

שְׁלִישֵׁי הַבָּא מִחֻמַּת שְׁנֵי, דְּשְׁנֵי גוֹפִיָּה  
אָסוּר בְּחוּלִין – אֵינוֹ דִּין שְׁעוֹשָׂה  
רְבִיעֵי בְּקוֹדֶשׁ.

וְכִי תִּימָא, מִשּׁוּם דְּאִיכָא לְמִפְּרֹךְ:  
מָה לְטָבוֹל יוֹם שְׁבֵן אַב הַטּוֹמְאָה!  
הָא אֵייתִינָה מִמְּחוּסָר כִּיפּוּרִים וְלֹא  
פְּרִיָּה.

whose third-degree impurity came from contact with an item of second-degree impurity, in which case the item with the second-degree impurity is itself forbidden, i.e. impure, even if it is non-sacred food, isn't it logical to infer that it should be able to impart fourth-degree impurity upon sacrificial food?

And if you would say that the reason Rabbi Yosei did not employ this *a fortiori* inference is because it can be refuted as follows: What is unique about one who immersed that day is that prior to his immersion he was a primary source of impurity, this cannot be, as Rabbi Yosei brought proof for the existence of a fourth degree of impurity from the case of one who has not yet brought an atonement offering, who was also a primary source of impurity prior to his immersion, and Rabbi Yosei clearly did not refute the proof due to this factor. Therefore, the reason Rabbi Yosei did not employ an *a fortiori* inference from the case of food that contracted impurity from one who immersed that day is clearly that he disagrees with the opinion of Abba Shaul. Consequently, Rabbi Yoḥanan concluded that he cannot understand Rabbi Yosei's reasoning.

§ Rabbi Asi said that Rav said, and some say Rabba ben Isi said that Rav said: Rabbi Meir, and Rabbi Yosei, and Rabbi Yehoshua, and Rabbi Elazar, and Rabbi Eliezer all hold that an item of second-degree ritual impurity status cannot impart third-degree ritual impurity status to non-sacred items.<sup>h</sup> Rav proceeds to prove this by attributing support from the rulings of each of these *tanna'im*.

Rabbi Meir is of this opinion, as we learned in a mishna (*Para* 11:5): **Anything that requires immersion in water<sup>h</sup> by rabbinic law renders sacrificial food impure** upon contact, with second-degree impurity, and disqualifies *teruma*, meaning that it renders the *teruma* itself impure, but not to the extent that the *teruma* can render other *teruma* impure. **And anything that requires immersion in water by rabbinic law is permitted for non-sacred food and for the second tithe, i.e., it does not render these items impure. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. But the Rabbis prohibit one who has this degree of impurity from partaking of the second tithe.**<sup>h</sup> From the fact that Rabbi Meir permits him to partake of the second tithe, it is inferred that he maintains that an item of second-degree impurity cannot impart third-degree impurity upon non-sacred items.

It is evident that Rabbi Yosei is of this opinion from **that which we have stated** above, that he derives that sacrificial food can contract fourth-degree impurity, **because if he holds** that non-sacred items can contract third-degree impurity, **he should have derived** through his *a fortiori* inference that there is fourth-degree impurity **vis-à-vis *teruma* and fifth-degree impurity vis-à-vis sacrificial food**, since each of these categories has a unique level of impurity.

Rabbi Yehoshua is of this opinion, as we learned in a mishna (*Teharat* 2:2): **Rabbi Eliezer says: One who eats food with first-degree impurity<sup>h</sup> assumes first-degree impurity.** One who eats food with second-degree impurity assumes second-degree impurity. One who eats food with third-degree impurity assumes third-degree impurity. **Rabbi Yehoshua says: One who eats food with first-degree impurity or food with second-degree impurity assumes second-degree impurity.** One who eats food with third-degree impurity assumes second-degree impurity **vis-à-vis sacrificial food,<sup>h</sup> and he does not assume second-degree impurity vis-à-vis *teruma*.**

#### HALAKHA

An item of second-degree impurity status cannot impart third-degree impurity status to non-sacred items – אין שני עושה – שלישי בחולין: A non-sacred food item with first-degree ritual impurity status imparts impurity upon other items with which it comes into contact. A non-sacred item with second-degree impurity status cannot impart impurity to another non-sacred item, as non-sacred food cannot contract third-degree impurity status (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 11:2).

כל הטעון ביהא – כל הטעון ביהא: The Sages decreed that if one's head and most of his body are immersed in drawn water, he assumes second-degree impurity status until he immerses himself in a ritual bath. If this individual, or any other person who is impure due to a similar rabbinic decree, touches *teruma*, he imparts upon the *teruma* third-degree impurity status. If he touches sacrificial food, he imparts upon it fourth-degree impurity status (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 10:2–3).

But the Rabbis prohibit the second tithe – וחכמים אוסרין – במעשר: It is prohibited to partake of the second tithe if one is ritually impure. Even if he is rendered impure merely due to

rabbinically enacted ritual impurity, it is still prohibited for him to partake of the second tithe (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin* 16:8).

האוכל אוכל – ראשון: The Sages decreed that one who eats food of first- or second-degree impurity status assumes second-degree impurity status, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 8:10).

One who eats food with third-degree impurity assumes second-degree impurity vis-à-vis sacrificial food, etc. – שני בקודש וכו': One who eats food with third-degree impurity status, which can be either *teruma* or non-sacred food that has been kept to the standards of *teruma*, although he remains ritually pure in that he does not render *teruma* he touches impure, nevertheless he is considered as one who has second-degree impurity status vis-à-vis sacrificial food. One who eats non-sacred food that has been kept to the standards of sacrificial food and has contracted third-degree impurity status cannot impart impurity to sacrificial food (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 11:12).

אמר רב אסי אמר רב, ואמרי לה אמר רבה בן איסי אמר רב: רבי מאיר ורבי יוסי ורבי יהושע ורבי אלעזר ורבי אליעזר, כולהו סבירא להו דאין שני עושה שלישי בחולין.

רבי מאיר, דתנן: כל הטעון ביהא מים מדברי סופרים – מטמא את הקודש ופוסל את התרומה, ומותר בחולין ובמעשר, דברי רבי מאיר; וחכמים אוסרין במעשר.

רבי יוסי, הא דאמרן, דאם איתיה, ליתיה לרביעי בתרומה וחמישי בקודש.

רבי יהושע, דתנן, רבי אליעזר אומר: האוכל אוכל ראשון – ראשון; שני – שני; שלישי – שלישי; רבי יהושע אומר: האוכל אוכל ראשון ואוכל שני – שני; שלישי – שני בקודש ואין שני בתרומה,

Eating an item with third-degree impurity is possible only in the case of non-sacred items, as eating impure *teruma* or sacrificial food is prohibited. However, generic non-sacred food cannot contract third-degree impurity at all. Therefore, the case of one who eats food with third-degree impurity refers specifically to **non-sacred food items that were prepared** as if their level of purity were **on the level of the purity of *teruma***. By means of a vow, one can establish the purity status of non-sacred food items to be treated on the level of purity necessary for *teruma*.

**Halla – חלה:** The Torah commands the separation of a portion of one's dough, which is declared as *halla* and is later given to the priests (see Numbers 15:20). This portion of *halla* is governed by all the *halakhot* pertaining to *teruma*, the portion of produce set aside for the priests. *Halla* must be taken from all dough made from any of the five types of grain, provided that the quantity of flour of the batch is at least a tenth of an ephah in volume. If *halla* is not taken, the dough has the status of untithed produce and may not be eaten.

The Torah does not specify a measure for *halla*. However, the Sages required an individual baking for personal use to give one twenty-fourth of his dough as *halla*, and a commercial baker to give one forty-eighth. Nowadays, as all Jews are assumed to be ritually impure, *halla* is governed by *halakhot* similar to impure *teruma*; it cannot be eaten and therefore must be burned. Accordingly, the measures mentioned above no longer apply; only a small portion is separated from the dough and burned, and the rest of the dough may then be used. A blessing is recited for the separation of *halla*. The *halakhot* of this mitzva, which is one of the mitzvot performed particularly by women, are discussed comprehensively in tractate *Halla*.

עַל טְהָרַת הַתְּרוּמָה – אֵין, עַל טְהָרַת הַקְּדוּשׁ – לֹא.

The Gemara infers from Rabbi Yehoshua's statement that **yes**, one is able to prepare items as if their level of purity were **on the level of the purity of *teruma***; but one is **not** able to prepare items as if their level of purity were **on the level of the purity of sacrificial food**, and such items would not contract third-degree impurity.

אֲלֵמָא קִסְבֵּר: אֵין שְׁנֵי עוֹשֵׂה שְׁלִישִׁי בְּחֻלִּין.

The Gemara concludes: **Apparently**, Rabbi Yehoshua holds that an item of second-degree impurity **cannot impart** third-degree impurity **upon ordinary non-sacred items** that were not prepared on the level of the purity of *teruma*.

NOTES

*Halla* can be taken from ritually pure dough on behalf of ritually impure dough – חלה נישלת מן הטהורה על הטמאה. Why is it necessary to separate *halla* from ritually pure dough on behalf of ritually impure dough? Rashi explains that according to Rabbi Eliezer one must do so only if he purposely rendered the dough impure, as a fine. In *Tosefot HaRosh*, however, it is argued that one who has impure dough must always separate *halla* from pure dough on its behalf, in order to provide the priest with ritually pure dough from which he can eat.

וְנִתְּנָה פָּחוֹת מִכִּבְיָצָה, etc. – רבי אליעזר אומר: רבי: The way in which this process is performed would seem to indicate that it is not considered as if two batches of dough are situated near each other unless they are actually touching, and it would not be sufficient to just place the two batches in the same basket to group them together, as otherwise this whole process would be unnecessary. The Maharam of Rothenburg, however, states that this procedure needs to be done only in such a situation where one of the batches of dough is pure and the other impure; since one clearly does not want to combine the two batches, in order to separate *halla* for both of them together it is necessary that they actually touch. Otherwise, placing different batches of dough in the same basket would suffice.

רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר, דְּתַנָּי, רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר אֹמֵר: שְׁלִשְׁתָּן שְׁוִין, הָרֵאשׁוֹן שֶׁבְּקוֹדֶשׁ וְשֶׁבְּחֻלִּין וְשֶׁבְּתְרוּמָה –

Rabbi Elazar is of this opinion, as it is taught in a mishna (*Teharot* 2:7): **Rabbi Elazar says:** The **three of these are equal** in their ability to impart ritual impurity to other items: An item of **first-degree impurity**, whether it is an item of **sacrificial food**, or of **non-sacred food**, or of *teruma*.

מִטְמֵא שְׁנַיִם וּפּוֹסֵל אֶחָד בְּקוֹדֶשׁ,

With regard to **sacrificial food**, such an item **renders impure two** additional levels of contact, enabling the items that contracted ritual impurity from it to transfer that impurity to items that they in turn touch afterward. **And it disqualifies one** level afterward, imparting upon the food fourth-degree impurity, which cannot impart impurity to a fifth item.

מִטְמֵא אֶחָד וּפּוֹסֵל אֶחָד בְּתְרוּמָה,

With regard to *teruma*, an item of first-degree impurity **renders impure one** additional level of contact, i.e., it imparts second-level impurity to *teruma* food with which it comes into contact, **and** that item in turn **disqualifies one** additional level afterward, as that *teruma* food imparts third-degree impurity upon *teruma*.

וּפּוֹסֵל אֶחָד בְּחֻלִּין.

**And with regard to non-sacred food**, an item of first-degree impurity merely **disqualifies one** additional level of non-sacred food. Evidently, non-sacred items cannot go beyond a second-degree impurity.

רַבִּי אֶלְיָעָזָר, דְּתַנָּן, רַבִּי אֶלְיָעָזָר אֹמֵר: חֵלָה נִישְׁלֶת מִן הַטְּהוּרָה עַל הַטְּמֵאָה. כִּיצַד? שְׁתֵּי עִיסוֹת אֶחָת טְהוּרָה וְאַחַת טְמֵאָה, נוֹטֵל כְּדֵי חֵלָה מֵעִיסָה שְׁלֵא הוֹרְמָה חֲלָתָהּ, וְנִתְּנָה פָּחוֹת מִכִּבְיָצָה בְּאֶמְצַע כְּדֵי לִיטוֹל מִן הַמוֹקֵף.

Rabbi Eliezer also agrees with this principle, as we learned in a mishna (*Halla* 2:8): **Rabbi Eliezer says:** *Halla*<sup>B</sup> can be taken from ritually pure dough on behalf of ritually impure dough.<sup>N</sup> How so? If there are **two batches of dough**,<sup>H</sup> one of which is pure and one of which is impure, one **takes the required amount** of dough for separating *halla* for both of the batches **from the pure dough when its *halla* has not yet been separated for itself, and then places less than an egg-bulk<sup>N</sup> of dough**, which is not susceptible becoming ritually impure due to its size, **in the middle**, between the impure dough and the pure dough set aside for being used as the separated *halla*. This joins all of the dough together, **so that one can fulfill the requirement to take dough for separating *halla* from dough that is situated near the dough it comes to exempt.**

HALAKHA

Two batches of dough – שְׁתֵּי עִיסוֹת: If one has two batches of dough, one of which is ritually pure and the other of which is ritually impure, he must take the entire required amount of dough for separating *halla* from the pure dough, and then

place less than an egg-bulk of impure dough between the pure batch and the impure batch, in order to separate *halla* from dough that is situated near the dough it comes to exempt (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im*, *Hilkhot Bikkurim* 7:12).

וְחֻכְמֵי אֶסְרִין. **And the Rabbis prohibit separating *halla* in this manner.**

וְתַנְיָא: כְּבִיזָה; **And it is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Eliezer even allows the ritually pure dough placed in the middle to be as large as an egg-bulk,<sup>N</sup> even though dough of that size is susceptible to the *halakhot* of ritual impurity.**

The Gemara now explains the reasoning of those who tried to prove from here that Rabbi Eliezer is of the opinion that second-degree ritual impurity cannot impart third-degree ritual impurity upon non-sacred items: **They assumed<sup>N</sup> that both this mishna and this *baraita* are referring to cases where the dough is of first-degree impurity. And furthermore, they assumed that all the *tanna'im* agree that non-sacred food that is untithed with regard to the obligation to separate *halla*, as its *halla* has not yet been separated, is not treated like *halla* as far as its ability to contract third-degree ritual impurity. Rather, it is regarded as generic non-sacred food, which is susceptible only to second-degree impurity.**

Based on these assumptions the Gemara explains how these authorities understood the tannaitic dispute: **What, is it not clear that Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis disagree with regard to the following matter:<sup>N</sup> One Sage, Rabbi Eliezer, holds that an item of second-degree impurity cannot impart third-degree impurity to non-sacred items. Therefore, there is no problem placing an egg-bulk of pure dough in the middle, as although it will touch the impure dough and will thereby contract second-degree impurity, nevertheless it is unable to transmit impurity to the pure dough.**

**And one Sage, i.e., the Rabbis, holds that an item of second-degree impurity can impart third-degree ritual impurity to non-sacred items. They therefore prohibit placing an egg-bulk of dough in the middle, as it will assume second-degree impurity status, which, in their opinion, can impart third-degree impurity status upon the pure dough.**

**Rav Mari, son of Rav Kahana, said that the dispute can be understood differently: Everyone agrees that an item of second-degree ritual impurity cannot impart third-degree ritual impurity to non-sacred items. But here, the dispute concerns another matter, as they disagree with regard to the status of non-sacred food that is untithed vis-à-vis *halla*, as its *halla* has not yet been separated. One Sage, i.e., the Rabbis, holds that it is treated like *halla* with regard to its ability to contract third-degree impurity, and one Sage, Rabbi Eliezer, holds that it is not treated like *halla* and cannot contract third-degree impurity. Therefore, he permits separating *halla* in this manner.**

**And if you wish, say instead that they disagree with regard to a different issue: Everyone agrees that non-sacred food that is untithed with regard to *halla* is not treated like *halla* and cannot contract third-degree impurity, and that an item of second-degree ritual impurity cannot impart third-degree ritual impurity to non-sacred items. But here, they disagree with regard to whether or not it is permitted to cause ritual impurity to non-sacred food that is in Eretz Yisrael.<sup>HN</sup>**

NOTES

**An egg-bulk – כְּבִיזָה:** Although it is agreed upon that an egg-bulk is the minimum measurement necessary for food to contract ritual impurity, there is a dispute between Rashi and *Tosafot* with regard to the details of this requirement. Rashi understands that at least an egg-bulk of food is necessary in order for it to be capable of imparting impurity upon other food items with which it comes into contact. However, according to *Tosafot* (*Pesahim* 33b), less than an egg-bulk of food cannot contract ritual impurity either. This disagreement leads to conflicting interpretations of the Gemara here.

**They assumed – סְבִירָה:** Usually when a statement is introduced by the expression: They assumed, it is an indication that this opinion was expressed in the study hall but was eventually rejected. The Meiri points out that in this case, only part of the opinion presented is rejected in the continuation of the Gemara, as there is no rejection of the assumption that the reference is to dough of first-degree impurity status.

**Disagree with regard to the following matter – בְּהֵא – קְמִיפְלִי:** Does this refer to the mishna or to the *baraita*? Rashi maintains that the Gemara is explaining the dispute in the mishna. Although Rabbi Eliezer's opinion, as quoted in the mishna, is that one should use a piece of dough small enough that it is not susceptible to the *halakhot* of ritual impurity, nevertheless, the Gemara assumes that he is not concerned about it transferring impurity to the *halla*. Otherwise, he would prohibit this procedure lest one accidentally use an egg-bulk of dough, thereby imparting impurity upon the pure dough. Accordingly, the *baraita* is mentioned tangentially, as it is not necessary for the discussion.

According to this explanation, later commentaries ask why the Gemara does not suggest that the core dispute between Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis is whether or not the concern that use of a smaller piece of dough will lead to use of an egg-bulk should be taken into account. *Torat HaKenaot* answers that this concern is obviously valid, as it is difficult for people to discern between these measurements.

In the Commentary of Rabbi Shimshon of Saens on tractate *Terumat*, the Gemara here is explained as discussing the dispute between the mishna and the *baraita* with regard to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer.

**It is permitted to cause ritual impurity to non-sacred food that is in Eretz Yisrael – מוֹתֵר לְגֵרוֹם טוּמְאָה לְחוּלִין – שְׁבִאֲרָץ יִשְׂרָאֵל:** The reason why this issue applies only in Eretz Yisrael is that non-sacred food outside of Eretz Yisrael is automatically impure due to the inherent impurity of what is called the land of the nations, i.e., any territory outside of Eretz Yisrael.

The opinion that it is prohibited to cause impurity in Eretz Yisrael is perhaps related to the fact that although eating impure non-sacred food is halakhically permitted, many individuals who were devoted to the meticulous observance of mitzvot would make sure to keep their food ritually pure. Furthermore, it can be reasoned that if people are not careful to avoid causing food to become impure, they may accidentally impart impurity to items that are prohibited to become impure, e.g., *teruma* and sacrificial food.

HALAKHA

It is permitted to cause ritual impurity to non-sacred food that is in Eretz Yisrael – מוֹתֵר לְגֵרוֹם טוּמְאָה לְחוּלִין שְׁבִאֲרָץ יִשְׂרָאֵל – Just as it is permitted to eat non-sacred food while in a state of ritual impurity, so too, it is permitted to cause impurity to non-sacred food that is in Eretz Yisrael (Rambam *Sefer Tahara*, *Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin* 16:9).

**Shabbat boundary** – תחום שבת: By rabbinic decree, and some say by Torah law, a person is not permitted to travel more than a certain distance away from the place where he established his residence at the onset of Shabbat. That distance is known as the Shabbat boundary. Even animals and inanimate objects have a boundary, determined by that of the person to whose care they are entrusted, beyond which they may not be taken. Generally, the Shabbat boundary is defined as two thousand cubits outside of the person's city, in any direction.

NOTES

One Sage holds that the *halakha* of Shabbat boundaries is mandated by Torah law, etc. – תחומין וכו' דאורייתא וכו': It is explained in the Jerusalem Talmud that both *tanna'im* agree that the Shabbat limit is by Torah law and the dispute is with regard to its extent. Rabbi Akiva holds that it is two thousand cubits, and Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, holds that by Torah law it is larger than that, and the two-thousand-cubit measure is by rabbinic law.

HALAKHA

The *halakha* of Shabbat boundaries is mandated by rabbinic law – תחומין... דרבנן: One who goes beyond the Shabbat limit is liable to receive lashes. The extent of this limit is not explicitly defined in the Torah, but there is a tradition that by Torah law it is twelve *mil*, which is approximately twelve kilometers, whereas the Sages limited it to two thousand cubits, approximately one kilometer. The Ramban and the Rashba, cited in *Maggid Mishne*, are of the opinion that by Torah law there is no Shabbat limit at all. They claim that it is only the opinion of Rabbi Akiva that the Shabbat limit is mandated by Torah law, whereas the other Sages maintain that it is by rabbinic law (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim*, *Hilkhot Shabbat* 27:1).

מר סבר: מותר לגרום טומאה לחולין שבארץ ישראל, ומר סבר: אסור לגרום טומאה לחולין שבארץ ישראל.

”בו ביום דרש רבי עקיבא” וכו’.

במאי קא מיפלגי? מר סבר: תחומין דאורייתא, ומר סבר: דרבנן.

תנו רבנן. בו ביום דרש רבי עקיבא: בשעה שעלו ישראל מן הים נתנו עיניהם לומר שירה. וכיצד אמרו שירה? בגדול המקרא את הלל והן עונים אחרי ראשי פרקים. משה אמר “אשירה לה” והן אומרים “אשירה לה”; משה אמר “כי גאה גאה” והן אומרים “אשירה לה”.

רבי אליעזר בנו של רבי יוסי הגלילי אומר: כקטן המקרא את הלל והן עונים אחרי כל מה שהוא אומר, משה אמר “אשירה לה” והן אומרים “אשירה לה”; משה אמר “כי גאה גאה” והן אומרים “כי גאה גאה”.

רבי נחמיה אומר: בסופר הפורס על שמע בבית הכנסת, שהוא פותח תחילה והן עונים אחרי.

במאי קמיפלגי? רבי עקיבא סבר: “לאמר” – אמילתא קמיינתא.

ורבי אליעזר בנו של רבי יוסי הגלילי סבר: “לאמר” – אכל מילתא ומילתא, ורבי נחמיה סבר: “ויאמרו” – דאמור כולהו בהדי הדדי; “לאמר” – דפתח משה ברישא.

One Sage, Rabbi Eliezer, holds that it is permitted to cause impurity to non-sacred food that is in Eretz Yisrael. Therefore, since the dough placed in the middle cannot impart third-degree ritual impurity status upon the dough designated for *halla*, there is no reason to prohibit doing so. And one Sage, i.e., the Rabbis, holds that it is prohibited to cause impurity to non-sacred food that is in Eretz Yisrael. Therefore, although the dough of the ritually pure batch will not become impure, nevertheless the Rabbis prohibit separating *halla* in this manner, as causing the dough in the middle to become impure is prohibited.

It is stated in the mishna: On that same day Rabbi Akiva interpreted one of the contradictory verses with regard to the amount of land surrounding the Levite cities as teaching that one may not travel beyond a two-thousand-cubit radius around his city limits on Shabbat. Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, on the other hand, interprets the contradictory verses as referring to different types of land left for the Levites around their cities.

The Gemara asks: With regard to what halakhic matter do they disagree? The Gemara answers: One Sage, Rabbi Akiva, holds that the *halakha* of Shabbat boundaries<sup>8</sup> is mandated by Torah law,<sup>9</sup> as he bases it on a verse; and one Sage, Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, holds that the *halakha* of Shabbat boundaries is mandated by rabbinic law,<sup>10</sup> and he therefore derives other matters from the verse.

The Sages taught: On that same day Rabbi Akiva taught that at the time that the Jewish people ascended from the split sea they set their eyes on reciting a song of gratitude to God. And how did they recite the song? In the same manner as an adult man reciting *hallel* on behalf of a congregation, as his reading enables all who hear to fulfill their obligation, and the congregation listening merely recite after him the chapter headings of *hallel*. So too, by the sea, Moses said: “I will sing unto the Lord” (Exodus 15:1), and the people said after Moses: “I will sing unto the Lord.” Moses continued and said: “For He is highly exalted” (Exodus 15:1), and they said once again the chapter heading: “I will sing unto the Lord.”

Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, says: The Jewish people sang just like a minor boy reciting *hallel* and the congregation who hear him repeat after him all that he says, word for word, as hearing the recital of a minor is insufficient for fulfilling one's obligation. So too, by the sea, Moses said: “I will sing unto the Lord” (Exodus 15:1), and the people said after Moses: “I will sing to the Lord.” Moses said: “For He is highly exalted,” and they said after him the same words: “For He is highly exalted.”

Rabbi Neḥemya says: They sang the song of the sea like a scribe, a cantor, who recites aloud the introductory prayers and blessings before *Shema* in the synagogue; as he begins by saying the first words of the blessing, and they repeat after him the initial words and continue reciting the rest of *Shema* together with him in unison. So too, in the song of the sea, Moses began and then everyone recited the entire song together with him.

The Gemara asks: With regard to what do they disagree? The Gemara answers that they disagree with regard to the interpretation of the verse: “Then Moses and the children of Israel sang this song unto the Lord, and said, saying” (Exodus 15:1). Rabbi Akiva holds that the word “saying,” which indicates that the people sang after Moses, is referring only to the first words of the song, which the people continually repeated: “I will sing unto the Lord” (Exodus 15:1).

And Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, holds that the word “saying” is referring to every single word, as they would repeat after Moses every word. And Rabbi Neḥemya holds that the phrase “and they said” (Exodus 15:1) indicates that everyone recited the song of the sea together, and the word “saying” means that Moses began singing the song first; and then the rest of the people sang the beginning after him and they all continued in unison.

Babies...fetuses – עוללים...עופרים: The Maharsha writes that it is possible that according to Rabbi Yosei HaGelili the infants sang but the fetuses did not, as it is stated in the Midrash that in Egypt, Jewish babies were born in the fields and God raised them miraculously. Therefore, these infants recognized God at the sea and could say: “This is my God and I will glorify Him” (Exodus 15:2). In *Iyyun Ya’akov*, however, it is claimed that both opinions agree that the fetuses sang, as the Gemara (*Nidda* 31b) writes that while in its mother’s womb a fetus is taught the entire Torah by an angel, and therefore it is in a position to recognize God.

**S** The Sages taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yosei HaGelili taught: At the time that the Jewish people ascended from the sea they resolved to sing a song of gratitude to God. And how did they recite this song? If a baby was lying on his mother’s lap or an infant was nursing from his mother’s breasts, once they saw the Divine Presence, the baby straightened his neck and the infant dropped the breast from his mouth, and they recited: “This is my God and I will glorify Him” (Exodus 15:2). As it is stated: “Out of the mouths of babies and sucklings You have founded strength” (Psalms 8:3).

Rabbi Meir would say: From where is it derived that even fetuses<sup>N</sup> in their mother’s womb recited the song at the sea? As it is stated:

תָּנוּ רַבָּנָן, דִּרְשׁ רַבִּי יוֹסֵי הַגְּלִילִי: בְּשָׁעָה  
שָׁעְלוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל מִן הַיָּם נִתְּנוּ עֵינֵיהֶם לֹאמֹר  
שִׁירָה. וְכִיצַד אָמְרוּ שִׁירָה? עוֹלָל מוֹטָל  
עַל בְּרֵכֵי אִמּוֹ וְתִינוּק יוֹנֵק מִשְׁדֵּי אִמּוֹ.  
כִּיּוֹן שָׁרְאוּ אֶת הַשְּׂכִינָה, עוֹלָל הִגְבִּיהַ  
צָוָרוֹ וְתִינוּק שָׁמַט דָּד מִפִּיו, וְאָמְרוּ:  
”זֶה אֱלֹהֵי וְאֵנֹהוּ”, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: ”מִפִּי עוֹלָלִים  
וְיוֹנְקִים יִסְדַּת עֹז”.

הֲיָה רַבִּי מַעִיר אוֹמֵר: מִנֵּיין שְׁאֵפִילוּ  
עוֹפְרִים שְׁבִמְעֵי אִמָּן אָמְרוּ שִׁירָה?  
שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: