

יש אחריה היתר. וקדושת ירושלים
אין אחריה היתר.

גמ' אמר רבי יצחק: שמעתי
שמקריבין בבית חוניו בזמן הזה.
קסבר: בית חוניו לאו בית עבודה זרה
היא, וקא סבר: קדושה ראשונה –
קדושה לשעתה ולא קדושה לעתיד
לבוא.

דכתוב: "כי לא באתם עד עתה אל
המנוחה ואל הנחלה", "מנוחה" – זו
שילה, "נחלה" – זו ירושלים. מקיש
נחלה למנוחה; מה מנוחה יש אחריה
היתר – אף נחלה יש אחריה היתר.

אמרו ליה: אמרת? אמר להו: לא.
אמר רבא: האלהים! אמרה, וגמירנא
לה מיניה.

ומאי טעמא קא הדר ביה? משום
קשיא דרב מרי. דמותיב רב מרי:
קדושת שילה יש אחריה היתר,
קדושת ירושלים אין אחריה היתר.
ועוד תנן: משבאו לירושלים נאסרו
הבמות, ולא היה להם עוד היתר,
והיא היתה לנחלה.

after the Tabernacle was destroyed, there is permission to sacrifice offerings on improvised altars. But with regard to the sanctity of Jerusalem, after the Temple was destroyed, there is no permission to sacrifice offerings on improvised altars, as the prohibition^h remains intact.

GEMARA Rabbi Yitzhak said: I heard that one sacrifices offerings in the temple of Onias in Egypt at the present time. The Gemara cites the basis for the statement of Rabbi Yitzhak. He maintains that the temple of Onias is not a house of idol worship but rather a temple devoted to the service of God, and he maintains that the initial consecration sanctified Jerusalem for its time and did not sanctify Jerusalem forever. Therefore, after the destruction of the Temple, the sanctity of Jerusalem lapsed and the sacrifice of offerings elsewhere was no longer prohibited. For these reasons it was permitted to sacrifice offerings in the temple of Onias after the Temple was destroyed.

The Gemara cites the source of this *halakha*. It is as it is written: "For you are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance" (Deuteronomy 12:9), which is interpreted: "Rest," this is Shiloh; "inheritance," this is Jerusalem. The verse juxtaposes and likens inheritance to rest: Just as in the place of rest, Shiloh, after its destruction there is permission to sacrifice offerings on improvised altars, so too in the place of inheritance, Jerusalem, after its destruction there is permission to sacrifice offerings on improvised altars.

The Gemara reports that the other Sages said to Rabbi Yitzhak: Did you say this *halakha* with regard to the temple of Onias? He said to them: No, I did not say that.ⁿ Rava said, reinforcing his assertion with an oath: By God! Rabbi Yitzhak did in fact say this, and I myself learned it from him, but he later retracted this ruling.

The Gemara asks: And what is the reason he retracted his ruling?ⁿ The Gemara explains: It is due to the difficulty raised by Rav Mari, as Rav Mari raised an objection from the mishna: With regard to the sanctity of Shiloh, after the Tabernacle was destroyed there is permission to sacrifice offerings on improvised altars. But with regard to the sanctity of Jerusalem, after the Temple was destroyed there is no permission to sacrifice offerings on improvised altars. And furthermore, we learned in a mishna (*Zevahim* 112b): Once they came to Jerusalem, improvised altars were prohibited, and they did not again have permission to do so, and Jerusalem became the everlasting inheritance.

NOTES

אמרת? אמר להו: לא. The Rashba writes that there is no definitive proof from here that Rabbi Yitzhak completely retracted his opinion. In other places in the Gemara there are cases where one of the Sages learned a certain matter from his teachers. When that matter was challenged from various sources, although he continued to hold in accordance with that which he received from his teacher, rather than enter into a debate over the matter, he attempted to evade the challenge by saying that he never said it.

ומאי טעמא – אמרת? אמר להו: לא. As is ultimately proven later in the Gemara, there

is a tannaitic dispute, as well as a dispute between Rabbi Yohanan and Reish Lakish in tractate *Zevahim* with regard to this matter. Therefore, there was no need for him to retract his statement. Some explain that he retracted his statement because two unattributed *mishnayot* are very authoritative proofs, and in the face of those proofs, one cannot rely upon the opinion of an individual *tanna* (Rashba). Others write that initially Rav Yitzhak maintained that this dispute is parallel to the dispute between Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua. Once that parallel was rejected and there is no proof that they disagreed on this issue, he retracted his statement (*Penei Yehoshua*; *Turei Even*).

HALAKHA

The prohibition against improvised altars – איסור במות – After Solomon built the First Temple in Jerusalem, it was prohibited to sacrifice offerings anywhere else. The only Temple to the Lord is the one on Mount Moriah in Jerusalem, with regard to which it is stated: "This is My resting-place forever" (Psalms 132:14; Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 1:3).

Hangings for the Sanctuary – קלעים להיכל: Rashi says the Gemara seeks to prove from here that according to Rabbi Eliezer, the initial consecration sanctified Jerusalem for its time only and not forever. Consequently, hangings were necessary to establish barriers around the Temple in order to sanctify it. The hangings were later replaced with walls. Others seek to prove from the statement of Rabbi Eliezer that he maintained that the initial consecration sanctified Jerusalem forever, as otherwise, when they established the hangings they minimized the area of the Sanctuary, and it is prohibited to change its measurements. Therefore, it must be that the hangings were established for seclusion (*Ye'arot Devash*). The Meiri concurs with the first opinion, citing proof from tractate *Hagiga*, while Rabbeinu Tam rejects this proof.

First consecration and second consecration – קדושה ראשונה ושנייה: In terms of the Temple, the initial consecration is the establishment of the First Temple, built by Solomon, and the second consecration is the establishment of the Second Temple. However, with regard to the consecration of Eretz Yisrael, the initial consecration is the conquest of the land by Joshua and the second is the return of the exiles, led by Ezra, from Babylonia to Zion.

The initial consecration sanctified Jerusalem for its time and sanctified it forever – קדושה ראשונה קידשה לשעתה: With regard to this matter there is a fundamental dispute cited by *Tosafot* and the other early authorities here, and it apparently also relates to the dispute between the Rambam and the Ra'avad with regard to the sanctity of the Temple. Based on the Gemara here, there appears to be one question: Was the sanctity of the land abrogated by the destruction of the Second Temple? If it was, then the sanctity of Jerusalem was similarly abrogated.

However, in the opinion of the Rambam and many others, the sanctity of Jerusalem in terms of the prohibition against sacrificing offerings elsewhere and the sanctity of Eretz Yisrael are not interdependent. The sanctity of Jerusalem and the Temple was never abrogated, although the sanctity of Eretz Yisrael was. See the Rashba, who discusses this at length. Others write that Rabbi Yitzhak retracted his opinion due to those same considerations. Initially, he maintained that there is only one dispute here, basing his opinion on those who said the sanctity of the land was abrogated. However, once he realized that the sanctity of Jerusalem and the sanctity of Eretz Yisrael are not interdependent, and that there is no one who holds that the sanctity of Jerusalem was abrogated, he retracted his opinion (*Zikkaron BaSefer, Sefat Emet*).

HALAKHA

One sacrifices offerings even when there is no Temple – מקריבין אף על פי שאין בית: It is permitted to sacrifice all of the offerings even although the Temple is not standing. The offerings of the most sacred order may be eaten in the entire courtyard even though its walls are destroyed. Second tithe and offerings of lesser sanctity may be eaten throughout Jerusalem even if its walls are not standing, because the initial consecration sanctified Jerusalem for its time and forever, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 6:15).

תנאי היא: (דתנאי) אמר רבי אליעזר: שמעתי בשהיו בונין בהיכל עושין קלעים להיכל וקלעים לעזרה. אלא שבהיכל בונין מבחוץ, ובעזרה בונין מבפנים.

ואמר רבי יהושע: שמעתי שמקריבין אף על פי שאין בית, אוכלין קדשי קדשים אף על פי שאין קלעים, קדשים קלים ומעשר שני אף על פי שאין חומה. מפני שקדושה ראשונה – קידשה לשעתה, וקידשה לעתיד לבוא. מבבל דרבי אליעזר סבר: לא קידשה לעתיד לבוא.

אמר ליה רבינא לרב אשי: ממאי דלמא דכולי עלמא קדושה ראשונה – קידשה לשעתה, וקידשה לעתיד לבוא. ומר מאי דשמיע ליה קאמר, ומר מאי דשמיע ליה קאמר. וכי תימא קלעים לרבי אליעזר למה לי – לצניעותא בעלמא.

אליא, כי הני תנאי. דתנאי, אמר רבי ישמעאל ברבי יוסי: למה מנו חכמים את אלו? שבשעלו בני הגולה מצאו את אלו וקידשו, אבל הראשונות – בטלו משבטלה הארץ. אלמא קסבר: קדושה ראשונה קידשה לשעתה ולא קידשה לעתיד לבוא.

ורמינהו, אמר רבי ישמעאל ברבי יוסי: וכי אלו בלבד היו? והלא כבר נאמר: "ששים עיר כל חבל ארגוב", וכתוב: "כל אלה ערים בעורות חומה גבוהה" אלא למה מנו חכמים את אלו? שבשעלו בני הגולה מצאו אלו וקידשו.

The Gemara comments: This matter is subject to a dispute between *tanna'im*, as it is taught in a mishna (*Eduyyot* 8:6): Rabbi Eliezer said: I heard that when they were building the Sanctuary in the Second Temple, they fashioned temporary hangings for the Sanctuary^N and temporary hangings for the courtyard to serve as partitions until construction of the stone walls was completed. The difference was only that in building the Sanctuary, the workers built the walls outside the hangings, without entering, and in the courtyard, the workers built the walls inside the hangings.

And Rabbi Yehoshua said: I heard that one sacrifices offerings on the altar even though there is no Temple,^H one eats offerings of the most sacred order in the Temple courtyard even if there are no hangings, and one eats offerings of lesser sanctity and second tithe produce in Jerusalem even if there is no wall surrounding the city, due to the fact that the initial consecration^N sanctified Jerusalem for its time and also sanctified Jerusalem forever.^N Even if the walls do not exist, the sanctity remains intact. The Gemara concludes: From the fact that Rabbi Yehoshua based his opinion on the principle that the initial sanctification sanctified Jerusalem forever, by inference one can conclude that Rabbi Eliezer holds: It did not sanctify Jerusalem forever. Apparently, this issue is subject to a dispute between *tanna'im*.

Ravina said to Rav Ashi: From where do you draw this inference? Perhaps everyone maintains that the initial consecration sanctified Jerusalem for its time and also sanctified Jerusalem forever. And one Sage, Rabbi Eliezer, stated that tradition, which he heard from his teachers, and one Sage, Rabbi Yehoshua, stated that tradition, which he heard from his teachers, and there is no dispute between them. And if you would say: Why then do I need hangings at all according to Rabbi Eliezer? The original sanctity remained when Jerusalem was not surrounded by walls, and the presence or absence of hangings is irrelevant as well. The Gemara answers: The hangings were established merely for seclusion, as it would have been unbecoming for the activity in this most sacred venue to be visible to all.

Rather, this matter is subject to the dispute between these *tanna'im*, as it is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yosei, said: Why did the Sages enumerate these nine cities in tractate *Arakhin* as cities walled since the days of Joshua, son of Nun? Weren't there many more? As, when the exiles ascended to Eretz Yisrael from Babylonia, they discovered these cities and consecrated them as walled cities; but the sanctity of the first walled cities enumerated in the book of Joshua was negated when settlement in the land was negated and the Jewish people were exiled. Apparently, Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yosei, maintains: The initial consecration sanctified Jerusalem for its time only and did not sanctify Jerusalem forever.

The Gemara raises a contradiction from a different *baraita*. Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yosei, said: Were these cities that were enumerated in tractate *Arakhin* the only walled cities? Wasn't it already stated: "Sixty cities, all the region of Argov" (Deuteronomy 3:4), and concerning these cities it is written: "All these cities were fortified with high walls, gates and bars" (Deuteronomy 3:5), indicating that there were a great number of walled cities? Rather, why then did the Sages enumerate these specific cities? It is due to the fact that when the exiles ascended from Babylonia they discovered these and consecrated them as walled cities.

קידשים?!

The Gemara asks: Consecrated them? If their sanctity remained, why was it necessary to consecrate them?

הַשְׁתָּא [הא] אָמְרִי לֹא צְרִיכָא לְקַדְוִשֵׁי אֲלָא: מְצָאוּ אֶת אֵלֹהֵי וּמְנַאֵוּם.

וְלֹא אֵלֹהֵי בְלִבְדָּה, אֲלָא כָּל שְׁתַּעֲלָה לְךָ מִסֻּרְתָּ בִּידְךָ מֵאֲבוֹתֶיךָ שְׂמוּקֶפֶת חוֹמָה מִיָּמֹת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן נֹון – כָּל הַמִּצְוֹת הֵלְלוּ נוֹהֲגִין בָּהֶן, מִפְּנֵי שְׂקִדּוּשָׁה רַאשׁוֹנָה קִידְשָׁה לְשַׁעֲתָהּ וְקִידְשָׁה לְעֶתִיד לְבָא. קִשְׁיָא דְרַבִּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל אֲדַרְבֵּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל!

תְּרִי תִנְיָא אֲלִיבָא דְרַבִּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל בְּרַבִּי יוֹסִי, וְאִיבְעִית אִימָא: הָא – רַבִּי אֲלֵעָזָר בְּרַבִּי יוֹסִי אָמְרָה. דִּתְנִיָא, רַבִּי אֲלֵעָזָר בְּרַבִּי יוֹסִי אָמַר: “אֲשֶׁר לֹא חוֹמָה” – אִף עַל פִּי שְׂאִין לֹא עֲבָשׁוּ וְהָיָה לוֹ קוֹדֵם לְכֹן.

“וְהָיָה בְיָמֵי אַחַשְׁוֵרוּשׁ” אָמַר רַבִּי לֹוי וְאִיִּתִּימָא רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן: דְּבַר זֶה מִסֻּרְתָּ בִּידְנוּ מֵאֲנָשֵׁי כְּנַסַּת הַגְּדוּלָּה: כָּל מְקוֹם שְׁנֵאמַר “וְהָיָה” אֵינוֹ אֲלָא לְשׁוֹן צַעַר.

“וְהָיָה בְיָמֵי אַחַשְׁוֵרוּשׁ” – הָיָה הֶמֶן, וְהָיָה בְיָמֵי שְׁפוּט הַשׁוֹפְטִים – הָיָה רַעַב, וְהָיָה כִּי הִחַל הָאָדָם לְרֹב – “וַיֵּרָא ה’ כִּי רַבָּה רַעַת הָאָדָם”.

“וְהָיָה בְּנִסְעָם מִקְדָּם” – “הִבָּה נִבְנָה לָנוּ עִיר” וְהָיָה בְיָמֵי אֲמֶרְפֶּל – “עָשׂוּ מִלְחָמָה” וְהָיָה בְהַיּוֹת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בִּירִיחוֹ – “וַיַּחֲרָבוּ שְׁלֹפָה בְּיָדוֹ” וְהָיָה ה’ אֶת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ – “וַיִּמְעְלוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל” וְהָיָה אִישׁ אֶחָד מִן הָרַמְתִּים – “כִּי אֶת תְּנָה אָהַב וְה’ סָגַר רַחֲמָה”.

Now, didn't they say later in the same *baraita* that it is not necessary to consecrate them? Rather, this is what the *baraita* means to say: It is due to the fact that when the exiles ascended from Babylonia they discovered these and enumerated them.

The *baraita* continues. And not only these, but in any city with regard to which you receive a tradition from your ancestors that it was surrounded by a wall from the days of Joshua, son of Nun, all these mitzvot are observed in it, due to the fact that the initial consecration sanctified Jerusalem for its time and sanctified Jerusalem forever. This is difficult, as there is a contradiction between one statement of Rabbi Yishmael and another statement of Rabbi Yishmael.

The Gemara answers: This is a dispute between two later *tanna'im*, who hold according to the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yosei. Each transmitted Rabbi Yishmael's opinion in a different manner. And if you wish, say instead that one of the traditions is mistaken, as with regard to this statement, Rabbi Elazar bar Yosei said it, as it is taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Yosei,^p said^N that the verse states: “Which has [lo] a wall” (Leviticus 25:30). The word *lo* is written with an *alef*, meaning no, that it does not have a wall, but its vocalization is in the sense of its homonym, *lo* with a *vav*, meaning that it has a wall. This indicates that even though it does not presently have a wall, as it was destroyed, but it had a wall previously, it retains its status as a walled city. It is Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Yosei, who maintains that the first consecration sanctified Jerusalem forever.

§ The Gemara returns to the primary topic of this chapter, the book of Esther. The Gemara cites various aggadic interpretations of the verses of the Megilla. The opening verse of the Megilla states: “And it came to pass [vayhi] in the days of Ahasuerus” (Esther 1:1). Rabbi Levi said, and some say that it was Rabbi Yonatan who said: This matter is a tradition that we received from the members of the Great Assembly. Anywhere that the word *vayhi* is stated, it is an ominous term indicating nothing other than impending grief, as if the word were a contraction of the words *vai* and *hi*, meaning woe and mourning.

The Gemara cites several proofs corroborating this interpretation. “And it came to pass [vayhi] in the days of Ahasuerus” led to grief, as there was Haman. “And it came to pass [vayhi] in the days when the judges ruled” (Ruth 1:1) introduces a period when there was famine. “And it came to pass [vayhi], when men began to multiply” (Genesis 6:1) is immediately followed by the verse: “And the Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth” (Genesis 6:5).

“And it came to pass [vayhi] as they journeyed from the east” (Genesis 11:2) is followed by: “Come, let us build us a city” (Genesis 11:4), which led to the sin of the Tower of Babel. The Gemara cites further examples: “And it came to pass in the days of Amraphel” (Genesis 14:1), about whom it is stated: “These made war” (Genesis 14:2). Another verse states: “And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho” (Joshua 5:13), it was there that he saw an angel “with his sword drawn in his hand” as a warning. It is written: “And the Lord was [vayhi] with Joshua” (Joshua 6:27), and immediately afterward: “But the children of Israel committed a trespass” (Joshua 7:1). It states: “And it came to pass that there was a certain man of Ramathaim” (1 Samuel 1:1), and it mentions shortly afterward Hannah's inability to conceive: “For he loved Hannah, but the Lord had closed up her womb” (1 Samuel 1:5).

PERSONALITIES

רַבִּי אֲלֵעָזָר בְּרַבִּי יוֹסִי – Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Yosei – a fifth generation *tanna*, son of the *tanna* Rabbi Yosei ben Halafta. Rabbi Yosei had five sons, all ordained Sages. The most famous among them was Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yosei, a disciple-colleague of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Apparently, Rabbi Elazar was significantly older than his brother Rabbi Yishmael, as he participated in a delegation of Sages to Rome together with Rabbi Shimon bar Yoḥai, who was a contemporary of his father's. In several places in the Gemara, there are exchanges between Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon with regard to both halakhic and aggadic matters. During the visit to Rome, Rabbi Elazar was privileged to see the Temple vessels among the emperor's treasures, and he shared the details of what he saw there with the Sages. He traveled often, was an accomplished conversationalist and debater, and was a man of the world. Several of his halakhic and aggadic statements appear throughout the Talmud.

NOTES

As it is taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Yosei, said – דִּתְנִיָא רַבִּי אֲלֵעָזָר בְּרַבִּי יוֹסִי אָמַר – The Ramban writes that this *baraita* is not actually dealing with the sanctity of Jerusalem or of Eretz Yisrael. The very existence of a specific verse dealing with the status of walled cities indicates that this is a separate discussion. This statement is cited here only to indicate that Rabbi Elazar, son of Yosei, dealt with a related issue, and it is conceivable that he was the *tanna* of one of the *baraitot* cited earlier.

“וַיְהִי (כִּי) זָקֵן שְׁמוֹ אֶל־” – “וְלֹא הִלְכוּ בְנָיו בְּדַרְכָּיו.” “וַיְהִי דָוִד לְכָל דַּרְכָּיו מִשְׁפִּיל [וְהָ] עֵמּוּ” – “וַיְהִי שְׂאוֹל עֵינָיו אֶת דָּוִד.” “וַיְהִי כִּי יָשָׁב הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּבֵיתוֹ” – “רַק אֶתְּהָ לֹא תִבְנֶה הַבַּיִת.”

וְהַכְּתִיב: “וַיְהִי בַיּוֹם הַשְּׁמִינִי, וְתִנְיָ: אוֹתוֹ הַיּוֹם הַיְתֵדָה שְׂמֵחָה לְפָנֵי הַקָּדוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא כַּיּוֹם שֶׁנִּבְרָאוּ בוֹ שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ, כְּתִיב הַכֹּא: “וַיְהִי בַיּוֹם הַשְּׁמִינִי” וְכִתִּיב הַתָּם: “וַיְהִי (בְּקָר) יוֹם אֶחָד!”

הָא שְׂכִיב נָדָב וְאָבִיהוּא.

וְהַכְּתִיב: “וַיְהִי בְשִׁמּוֹנִים שָׁנָה וָאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה!” וְהַכְּתִיב: “וַיְהִי כְּאִשׁוֹר רָאָה יַעֲקֹב אֶת רָחֵל!” וְהַכְּתִיב: “וַיְהִי עָרֵב וַיְהִי בְּקָר יוֹם אֶחָד!” וְהָאִיכָא שָׁנָה, וְהָאִיכָא שְׁלִישִׁי, וְהָאִיכָא טוּבָא!

אָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי: כָּל “וַיְהִי” – אִיכָא הָכִי, וְאִיכָא הָכִי, “וַיְהִי בִימֵי” אִינּוּ אֶלָּא לְשׁוֹן צַעַר.

חֲמֵשָׁה “וַיְהִי בִימֵי” הֵווּ: “וַיְהִי בִימֵי אַחְשָׁרוּשׁ”, “וַיְהִי בִימֵי שְׁפוֹט הַשׁוֹפְטִים”, “וַיְהִי בִימֵי אֲמֶרְפֶּל”, “וַיְהִי בִימֵי אָחָז”, “וַיְהִי בִימֵי יְהוֹאִקִים.”

(אָמַר רַבִּי) לְוִי: דְּבַר זֶה מְסוּרָת בְּיַדֵּנוּ מֵאַבּוֹתֵינוּ: אֲמוֹץ וְאַמְצִיָּה אֲחִים הָווּ. מֵאִי קָא מְשַׁמְעֵן לָן?

Similarly, the verse states: “And it came to pass, when Samuel was old” (I Samuel 8:1), and then it is written: “And his sons did not walk in his ways” (I Samuel 8:3). Also, it states: “And it came to pass that David was successful in all his ways, and the Lord was with him” (I Samuel 18:14), and only a few verses prior it is written: “And Saul viewed David with suspicion” (I Samuel 18:9). In another instance, the verse states: “And it came to pass, when the king dwelt in his house” (II Samuel 7:1). Here King David mentioned his desire to build a temple for God, but it is written elsewhere that he was told: “Yet you shall not build the house” (II Chronicles 6:9).

After citing several verses where *vayhi* portends grief, the Gemara mentions a number of verses that seem to indicate otherwise. **But isn’t it written:** “And it came to pass [*vayhi*] on the eighth day” (Leviticus 9:1), which was the day of the dedication of the Tabernacle? **And it is taught** in a *baraita* with regard to that day: **On that day there was joy before the Holy One, Blessed be He, similar to the joy that existed on the day on which the heavens and earth were created.** The Gemara cites a verbal analogy in support of this statement. **It is written here, with regard to the dedication of the Tabernacle: “And it came to pass [*vayhi*] on the eighth day,” and it is written there, in the Creation story: “And it was [*vayhi*] evening, and it was morning, one day” (Genesis 1:5).** This indicates that there was joy on the eighth day, when the Tabernacle was dedicated, similar to the joy that existed on the day the world was created. Apparently, the term *vayhi* is not necessarily a portent of grief.

The Gemara answers: This verse does not contradict the principle. On the day of the dedication of the Tabernacle, a calamity also befell the people, as **Nadav and Avihu died.**

The Gemara cites additional verses where *vayhi* is not indicative of impending grief: **But isn’t it written: “And it came to pass [*vayhi*] in the four hundred and eightieth year” (I Kings 6:1),** which discusses the joyous occasion of the building of the Temple? **And furthermore, isn’t it written: “And it came to pass [*vayhi*] when Jacob saw Rachel” (Genesis 29:10),** which was a momentous occasion? **And isn’t it written: “And it was [*vayhi*] evening, and it was [*vayhi*] morning, one day” (Genesis 1:5)? And isn’t there the second day of Creation, and isn’t there the third day, where the term *vayhi* is used? And aren’t there many verses in the Bible in which the term *vayhi* appears and no grief ensues? Apparently, the proposed principle is incorrect.**

Rather, Rav Ashi said: With regard to every instance of *vayhi* alone, **there are some that mean this, grief, and there are some that mean that, joy.** However, wherever the phrase “and it came to pass in the days of [*vayhi bimeit*]”^N is used in the Bible, **it is nothing other than a term of impending grief.**

The Gemara states that **there are five instances of *vayhi bimeit* in the Bible.** “And it came to pass in the days of [*vayhi bimeit*] Ahasuerus”; “And it came to pass in the days [*vayhi bimeit*] when the judges ruled”; “And it came to pass in the days of [*vayhi bimeit*] Amraphel”; “And it came to pass in the days of [*vayhi bimeit*] Ahaz” (Isaiah 7:1); “And it came to pass in the days of [*vayhi bimeit*] Jehoiakim” (Jeremiah 1:3).^N In all those incidents, grief ensued.

Ⓢ Apropos the tradition cited by Rabbi Levi above, the Gemara cites additional traditions that he transmitted. **Rabbi Levi said: This matter is a tradition that we received from our ancestors: Amoz, father of Isaiah, and Amaziah, king of Judea, were brothers.** The Gemara questions: **What novel element is this statement teaching us?**

NOTES

And it came to pass... And it came to pass in the days of – וַיְהִי... וַיְהִי בִימֵי: The Gemara explains the basis for associating the term *vayhi*, and it came to pass, with grief by viewing the word as *vai* and *hi*, meaning woe and mourning (see 11a). This explanation is also found in the midrash, which elucidates the term *vayhi* as used to express extremes. In instances of joy and happiness it expresses extreme happiness, while in cases of trouble and grief it refers to overwhelming calamity. There are those who understand Rav Ashi’s statement in the Gemara in this manner.

Others explain that when it is written: “And it came to pass,” it is possible that the phrase is not indicative of constant misfortune. However, when it is written: “And it came to pass in the days,” the verse is referring to an extended period of time, and the expression is always indicative of grief (*Gal Naul*; see *Or Hadash*).

And it came to pass in the days of Ahaz, And it came to pass in the days of Jehoiakim – וַיְהִי בִימֵי אָחָז, וַיְהִי בִימֵי יְהוֹאִקִים: The Gemara does not state explicitly what form of suffering befell the people during these periods. The Maharsha explains that it is unnecessary to do so, as the passages in the Bible following these verses detail the suffering that occurred to the Jews, including being besieged and defeated in battle.

כַּנֶּפֶף הַכְּרוּבִים הָאֶחָד עֶשְׂרֵי אַמּוֹת – The wing of one of the cherubs was ten cubits –



Cherubs in the First Temple

כְּתָב, לְשׁוֹן, וּמְלֻכּוּת – Writing, language, and kingdom:

After the Babylonian Empire fell to the Persians, many cultural changes occurred. Babylonian cuneiform writing and Akkadian, the Babylonian language, stopped being used and were replaced with the Aramaic alphabet and the Aramaic language. Babylonia as an independent kingdom also ceased to exist, and it remained as a mere district of the great Persian Empire.

LANGUAGE

Offspring [nin] – נִין: The exact definition of this word is unclear, and the commentaries offer several opinions as to its meaning. In a number of contexts, it appears to refer to progeny, either a son or a more distant descendant. However, the textual similarity to the verb *yinon* in the verse “May His name endure forever; may His name be continued [*yinon*] as long as the sun” (Psalms 72:17) would seem to indicate that the word *nin* means enduring existence. In that context, *nin* would seem to refer to any form of continued existence or remembrance.

כִּי הָא דְאָמַר רַבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר נַחֲמָנִי אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן: כָּל כְּלָה שְׁהִיא צְנוּעָה בְּבֵית חַמֵּיהּ, זֹכָה וְיוֹצֵאִין מִמֶּנָּה מְלָכִים וְנְבִיאִים. מִנְּלָן – מִתְמַר. דְּכַתְּבִיב: “וַיִּרְאֶה יְהוָה וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ לְזוֹנָה כִּי כִסְתָה פָּנֶיהָ. מִשּׁוּם דְּכִסְתָהּ פָּנֶיהָ וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ לְזוֹנָה?!”

אֲלֵא: מִשּׁוּם דְּכִסְתָהּ פָּנֶיהָ בְּבֵית חַמֵּיהּ וְלֹא הוּא יָדַע לָהּ, זְכַתָּה וְיוֹצֵאִין מִמֶּנָּה מְלָכִים וְנְבִיאִים. מְלָכִים – מִדָּוִד, נְבִיאִים – דְּאָמַר רַבִּי לִוִּי: מִסְּפֹרֶת בְּיַדְנִי מֵאַבְוֹתַיִנּוּ. אָמוֹץ וְאַמְצִיָּה אַחִים הָיוּ. וְכַתְּבִיב: “חֲזוֹן יִשְׁעֵיהוּ בֶן אָמוֹץ.”

וְאָמַר רַבִּי לִוִּי: דְּבַר זֶה מִסְּפֹרֶת בְּיַדְנִי מֵאַבְוֹתַיִנּוּ: מְקוּם אֲרוֹן אֵינוֹ מִן הַמִּדְּבָר.

תִּנְיָא נְמִי הֵכִי: אֲרוֹן שְׁעֵשָׂה מִשָּׁה יֵשׁ לֹו עֶשְׂרֵי אַמּוֹת לְכָל רוּחַ, וְכַתְּבִיב: “וְלִפְנֵי הַדְּבַר עֶשְׂרִים אַמָּה אֹרְךָ,” וְכַתְּבִיב: “כַּנֶּפֶף הַכְּרוּבִים הָאֶחָד עֶשְׂרֵי אַמּוֹת וְכַנֶּפֶף הַכְּרוּבִים הָאֶחָד עֶשְׂרֵי אַמּוֹת.” אֲרוֹן גּוֹפִיָּה הֵיכָא הָיָה קָאִי? אֲלֵא לֹא שְׁמַע מִינָּה: בְּנִים הָיָה עוֹמֵד.

רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן פָּתַח לָהּ פִּתְחָא לְהָאִי פְּרִשְׁתָּא מֵהָכָא: “וְקָמְתִי עֲלֵיהֶם” וְגוֹי “וְהִכְרַתִּי לְבַבְלַיִם שֵׁם וְשִׂאָר וְנִין וְנֹכַד נָאִם ה’.” “שֵׁם” – זֶה הַכְּתָב, “שִׂאָר” – זֶה לְשׁוֹן, “נִין” – זֶה מְלָכוּת, “וְנֹכַד” – זֶה וְשִׁתִּי.

The Gemara responds: It is in accordance with that which Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: Any bride who is modestⁿ in the house of her father-in-law merits that kings and prophets will emerge from her. From where do we derive this? From Tamar, as it is written: “When Judah saw her, he thought her to be a prostitute; for she had covered her face” (Genesis 38:15). Can it be that because Tamar covered her face he thought her to be a prostitute? On the contrary, a harlot tends to uncover her face.

Rather, because she covered her face in the house of her father-in-law and he was not familiar with her appearance, Judah didn’t recognize Tamar, thought she was a harlot, and sought to have sexual relations with her. Ultimately, she merited that kings and prophets emerged from her. Kings emerged from her through David, who was a descendant of Tamar’s son, Peretz. However, there is no explicit mention that she was the forebear of prophets. This is derived from that which Rabbi Levi said: This matter is a tradition that we received from our ancestors. Amoz, father of Isaiah, and Amaziah, king of Judea, were brothers,ⁿ and it is written: “The vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz” (Isaiah 1:1). Amoz was a member of the Davidic dynasty, and his son, the prophet Isaiah, was also a descendant of Tamar.

And Rabbi Levi said: This matter is a tradition that we received from our ancestors: The place of the Ark of the Covenant is not included in the measurement of the Holy of Holies in which it rested.

The Gemara comments: This is also taught in a *baraita*: The Ark crafted by Moses had ten cubits of empty space on each side. And it is written in the description of Solomon’s Temple: “And before the Sanctuary, which was twenty cubits in length, and twenty cubits in breadth” (1 Kings 6:20). The place “before the Sanctuary” is referring to the Holy of Holies. It was twenty by twenty cubits. If there were ten cubits of empty space on either side of the Ark, apparently the Ark itself occupied no space. And it is written: And the wing of one of the cherubs was ten cubits^b and the wing of the other cherub was ten cubits; the wings of the cherubs occupied the entire area. If so, where was the Ark itself standing? Rather, must one not conclude from it that the Ark stood by means of a miracle and occupied no space?

§ The Gemara cites prologues utilized by various Sages to introduce study of the Megilla: Rabbi Yonatan introduced this passage,ⁿ the book of Esther, with an introduction from here: “For I will rise up against them, says the Lord of hosts, and cut off from Babylonia name, and remnant, and offspring [*nin*],¹ and posterity, says the Lord” (Isaiah 14:22). This verse may be interpreted homiletically: “Name,” this is the writing of ancient Babylonia that will disappear from the world. “Remnant,” this is the language of ancient Babylonia. “Offspring,” this is their kingdom.^b And “posterity,” this is Vashti, who according to tradition was Nebuchadnezzar’s granddaughter, and the book of Esther relates how she too was removed from the throne.

NOTES

Any bride who is modest – כָּל כְּלָה שְׁהִיא צְנוּעָה: Some write that this statement concerning the rewards of a woman who is modest is mentioned in this tractate to connect Rabbi Levi’s tradition with the subject of the Megilla. The Gemara relates Esther’s modesty and states that various miracles were performed in her merit as a result of it (*Re’ah Duda’im*).

Amoz and Amaziah were brothers – אָמוֹץ וְאַמְצִיָּה אַחִים הָיוּ: The *Ein Ya’akov* explains that, according to tradition, whenever a prophet’s name is stated while mentioning his father’s name as well, the text is indicating that his father was also a prophet (see 15a). The Maharsha adds that although King David and his son, King Solomon, were prophets, the Gemara did not mention them as proof that one who is modest will

merit descendants who are prophets. This is because they were distinguished primarily as monarchs, not prophets. The Gemara is seeking proof of this principle from individuals who were only prophets, and therefore it mentions Isaiah and Amoz, his father.

Introduced this passage – פִּתַּח לָהּ פִּתְחָא: It was a common practice of the Sages of that time to begin teaching a book of the Bible with the aggadic exposition of a verse from another book. These expositions impart a lesson pertinent to the book of the Bible that the Sage is ultimately teaching. These types of introductions are an integral part of aggadic midrash.

The *Penei Yehoshua* explains that although the Talmud rarely includes these forms of aggadic teachings, the numerous

introductions here are mentioned in order to support the decision to include the Scroll of Esther in the Bible, by presenting various examples of other books of the Bible alluding to the Scroll of Esther. Others explain that these introductions are intended to prove that the entire Megilla is significant, not only the central part recounting the actual miracle.

The Gemara cites a dispute concerning which sections of the Megilla must be read. These introductions are intended to prove that not only the story of the miracle should be read, but even the first part should be read as well. It appears to be an introduction, but it also has independent importance, as it reveals other miracles that the Holy One, Blessed be He, performed, i.e., how He fulfilled the prophecy to destroy Babylonia and all associated with it (*Ginzei HaMelekh*).

And upon all thorns – ובכל הנעוצים: The Maharsha questions the nature of the Gemara's proof, as there seems to be no indication in the verse that it is discussing idolatry, but he leaves his query unanswered. Perhaps the Gemara's understanding relies on the understanding of *Targum Yonatan*. He explains "thorns and brambles" to mean houses that are designated for idolatry.

רבי שמואל בר נחמני פתח לה פיתחא
להאי פרתא מהכא: "תחת הנעוצין
יעלה ברוש ותחת הסרפד יעלה הדם".

"תחת הנעוצין" – תחת המן הרשע
שעשה עצמו עבודה זרה, דכתיב: "ובכל
הנעוצים ובכל הנהלולים",

"יעלה ברוש" – זה מרדכי שנקרא ראש
לכל הבשמים, שנאמר: "ואתה קח לך
בשמים ראש מר דרור" ומתרגמין: מרי
דבי.

"תחת הסרפד" – תחת ושתה הרשעה
בת בנו של נבוכדנצר הרשע, ששרף
רפידת בית ה', דכתיב: "רפידתו זהב",

"יעלה הדם" – זו אסתר הצדקת,
שנקראת הדסה, שנאמר: "ויהי אומן
את הדסה". ויהיה לה לשם – זו מקרא
מגילה, "לאות עולם לא יפרת" – אלו
ימי פורים.

רבי יהושע בן לוי פתח לה פיתחא להאי
פרשתא מהכא: "והיה כאשר שש ה'
עליכם להיטיב אתכם", בן ישיש להרע
אתכם.

ומי חדי הקדוש ברוך הוא במפלתן של
רשעים? והא כתיב: "בצאת לפני החלוצין
ואומרים הודו לה' בי לעולם חסדו",
ואמר רבי יוחנן: מפני מה לא נאמר "כי
טוב" בהודאה זו – לפי שאין הקדוש
ברוך הוא שמח במפלתן של רשעים.

ואמר רבי יוחנן, מאי דכתיב: "ולא קרב
זה אל זה כל הלילה" – בקשו מלאכי
השרות לומר שירה, אמר הקדוש ברוך
הוא: מעשה ידי טובעין בינים ואתם
אומרים שירה!?

Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani introduced this passage with an introduction from here: "Instead of the thorn shall the cypress come up, and instead of the nettle shall the myrtle come up; and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off" (Isaiah 55:13). Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani interpreted the verse homiletically as referring to the righteous individuals who superseded the wicked ones in the book of Esther.

"Instead of the thorn"; this means instead of the wicked Haman. He is referred to as a thorn because he turned himself into an object of idol worship, as he decreed that all must prostrate themselves before him. The Gemara cites proof that the term thorn is used in connection with idol worship, as it is written: "And upon all thorns," and upon all brambles" (Isaiah 7:19), which is understood to be a reference to idol worship.

The next section of the verse discusses what will replace the thorns, i.e., Haman: "Shall the cypress [*berosh*] come up"; this is Mordecai. Why is he called a cypress [*berosh*]? Because he was called the chief [*rosh*] of all the spices, as it is stated: "Take you also to yourself the chief spices, of pure myrrh [*mar deror*]" (Exodus 30:23), and we translate "pure myrrh," into Aramaic as *mari dakhei*. Mordecai was like *mari dakhi*, the chief [*rosh*] of spices, and therefore he is called *berosh*.

The verse continues: "And instead of the nettle [*sirpad*]," this means instead of the wicked Vashti. Why is she called a nettle [*sirpad*]? Because she was the daughter of the son of the wicked Nebuchadnezzar, who burned the ceiling [*saraf refidat*] of the House of God, as it is written: "Its top [*refidato*] of gold" (Song of Songs 3:10).

The next section of the verse states: "Shall the myrtle [*hadass*] come up"; this is the righteous Esther, who was called Hadassah in the Megilla, as it is stated: "And he had brought up Hadassah; that is, Esther" (Esther 2:7). The concluding section of the verse states: "And it shall be to the Lord for a name"; this is the reading of the Megilla. "For an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off"; these are the days of Purim.

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi introduced this passage with an introduction from here: "And it shall come to pass, that as the Lord rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you; so the Lord will rejoice over you to cause you to perish, and to destroy you" (Deuteronomy 28:63). The verse indicates that just as the Lord rejoiced in the good he did on behalf of Israel, so too, the Lord will rejoice to cause you harm.

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi asked: Does the Holy One, Blessed be He, in fact rejoice over the downfall of the wicked? But it is written: "As they went out before the army, and say: Give thanks to the Lord, for His kindness endures forever" (II Chronicles 20:21), and Rabbi Yohanan said: For what reason were the words: "for He is good" not stated in this statement of thanksgiving, as the classic formulation is: "Give thanks to the Lord; for He is good; for His kindness endures forever" (I Chronicles 16:34)? Because the Holy One, Blessed be He, does not rejoice over the downfall of the wicked. Since this song was sung in the aftermath of a military victory, which involved the downfall of the wicked, the name of God was not mentioned for the good.

And similarly, Rabbi Yohanan said: What is the meaning of that which is written: "And the one came not near the other all the night" (Exodus 14:20)? The ministering angels wanted to sing their song, for the angels would sing songs to each other, as it states: "And they called out to each other and said" (Isaiah 6:3), but the Holy One, Blessed be He, said: The work of My hands, the Egyptians, are drowning at sea, and you wish to say songs? This indicates that God does not rejoice over the downfall of the wicked.

So the Lord will rejoice [*ken yasis*], and it is not written *yasus* – כִּן יִשֵׁשׁ וְלֹא כְּתִיב יָשׁוּשׁ – The verb *yasis* can be intransitive or causative, meaning that it can be translated either as: He will rejoice, or: He will cause another to rejoice. However, *yasus* is always causative, and therefore it always implies the latter. For this reason, the Gemara uses the word *yasus* to indicate how *yasis* should be understood (Hida; *Mahzik Berakha*).

אמר רבי אלעזר: הוא אינו שש, אבל אחרים משיש. ודיקא נמי, דכתיב: "כִּן יִשֵׁשׁ" וְלֹא כְּתִיב "יָשׁוּשׁ", שִׁמְעַע מִינָהּ.

Rabbi Elazar said that this is how the matter is to be understood: Indeed, God Himself **does not rejoice** over the downfall of the wicked, **but He causes others to rejoice**. The Gemara comments: One can learn from the language of the verse as well, as it is written: "So the Lord will rejoice [*ken yasis*]" (Deuteronomy 28:63). **And it is not written *yasus***,ⁿ the grammatical form of the verb meaning: He will rejoice. Rather, it is written *yasis*. The grammatical form of this verb indicates that one causes another to rejoice. Consequently, these words are understood to mean that God will cause others to rejoice. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, **learn from it** that this is the case.

רבי אבא בר כהנא פתח לה פיתחא להאי פרשתא מהכא: "לְאָדָם שָׂטוּב לִפְנֵי נֹתַן חֲכֵמָה וְדַעַת וְשִׂמְחָה" – זֶה מְרַדְּבֵי הַצְדִּיק, "וְלַחֹטֵא נֹתַן עֵינָן לְאִסּוּף וְלִכְנוּס" – זֶה הָמָן, "לְתֵת לְטוֹב לְפָנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים" – זֶה מְרַדְּבֵי וְאִסְתֵּר, דְּכִתְיִב: "וַתִּשֶׁם אִסְתֵּר אֶת מְרַדְּבֵי עַל בֵּית הָמָן".

Rabbi Abba bar Kahana introduced this passage with an introduction from here. The verse states with regard to God's reward to the righteous: "He gives to a man that is good in His sight wisdom, and knowledge, and joy" (Ecclesiastes 2:26). The Gemara explains that this verse is referring to the righteous Mordecai. With regard to the next part of the verse: "But to the sinner He gives the task of gathering and heaping up," this is referring to Haman. The conclusion of the verse states: "That he may give it to one who is good before God" (Ecclesiastes 2:26). This is Mordecai and Esther, as it is written: "And Esther set Mordecai over the house of Haman" (Esther 8:2).

רבה בר עופרן פתח לה פיתחא להאי פרשתא מהכא: "וְשִׂמְתִּי כִסְאִי בְעֵילָם וְהֶאֱבַדְתִּי מִשָּׁם מֶלֶךְ וְשָׂרִים". "מֶלֶךְ" – זֶה הָמָן וְעֶשְׂרֵת בָּנָיו.

Rabba bar Oferan introduced this passage with an introduction from here: "And I will set my throne in Elam, and destroy from there the king and the princes, says the Lord" (Jeremiah 49:38). "The king" who was destroyed; this is referring to Vashti. "And the princes"; this is referring to Haman and his ten sons.

רב דימי בר יצחק פתח לה פיתחא להאי פרשתא מהכא:

Rav Dimi bar Yitzhak introduced this passage with an introduction from here:

Perek I

Daf 11 Amud a

"כִּי עֲבָדִים אָנַחְנוּ וּבַעֲבֹדוֹתֵינוּ לֹא עֲזָבוּנוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וַיִּטַּע עָלֵינוּ חֶסֶד לְפָנֵי מַלְכֵי פָרַס", אֵימָתִי – בְּזִמְנֵי הָמָן.

"For we are bondmen; yet our God has not forsaken us in our bondage, but has extended mercy unto us in the sight of the kings of Persia" (Ezra 9:9). **When did this occur? In the time of Haman.**

רבי חנינא בר פפא פתח לה פיתחא להאי פרשתא מהכא: "הֲרֹכַבְתָּ אָנוּשׁ לְרֵאשֵׁנוּ בָּאֵנוּ בְּאֵשׁ וּבַמַּיִם", "בְּאֵשׁ" – בִּימֵי נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר הַרְשָׁע, "וּבַמַּיִם" בִּימֵי פְרַעֲוֹה. "וַתּוֹצִיאֵנוּ לְרוּיָהּ" – בִּימֵי הָמָן.

Rabbi Hanina bar Pappa introduced this passage with an introduction from here: The verse states: "You have caused men to ride over our heads; we went through fireⁿ and through water; but You brought us out into abundance" (Psalms 66:12). "Through fire"; this was in the days of the wicked Nebuchadnezzar, who cast the righteous into the furnace. "And through water"; this was in the days of Pharaoh, who decreed that all newborn males be cast into the water. "But You brought us out into abundance"; this was in the days of Haman, where abundant feasts played a pivotal role in their peril and salvation.

רבי יוחנן פתח לה פתחא להאי פרשתא מהכא: "זָכוֹר חֶסֶדְךָ וְאֱמוּנָתְךָ לְבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל רְאוּ כָל אֲפָסֵי אֶרֶץ אֶת יְשׁוּעַת אֱלֹהֵינוּ", אֵימָתִי רְאוּ כָל אֲפָסֵי אֶרֶץ אֶת יְשׁוּעַת אֱלֹהֵינוּ – בִּימֵי מְרַדְּבֵי וְאִסְתֵּר.

Rabbi Yohanan introduced this passage with an introduction from here: The verse states: "He has remembered His mercy and His faithfulness toward the house of Israel: All the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God" (Psalms 98:3). **When did all the ends of the earth see the salvation of our God? In the days of Mordecai and Esther, for their peril and salvation became known through the letters sent throughout the empire.**

NOTES

We went through fire – בָּאֵנוּ בְּאֵשׁ: The Maharsha explains that "through fire" is referring to the burning of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar. "And you brought us out into abundance" is referring to Purim, primarily because the miracle of Purim relates back to a banquet with an abundance of wine, and Purim is celebrated through the drinking of wine (Rabbi Yoshiya Pinto; Maharsha).