafat, located near the northern neighborhoods of modern-day Jerusalem.



View of the Old City of Jerusalem from Mount Scopus



View of Mount Scopus and Old City of Jerusalem from Sherover Promenade in southern Jerusalem

LANGUAGE

Gifts [*sivlonot*] – סבלונות: Possibly from the Greek σύμβολον, *symbolon*, meaning collateral, gift, marriage agreement, covenant, treaty, or contract.

וכן מי שיצא מירושלים ונכר שיש בידו בשר קדש, אם עבר צופים – שורפו במקומו, ואם לאו – חוזר ושורפו לפני הבירה מעצי המערבה.

ועד כמה הן חוזרין? רבי מאיר אומר: זה וזה בכביצה. רבי יהודה אומר: זה וזה בכזית. וחכמים אומרים: בשר קדש – בכזית, וחמץ – בכביצה.

גמ' ורמינהו: ההולך לאכול סעודת אירוסין בבית חמיו ולשבות שביתת הרשות – יחזור מיד.

אמר רבי יוחנן: לא קשיא; הא – רבי יהודה, הא – רבי יוסי, דתנאי: סעודת אירוסין – רשות, דברי רבי יהודה. רבי יוסי אומר: מצוה.

והשתא, דאמר רב חסדא: מחלוקת – בסעודה שניה, אבל בסעודה ראשונה – דברי הכל מצוה. אפילו תימא הא והא רבי יהודה, ולא קשיא; הא – בסעודה ראשונה, הא – בסעודה שניה.

תנאי, אמר רבי יהודה: אני לא שמעתי אלא סעודת אירוסין, אבל לא סבלונות. אמר לו רבי יוסי: אני שמעתי סעודת אירוסין וסבלונות.

תנאי, רבי שמעון אומר: כל סעודה שאינה של מצוה – אין תלמיד חכם רשאי להנות ממנה.

בגון מאי? אמר רבי יוחנן: בגון בת בהן לישראל, ובת תלמיד חכם לעם הארץ. דאמר רבי יוחנן: בת בהן לישראל – אין וויגן עולה יפה.

And so too, the same *halakha* applies to one who left Jerusalem and remembered that there was consecrated meat in his hand.⁴ Meat that is taken out of Jerusalem becomes disqualified, and one is required to burn it in proximity to the Temple. If he passed the area of Mount Scopus [Tzofim],⁵ beyond which one cannot see Jerusalem, he burns the meat at the site where he is located; and if he has not traveled that far, he must return and burn it before the Temple with wood from the arrangement on the altar, which was designated for burning consecrated items that were disqualified.

The mishna asks: For how much leaven or consecrated meat is one required to return?⁶ Rabbi Meir says: In both this case and that case, one must return for an egg-bulk. Rabbi Yehuda says: In both this case and that case, one must return for an olive-bulk. And the Rabbis say that the amount depends on the case: With regard to consecrated meat, he is required to return if he has an olive-bulk, but in a case where he remembers that he has leavened bread, he required to return only for an egg-bulk.

GEMARA The Gemara raises a contradiction between this mishna and another source. It was taught in a *baraita*: One who is traveling to eat a betrothal feast in his father-in-law's house or to establish his Shabbat residence for an optional purpose, must return immediately to remove his leaven. This contradicts the mishna, which states that one who is going to a betrothal feast may nullify the leaven without returning for it, because the meal is considered a mitzva.

Rabbi Yohanan said: This is not difficult, as there is a tannaitic dispute with regard to the issue. This source, the *baraita*, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, while that source, the mishna, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei. As it was taught in a *baraita*: A betrothal feast is optional; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Yosei says: It is a mitzva.

And now that Rav Hisda said: The dispute between Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei applies to the second betrothal feast, where the groom takes part in an additional meal with the bride's family, but everyone agrees that the first betrothal feast is a mitzva, the contradiction between the mishna and the *baraita* can be resolved differently. Even if you say that this mishna and that *baraita* are both in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, it is not difficult. This mishna, which relates to the meal as a mitzva, is referring to the first meal. That *baraita*, which assumes that the meal is not a mitzva, is referring to the second meal.

It was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda said: I heard only that there is a mitzva with regard to a betrothal feast itself, but not with regard to the feast of the gifts [*sivlonot*],¹ when the groom would present gifts to the bride. While a festive meal was eaten on this occasion, it was not considered to be a mitzva. Rabbi Yosei said to him: I heard that both a betrothal feast and the feast of the gifts are considered mitzvot.

Having discussed whether a betrothal feast is a mitzva, the Gemara addresses a related issue. It was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Shimon says: A Torah scholar may not derive benefit from partaking in any feast that is not a mitzva.⁴

The Gemara asks: In what case does this statement apply? Rabbi Yohanan said: In a case where the daughter of a priest marries an Israelite, or where the daughter of a Torah scholar marries an ignoramus. Although a wedding feast is generally a mitzva, it is not in this case, as Rabbi Yohanan said: When the daughter of a priest marries an Israelite their union will not be auspicious, as it is disgraceful for the priesthood when the daughter of a priest marries an Israelite.

נְשׂוּאֵין לְבַת כֹּהֵן – Marriage to the daughter of a priest – The daughter of a priest should marry a Torah scholar in order for their marriage to be successful, as if she marries a man who is not a Torah scholar, the troubles the Sages warned about may come to pass (*Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer 2:8*).

NOTES

Two sons who were ordained – **תְּרֵי בְנֵי סְמִיכֵי**: The verse states with regard to the descendants of Aaron: “They will teach your laws to Jacob” (Deuteronomy 33:10). Through the merit of this marriage, Rav Idi bar Avin was granted sons who became Torah scholars (Maharsha).

Destroy his house, etc. – **מַחְרִיב אֶת בֵּיתוֹ וכו'** – Some explain that this expression means that such a person will spend all his money on these feasts. He will widow his wife by becoming deserving of divine punishment for his actions (Rav Yehuda ben Rav Binyamin HaRofeh). Dispute will come upon him as is common with drunkards, whose intoxication leads them to quarrel (Maharsha).

The son [bar] of the one who heats ovens – **בֶּר מַחֲמִים** – Some say that the gluttonous person himself will be referred to by this title, and that the word *bar* does not mean son but rather is used in a general way to express a sense of belonging, as in the expression *bar mitzva*, one who is subject to mitzvot. The expression would indicate that the person is constantly engaged in this degrading activity (Maharal, Maharsha).

PERSONALITIES

Rav Kahana – **רַב כְּהָנָא**: Many different Sages are referred to as Rav Kahana. The Rav Kahana mentioned here apparently refers to the one who was a disciple-colleague of Rav.

Rav Kahana came to study with Rav while still in his youth. Although he was a student of Rav with regard to traditions and sources, he was able to grasp halakhic reasoning independently. Nonetheless, he was a devoted student, zealously guarding Rav's honor. When someone once threatened to bring fabricated charges against Rav to the authorities, Rav Kahana thwarted this plan by causing the man's death. As a result of this incident, he was forced to flee to Eretz Yisrael. Once in Eretz Yisrael, he studied with scholars such as Rabbi Yohanan and Reish Lakish, who described him as the lion who ascended from Babylonia. However, it seems that the other scholars of Eretz Yisrael did not treat him with due respect, and he later returned to Babylonia. His statement here alludes to his move to Eretz Yisrael.

LANGUAGE

Inns [bei kuvei] – **בֵּי כוּבֵי** – From the Arabic *كوب*, *kub*, which literally means a jug without a handle, and can be used to refer to the place where the jugs are stored.

Bowls [pinkhei] – **פִּינְכֵי** – From the Greek *πίναξ*, *pinax*, meaning a trencher or a platter.

מאי היא? אמר רב חסדא: או אלמנה או גרושה או זרע אין לה. במתניתא תנא: קוברת או קוברתו, או מביאתו לידי עניות.

The Gemara asks: **What is meant by this statement that their union will be inauspicious?** Rav Hisda said: The inauspicious nature of such a marriage can be identified based on the verse describing the return of a daughter of a priest to her father's house after marrying a non-priest. The verse is understood as mentioning that the marriage will result in one of three possibilities: she will **either be a widow, a divorcee, or without children** (see Leviticus 22:13). It was taught in a *baraita*: Either her husband will bury her or she will bury him, because one of them will die young, or she will cause him to become poor.

איני? והא אמר רבי יוחנן: הרוצה שיתעשר – ידבק בזרעו של אהרן, כל שבין שתורה וכהונה מעשרתן – לא קשיא: הא – בתלמיד חכם, הא – בעם הארץ.

The Gemara asks: **Is that so? Didn't Rabbi Yohanan himself say: One who wishes to become wealthy should cling to the descendants of Aaron, and all the more so should the merit of the Torah and the priesthood cause them to become wealthy.** The Gemara answers: This is **not difficult**, as this case, where he becomes wealthy, refers to a Torah scholar who marries a woman of priestly lineage. In that case their union will be a successful one. That case, where their union will not be auspicious, refers to an ignoramus who marries a woman of priestly lineage.^h

רבי יהושע נסיב כהנתא, חלש. אמר: לא ניתחא ליה לאהרן דאדבק בזרעיה, דהוי ליה חתנא כי אנא.

The Gemara relates that **Rabbi Yehoshua married a daughter of a priest and became ill. He said: Apparently, it is not satisfactory to Aaron the priest that I cling to his descendants, so that he has a son-in-law like me.**

רב אידי בר אבין נסיב כהנתא, נפקו מיניה תרי בני סמיכי, רב ששת בריה דרב אידי ורבי יהושע בריה דרב אידי. אמר רב פפא: אי לא נסיבנא כהנתא לא איעתרי.

The Gemara also relates that **Rav Idi bar Avin married a daughter of a priest. Two sons who were ordainedⁿ to decide halakhic matters came from him, namely Rav Sheshet, son of Rav Idi, and Rabbi Yehoshua, son of Rav Idi. Similarly, Rav Pappa said: Had I not married a daughter of a priest, I would not have become wealthy.**

אמר רב כהנא: אי לא נסיבנא כהנתא – לא גלאי. אמרו ליה: והא למקום תורה גלית! לא גלאי בדגלי אינשו.

On the other hand, **Rav Kahana,^p who was not a priest, said: Had I not married a daughter of a priest, I would not have been exiled, as Rav Kahana was forced to flee from Babylonia to Eretz Yisrael. They said to him: But you were exiled to a place of Torah, which is not a punishment at all. He answered: I was not exiled as people are generally exiled, i.e., I did not emigrate of my own free will; rather, I was forced to flee from the authorities.**

אמר רבי יצחק: כל הנהנה מסעודת הרשות לסוף גולה, שנאמר: "ואכלים כרים מצאן ועגלים מתוך מרבק", וכתוב: "לכן עתה יגלו בראש גולים."

Rabbi Yitzhak said: Anyone who benefits from partaking in an optional feast, which is not a mitzva, will ultimately be exiled, as it is stated: "And eat the lambs of the flock and the calves out of the midst of the stall" (Amos 6:4), and it is written: "Therefore now they shall go into exile at the head of the exiles; and the revelry of those who stretched themselves out shall pass away" (Amos 6:7).

תנו רבנן: כל תלמיד חכם המרבה סעודתו בכל מקום – סוף מחריב את ביתו, ומאלמן את אשתו, ומייתם את גזליו, ותלמודו משתכח ממנו, ומחלוקות רבות באות עליו, ודבריו אינם נשמעים ומחלל שם שמים ושם רבו ושם אביו, וגורם שם רע לו ולבניו ולבניו עד סוף כל הדורות.

The Gemara continues discussing a Torah scholar who benefits from optional feasts. **The Sages taught: Any Torah scholar who feasts excessively everywhere degrades himself and brings suffering upon himself. He will ultimately destroy his house,ⁿ widow his wife, orphan his chicks, i.e., his children, and his studies will be forgotten. Much dispute will come upon him, his words will not be heeded, and he will desecrate God's name and the name of his master and the name of his father. And he will cause a bad name for himself, his children, and his descendants throughout future generations.**

מאי היא? אמר אבין: קרו ליה בר מחים תנורי, רבא אמר: בר מרקיד בי כובי. רב פפא אמר: בר מלחיד פינכי. רב שמעיה אמר: בר מן רבע.

The Gemara asks: **What is this bad reputation that he causes to himself and his descendants?** Abaye said: His son is called the son [*bar*] of the one who heats ovens,ⁿ since this person continually heated ovens in order to prepare food for feasts. Rava said: His son will be called the son of the one who dances in inns [*bei kuvei*],^l as he seems to be invited to every feast to entertain the guests. Rav Pappa said: His son will be called the son of the one who licks bowls [*pinkhei*].^l Rav Shemaya said: His son will be called the son of the one who folds his garment and crouches, i.e., falls asleep drunk.

NOTES

Acceptable and unacceptable – מתקבל ואינו מתקבל: Some explain that the metaphor indicates that the union will take hold and be fruitful (Maharsha).

BACKGROUND

Bramble – סנה: This plant, which is also referred to as *vardina* in the Talmud, is apparently *Rubus sanctus*, a species of the rose family. Also called the holy bramble, it is a small flowering evergreen that either grows along the ground or climbs upward. It grows primarily near riverbeds or in other wet regions throughout Eretz Yisrael. Its leaves are made up of three or four small parts and many strong thorns, some of which are bent. Its flowers, which are approximately 2 cm in diameter, are pinkish-purple or white, and it produces black and red fruits, which are the berries of the bramble referred to in the Gemara. Although these fruits are edible, they are often small, hard, and dry, and they are vastly different from cultivated grapes.



Holy bramble

Perek III

Daf 49 Amud b

BACKGROUND

Heads of congregations – ראשי כנסיות: This title referred to those who managed the affairs of the congregation. Those who filled this position were always well respected and continually engaged in mitzvot. Indeed, the priest who occupied this position in the Temple had a status just below that of the deputy High Priest. This title may be found on various tombstones from the talmudic period.

HALAKHA

Whom is it fitting to marry – את מי ראוי לישא: It is proper for a man to marry the daughter of a Torah scholar, or of a respectable family, or of people of action, or of those who are well known for their scrupulous performance of mitzvot (*Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 2:6).

תנו רבנן: לעולם ימכור אדם כל מה שיש לו וישא בת תלמיד חכם. שאם מת או גולה – מובטח לו שבניו תלמידי חכמים, ואל ישא בת עם הארץ – שאם מת או גולה בניו עמי הארץ.

תנו רבנן: לעולם ימכור אדם כל מה שיש לו וישא בת תלמיד חכם, וישא בתו לתלמיד חכם. משל לענבי הגפן בענבי הגפן, דבר נאה ומתקבל. ולא ישא בת עם הארץ – משל לענבי הגפן בענבי הסנה, דבר כעור.

On the topic of proper marriage partners, the Gemara cites the following discussion. The Sages taught: One should always be willing to sell all he has in order to marry the daughter of a Torah scholar, as if he dies or if he is exiled and he cannot raise his children, he can be assured that his sons will be Torah scholars, since their mother will ensure that they are well educated. And one should not marry the daughter of an ignoramus, as if he dies or is exiled, his sons will be ignoramuses.

Furthermore, the Sages taught: One should always be willing to sell all he has in order to marry the daughter of a Torah scholar and in order to marry off his daughter to a Torah scholar. This type of marriage can be compared to grapes of a vine that become intertwined with grapes of a vine, something which is beautiful and acceptable^N to God and man. And one should not marry the daughter of an ignoramus. This type of marriage can be compared to grapes of a vine that have become intertwined with berries of a bramble,^B which is something unseemly

ואינו מתקבל.

and unacceptable.

תנו רבנן: לעולם ימכור אדם כל מה שיש לו וישא בת תלמיד חכם. לא מצא בת תלמיד חכם – ישא בת גדולי הדור. לא מצא בת גדולי הדור – ישא בת ראשי כנסיות. לא מצא בת ראשי כנסיות – ישא בת גבאי צדקה. לא מצא בת גבאי צדקה – ישא בת מלמדי תינוקות. ולא ישא בת עמי הארץ, מפני שהן שקצ, ונשותיהן שרץ, ועל בנותיהן הוא אומר: "ארוו שוכב עם כל בהמה."

The Sages taught: A person should always be willing to sell all he has in order to marry the daughter of a Torah scholar. If he cannot find the daughter of a Torah scholar, he should marry the daughter of one of the great people of the generation, who are pious although they are not Torah scholars. If he cannot find the daughter of one of the great people of the generation, he should marry the daughter of one of the heads of the congregations.^B If he cannot find the daughter of one of the heads of the congregations, he should marry the daughter of one of the charity collectors. If he cannot find the daughter of one of the charity collectors, he should marry the daughter of one of the schoolteachers. However, he should not marry the daughter of an ignoramus [*am ha'aretz*]^N because they are vermin and their wives are similar to a creeping animal, as their lifestyle involves the violation of numerous prohibitions. And with regard to their daughters the verse states: "Cursed is he who lies with an animal" (Deuteronomy 27:21), as they are similar to animals in that they lack any knowledge or moral sense.^H

NOTES

Ignoramus [*am ha'aretz*] – עם הארץ: Many explanations are suggested for the various statements in the Gemara here with regard to ignoramuses; however, certain points are generally agreed upon. The term ignoramus is used to refer to several different types of people at different levels of knowledge and observance. It may refer to people at the lowest levels, and even to those who have studied the Bible and Mishna but have not been adequately trained in advanced talmudic logic. It appears that the statements made here apply to the most boorish type of ignoramus. In accordance with the Gemara's definition elsewhere, this

is referring to one who has not studied Bible or Mishna or engaged in any type of productive activity. Such a person is not only ignorant of the Torah, but also degrades mitzva observance and does not contribute to society. One who falls into this category should be entirely avoided, as he is likely to intentionally or unintentionally violate *halakha*. The term *am ha'aretz* used in reference to an ignoramus originates from the fact that gentiles were originally called nations of the earth [*amei ha'aretz*]. Others say that the title is related to the word *amum*, meaning dim or weak, and that an ignoramus has a weak spirit (*Arukh*).

אָסור – אִסוּר: Is prohibited to eat the meat of animals or fowl – לֹא־אֶכֶל בְּשַׂר בְּהֵמָה וְעוֹף: Some explain this statement in the following manner: Since an ignoramus is unable to distinguish between an animal or fowl that was slaughtered properly and one that was not, he may not eat them. Others say that in his boorishness he will cause his animals to develop conditions that will cause them to die within twelve months and thereby attain the status of *tereifa*, which would mean that they may not be consumed. For this reason, the Gemara mentioned the meat of animals and fowl, with regard to which these concerns exist, but did not mention fish, which do not need to be slaughtered and cannot attain the status of *tereifa* (*ge'onim*).

It is permitted to stab an ignoramus on Yom Kippur – מוֹתֵר לְנוֹחֵר בְּיוֹם הַכִּיפּוּרִים: Some explain that this refers to an ignoramus who was attempting to murder someone or who was chasing a young betrothed woman in order to rape her. In such a case it is permitted to save the potential victim by killing the pursuer by any means necessary (Rif). Indeed, this is the case with regard to any type of pursuer who is on his way to commit these sins (see Ran). An ignoramus is specified only because he is more likely to commit such a crime (Ritva), as it is difficult to attribute this behavior to a Torah scholar (*Me'iri*). Most commentaries hold that this is an exaggeration and is stated only in order to encourage the study of Torah and to encourage people to keep their distance from ignoramuses (Rav Sherira Gaon; Ran; Ritva; and others).

If we did not need – אֵילְמָלֵא אֲנִי צְרִיכִין: Some understand this statement in the following manner: If Torah scholars did not need the ignoramuses, they would create more boundaries between the two groups, engendering even greater animosity between them (*Hokhmatah Man'ah*).

As though he had sexual relations with the ignoramus's betrothed bride – כְּאִילוּ בּוּעַל אֲרוֹסָתוֹ: Some explain this expression in the following way: This is similar to a case where a man does not recognize the good qualities of his betrothed bride and divorces her, and she subsequently marries a superior man. When her first husband sees her new husband, he will certainly be anguished. Similarly, the ignoramus, who despised the study of Torah, will surely be anguished when he sees the Torah scholar engaged in Torah study (*Petaḥ Einayim*).

תֵּנָא, רַבִּי אֹמֵר: עִם הָאֶרֶץ אָסוּר לֶאֱכֹל בְּשַׂר (בְּהֵמָה), שְׁנֵאמַר: "זֹאת תּוֹרַת הַבְּהֵמָה וְהָעוֹף" כֹּל הָעוֹסֵק בַּתּוֹרָה – מוֹתֵר לֶאֱכֹל בְּשַׂר בְּהֵמָה וְעוֹף, וְכֹל שְׂאִינוּ עוֹסֵק בַּתּוֹרָה – אָסוּר לֶאֱכֹל בְּשַׂר בְּהֵמָה וְעוֹף.

The Gemara continues its discussion with regard to an ignoramus. It was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: It is prohibited for an ignoramus to eat meat, as it is stated: "This is the law [*torah*] of the beast and of the fowl" (Leviticus 11:46). He expounds: Anyone who engages in Torah study is permitted to eat the meat of animals and fowl, and anyone who does not engage in Torah study is prohibited to eat the meat of animals or fowl.^N

אָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר: עִם הָאֶרֶץ מוֹתֵר לְנוֹחֵר בְּיוֹם הַכִּיפּוּרִים שְׁחַל לְהֵיוֹת בְּשַׁבָּת. אָמְרוּ לוֹ תַלְמִידָיו: רַבִּי, אָמַר לְהֵן: זֶה – טְעוֹן בְּרַכָּה, וְזֶה – אֵינוּ טְעוֹן בְּרַכָּה.

The Gemara proceeds to mention some sharply negative statements of the Sages in which they overstated their negative sentiments with regard to ignoramuses, although these ignoramuses were wicked in addition to being boors (*ge'onim*). Rabbi Elazar said: It is permitted to stab an ignoramus to death on Yom Kippur^N that occurs on Shabbat. His students said to him: Master, at least say that it is permitted to slaughter him. He said to them: I intentionally used the word stab, as this term, slaughtering, requires a blessing when one slaughters an animal, and that term, stabbing, does not require a blessing in any context.

אָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר: עִם הָאֶרֶץ אָסוּר לְהִתְלוֹוֹת עִמּוֹ בְּדֶרֶךְ, שְׁנֵאמַר: "כִּי הִיא חַיִּיךָ וְאוֹרֶךְ יָמֶיךָ" עַל חַיִּי לֹא חָס – עַל חַיִּי חֲבִירוֹ לֹא כָּל שָׂבָן.

Rabbi Elazar said: It is prohibited to accompany an ignoramus while traveling on the road due to concern that the ignoramus might try to harm his traveling partner, as it is stated with regard to Torah: "For it is your life and the length of your days" (Deuteronomy 30:20). An ignoramus has not studied any Torah, indicating that he is not concerned about his own life; with regard to another's life, all the more so.

אָמַר רַבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל בְּרַ נַחֲמָנִי אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: עִם הָאֶרֶץ מוֹתֵר לְקוֹרְעוֹ כְּדָג. אָמַר רַבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל בְּרַ יִצְחָק: וּמַגְבֹּו.

Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that Rabbi Yohanan said: It is permitted to tear open an ignoramus like a fish. Rabbi Shmuel bar Yitzhak said: And one may cut him open from his back and thereby cause his immediate death by piercing his spinal cord rather than his stomach.

תֵּנָא, אָמַר רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא: כִּשְׁהֵייתִי עִם הָאֶרֶץ אֲמַרְתִּי: מִי יִתֵּן לִי תַלְמִיד חָכֵם וְאֵנְשִׁכְנוּ כַחֲמוֹר. אָמְרוּ לוֹ תַלְמִידָיו: רַבִּי, אָמַר כְּכֹל! אָמַר לְהֵן: זֶה – נוֹשֵׁךְ וְשׁוֹבֵר עֲצָם, וְזֶה – נוֹשֵׁךְ וְאֵינוּ שׁוֹבֵר עֲצָם.

It was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Akiva said: When I was an ignoramus I said: Who will give me a Torah scholar so that I will bite him like a donkey? His students said to him: Master, say that you would bite him like a dog! He said to them: I specifically used that wording, as this one, a donkey, bites and breaks bones, and that one, a dog, bites but does not break bones.

תֵּנָא, הִיָּה רַבִּי מֵאִיר אֹמֵר: כֹּל הַמְשִׂיא בִּתּוֹ לְעִם הָאֶרֶץ – כְּאִילוּ בּוֹפְתָהּ וּמְנַחֶהּ לְפָנֵי אַרְיֵי מָה אַרְי דּוֹרֵס וְאוֹכֵל וְאֵין לוֹ בּוֹשֶׁת פָּנִים – אֵף עִם הָאֶרֶץ מְכָה וּבוּעַל וְאֵין לוֹ בּוֹשֶׁת פָּנִים.

It was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Meir would say: Anyone who marries off his daughter to an ignoramus is considered as though he binds her and places her before a lion. Why is this so? Just as a lion mauls its prey and eats and has no shame, so too, an ignoramus strikes his wife and then engages in sexual relations with her without appeasing her first, and has no shame.

תֵּנָא, רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר אֹמֵר: אֵילְמָלֵא אֲנִי צְרִיכִין לְהָם לְמַשָּׂא וּמִתָּן – הֵיוּ הוֹרְגִין אוֹתָנוּ.

It was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Eliezer says: If we did not need^N the ignoramuses for business, they would kill us.

תֵּנָא רַבִּי חִיָּיא: כֹּל הָעוֹסֵק בַּתּוֹרָה לְפָנֵי עִם הָאֶרֶץ – כְּאִילוּ בּוּעַל אֲרוֹסָתוֹ בְּפָנָיו, שְׁנֵאמַר: "תּוֹרָה צִוָּה לָנוּ מִשָּׁה מוֹרְשָׁה" אֵל תִּקְרִי "מוֹרְשָׁה" אֵלֵא "מְאֹרְסָה".

The Gemara shifts to a discussion of an ignoramus who has some degree of sensitivity (*Me'iri*). Rabbi Hiyya taught: Anyone who engages in Torah study in the presence of an ignoramus, causing the ignoramus embarrassment and anguish over his inability to study Torah, is considered as though he had sexual relations with the ignoramus's betrothed bride^N in his presence, as it is stated: "Moses commanded us the Torah, an inheritance [*morasha*] for the congregation of Jacob" (Deuteronomy 33:4). Do not read it as inheritance [*morasha*]; rather, read it as betrothed [*me'orasa*]. The Torah is compared to the betrothed bride of the Jewish people until one studies it and thereby consummates his marriage with it.

The wives hate Torah scholars more than the ignoramuses themselves – נשׂוּתֵיהֶן יוֹתֵר מֵהֶן: The reason for this is because the women are not involved in business and thus have less interaction with Torah scholars. The only knowledge these women have of Torah scholars is with regard to the distance the Torah scholars created between the groups. Therefore, the wives hate them to a greater degree.

Statements were made with regard to ignoramuses – דְּבָרִים נֶאֱמָרוּ בְּעַמֵּי הָאָרֶץ: They should not be selected to witness an action, since they lack the knowledge to know what to scrutinize in witnessing; their testimony is not accepted out of concern that they report imprecisely, embellish upon what they saw or heard, or testify based on that which seems to be correct without verifying that it is true; they should not be appointed as guardians over charity funds due to a concern that they will divide the money inequitably (Rabbeinu Yehonatan); and one should not accompany them when traveling, as they are unfamiliar with or unconcerned about the concept: “You shall not stand over your fellow’s blood” (Leviticus 19:16), and consequently in a dangerous situation they will flee rather than save their traveling companions (*Me’iri*).

HALAKHA

The testimony of an ignoramus – עֵדוּת עִם הָאָרֶץ: One who has not studied Torah and Mishna and has no profession may serve as a witness only if he is known to be upright and to act properly. Some say, based on Rabbi Yosei’s statement, that we are not particular about this today (*Shulhan Arukh, Hoshen Mishpat* 34:17).

An ignoramus as a steward – אֶפּוֹטְרוֹפּוֹס עִם הָאָרֶץ: When a court appoints a guardian over an estate of orphans, an ignoramus should not be appointed to this position because he is suspected of improper conduct (*Shulhan Arukh, Hoshen Mishpat* 290:2).

Zimmun for an olive-bulk of food – זִמּוּן בְּכֵזַיִת: One who eats an olive-bulk of bread is required to join a *zimmun* and recite Grace after Meals, as stated in tractate *Berakhot* (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 184:6, 196:4).

LANGUAGE

Steward [apotropos] – אֶפּוֹטְרוֹפּוֹס: From the Greek ἐπίτροπος, *epitropos*, meaning appointee or guardian of an estate.

גְּדוּלַּת שִׂנְאָה שֶׁשׂוֹנְאֵי עַמֵּי הָאָרֶץ לְתַלְמֵיד חָכָם, יוֹתֵר מִשִּׂנְאָה שֶׁשׂוֹנְאֵי אוֹיְמוֹת הָעוֹלָם אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל, וְנִשְׂוֵתֵיהֶן יוֹתֵר מֵהֶן. תָּנָא: שָׂנְאָה וּפְיִירֵשׁ – יוֹתֵר מִבּוֹלָן.

תְּנִי רַבְנֵי: שֶׁשָּׂה דְּבָרִים נֶאֱמָרוּ בְּעַמֵּי הָאָרֶץ: אֵין מוֹסְרִין לָהֶן עֵדוּת, וְאֵין מְקַבְּלִין מִמֶּנּוּ עֵדוּת, וְאֵין מְגַלִּין לָהֶן סוּד, וְאֵין מְמַנִּין אוֹתָן אֶפּוֹטְרוֹפּוֹס עַל הִיתוּמֵם, וְאֵין מְמַנִּין אוֹתָן אֶפּוֹטְרוֹפּוֹס עַל קוֹפְפָה שֶׁל צְדָקָה, וְאֵין מְתַלִּין עִמָּהֶן בְּדֶרֶךְ. וְיֵשׁ אוֹמְרִים: אִף אֵין מְכַרְזִין עַל אֲבִידָתוֹ.

וְתַנָּא קָמָא: זְמַנִּין דְּנִפְיָק מִיָּמִיה זָרְעָא מְעַלְיָא וְאֲכִיל לֵיהּ, שְׁנַאֲמַר: “יִכֵּן וְצָדִיק יִלְבֹּשׁ.”

“יִכֵּן מִי שִׁינְעָא וְכוּ.”

לְמִימְרָא דְרַבִּי מֵאִיר סָבַר בְּבִיצָה הוּא דְחָשִׁיב, וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה סָבַר בְּזַיִת נְמִי חָשִׁיב? וְרַבִּי מֵאִיר: עַד כְּזַיִת, וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר: עַד בְּבִיצָה!

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מוֹחֲלֶפֶת הִשְׁטִיטָה.

אֲבַיִי אָמַר: לְעוֹלָם לֹא תִפּוּדְךָ; הָתָם בְּקִרְאֵי פְּלִיגִי, הָכָא בְּסָבְרָא פְּלִיגִי. הָתָם בְּקִרְאֵי פְּלִיגִי, רַבִּי מֵאִיר סָבַר: “וְאֲכַלְתָּ” – זֶה אֲכִילָה, “וְשָׂבַעְתָּ” – זֶה שְׂוִתָּה, וְאֲכִילָה בְּכֵזַיִת. וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה סָבַר: “וְאֲכַלְתָּ וְשָׂבַעְתָּ” – אֲכִילָה שְׁשִׁי בָּהּ שְׂבִיעָה, וְאֵינוֹ זֶה – בְּכִיצָה.

הָכָא בְּסָבְרָא פְּלִיגִי. דְרַבִּי מֵאִיר סָבַר: חוֹרְתוֹ כְּטוּמְאָתוֹ, מִה טוּמְאָתוֹ בְּכִיצָה – אִף חוֹרְתוֹ בְּכִיצָה, וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה סָבַר: חוֹרְתוֹ

Similarly, he said: **The hatred which ignoramuses have for a Torah scholar is greater than the hatred that the nations of the world have for the Jewish people. And the wives of the ignoramuses hate Torah scholars more than the ignoramuses themselves.**^N It was taught in the *Tosefta* that one who studied Torah and left his studies hates Torah scholars more than all of them.

The Sages taught: **Six statements were made with regard to ignoramuses:**^N **One may not entrust them with testimony,**^H i.e., one may not appoint them as witnesses to a particular event or transaction. Additionally, **one may not accept testimony from them**, as they are not considered trustworthy, and **one should not reveal a secret to them**, as they will reveal it. **One may not appoint them as steward** [*apotropos*]^L **over an estate belonging to orphans,**^H due to concern that they might make improper use of the orphans’ property. Likewise, **one may not appoint them as guardian over a charity fund.** Finally, **one should not accompany them while traveling on the road**, due to concern for one’s safety. **And there are those who say: One does not even announce their lost items**, meaning that if one finds a lost article from such a person, he is allowed to keep it without making an effort to locate the owner (*Me’iri*).

The Gemara asks: What is the reasoning of the first *tanna*, who holds that one must announce having found the lost article of an ignoramus? The Gemara explains: **Sometimes upstanding offspring will come from him and will consume the property, as it is stated: “He may prepare it but the just shall put it on”** (Job 27:17). It is possible for a wicked person to prepare something for himself that will later be used by a righteous person.

The Gemara returns to explaining the mishna. It was taught: **And so too, one who left Jerusalem with sacrificial meat in his possession must return to Jerusalem to burn it**, just as one is required to return in order to remove leaven from his possession. According to Rabbi Meir, this *halakha* applies with regard to an egg-bulk of sacrificial meat or leaven, whereas Rabbi Yehuda disagrees and says the minimum amount for both is an olive-bulk.

The Gemara asks: **Is that to say that Rabbi Meir holds that an egg-bulk is the minimal amount that is considered significant, and Rabbi Yehuda holds that an olive-bulk is also considered significant?** The Gemara raises a contradiction from a mishna in *Berakhot*: **How much food must one eat in order to obligate those with whom he ate in a *zimmun*?** An olive-bulk of food^H is sufficient according to the unattributed opinion in the mishna, which is generally that of Rabbi Meir. **And Rabbi Yehuda says: An egg-bulk is the minimum measure to obligate those with whom one ate in a *zimmun*.** This seems to contradict the opinions of Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda stated in the mishna here.

Rabbi Yohanan said: **The opinions are reversed** in one of these sources, and must be emended.

Abaye said: **Actually, do not reverse the opinions. There, they disagree with regard to the interpretation of verses, while here, they disagree with regard to logical reasoning.** How so? **There**, with regard to *zimmun*, **they disagree with regard to the interpretation of verses. Rabbi Meir holds that the verse: “And you shall eat and be satisfied and bless the Lord your God”** (Deuteronomy 8:10) should be understood as follows: **“And you shall eat,” that is eating; “and be satisfied,” that is drinking.** The standard halakhic principle is that eating is defined as the consumption of an olive-bulk. **And Rabbi Yehuda holds: “And you shall eat and you shall be satisfied” refers to eating that includes satisfaction. And what is considered eating with satisfaction? It is consumption of an egg-bulk.**

However, **here**, in the cases of leaven and consecrated food, **they disagree not with regard to the interpretation of verses but with regard to logical reasoning, as Rabbi Meir holds: The requirement to return consecrated food is analogous to its ritual impurity. 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**