

## HALAKHA

ואנן קא יהבינן לכהנים.

and we give it to the priests.<sup>h</sup> Ezra penalized the Levites for not ascending with him from Babylonia to Eretz Yisrael by taking away their right to the first tithe. Consequently, the owner of the produce can no longer recite the declaration of tithes, which includes the statement: “I have done according to all that You have commanded me” (Deuteronomy 26:14), as he did not give the tithe to the Levites.

And we give it to the priests – ואנן קא יהבינן לכהנים: Ezra penalized the Levites of his time for not ascending to Jerusalem with him, decreeing that they should not receive the first tithe but that it should go to the priests instead. The Radbaz and the *Kesef Mishne* both state that the decree applied only in Ezra’s time, but afterward the tithe could be given either to the Levites or the priests (Rambam *Sefer Zera’im, Hilkhot Ma’asrot* 1:4).

Any house that does not state the declaration, etc. – כל בית שאין מתודה וכו': One may recite the declaration of tithes only if none of the gifts remain in his possession, as it is stated: “I have cleared the sacred things from my house” (Deuteronomy 26:13). The Rambam indicates that not only does holding on to the first tithe preclude the recitation of the declaration, but one may not recite the declaration if he has failed to give any of the gifts in the proper manner (Rambam *Sefer Zera’im, Hilkhot Ma’aser Shenii* 11:7).

He sent throughout the land, to all the borders of Eretz Yisrael, etc. – שילח בכל גבול ישראל וכו': In the days of Yohanan the High Priest, the Sanhedrin conducted an investigation and found that all were careful to separate *teruma gedola*, but some *amei ha'aretz* were lax in the proper separation of both the first and second tithes and the tithe for the poor. Consequently, they decreed that only *haverim* could be relied upon with regard to tithes, and the produce of *amei ha'aretz* was considered doubtfully tithed and could not be eaten until it was tithed by the new owner. Such produce is called *demai* (Rambam *Sefer Zera’im, Hilkhot Ma’asrot* 9:1).

He arose and instituted an ordinance for them, etc. – עמד והתקין להם וכו': The Sages decreed that one must separate the *teruma* of the tithe from doubtfully tithed produce, as its consumption is punished by death from Heaven. One must likewise set aside the second tithe. Since it is eaten by the owner, he incurs no financial loss by doing so. However, the first tithe and the poor man’s tithe are not given from doubtfully tithed produce, as it is not certain that they have not been separated by the *am ha'aretz*, and the burden of proof rests upon the claimant (Rambam *Sefer Zera’im, Hilkhot Ma’asrot* 9:2).

## NOTES

And decreed with regard to doubtfully tithed produce [*demai*] – וגזר על הדמאי: The standard explanation of the word *demai* is that it is an acronym of the Aramaic *da mai*, meaning: This, what is it? In other words, is this produce tithed or not? The eponymous tractate in the order of *Zera’im* is devoted to the *halakhot* of doubtfully tithed produce, which addresses issues such as which doubtfully tithed produce requires tithing, and who is believed when they claim to have separated tithes in the proper manner. The general practice with regard to doubtfully tithed produce is to assume most *amei ha'aretz* do separate tithes properly, but nevertheless a decree was instituted due to the minority who neglected to do so.

Only *teruma gedola* – תרומה גדולה בלבד: The reason why they would separate *teruma gedola* is because they would have to give only a small amount, generally 2 percent, and according to Torah law even a single grain will exempt an entire pile. Another reason why they viewed *teruma gedola* differently is because it has special sanctity, as the *halakhot* of ritual purity apply to it from the moment it was separated and it is prohibited to non-priests. By contrast, since tithes can be eaten like regular produce, the *amei ha'aretz* did not consider them to be sacred. They were also not concerned for the general prohibition of untithed produce, and ignored the fact that the first tithe contains within it the *teruma* of the tithe, which must be given to a priest and has the status of *teruma* in all regards.

ולדי אשאר מעשרות! אמר ריש לקיש: כל בית שאין מתודה על מעשר ראשון, שוב אין מתודה על שאר מעשרות. מאי טעמא? אמר אבמי: הואיל ופתח בו הכתוב תחילה.

The Gemara asks: And let him at least declare that he donated the other tithes in the proper manner. Reish Lakish said: Any house that does not state the declaration<sup>h</sup> about the first tithe can no longer state the declaration of the other types of tithes. The Gemara asks: What is the reason for this? Abaye said: Because the written verse began the declaration with the tithe given to the Levites: “And I also gave it to the Levite, and to the stranger, to the orphan, and to the widow, in accordance with all Your mitzvot that You commanded me” (Deuteronomy 26:13). If he cannot say the first part of the declaration, he cannot say the rest.

מכלל דאפרושי הווי מפרשי, והא תנאי: אף הוא ביטל את הוידי וגזר על הדמאי, לפי ששלח בכל גבול ישראל וראה שאין מפרישין אלא תרומה גדולה בלבד, ומעשר ראשון ומעשר שני מקצתן מעשרין ומקצתן אין מעשרין.

The Gemara poses a question: The fact that Rabbi Yohanan canceled the declaration of tithes proves by inference that they would separate tithes in his days. But isn’t it taught (*Tosefta* 13:10): He, Yohanan the High Priest, also canceled the declaration of tithes and decreed with regard to doubtfully tithed produce [*demai*]?<sup>N</sup> Why did he issue this decree? Because he sent messengers throughout the land, to all the borders of Eretz Yisrael<sup>h</sup> to investigate, and saw that they would separate only *teruma gedola*,<sup>N</sup> and as for first tithe and second tithe, some people would tithe and some people would not tithe.

אמר להם: בני, בואו ואומר לכם: כשיש תרומה גדולה יש בה עון מיתה, כך תרומת מעשר וטבל יש בהן עון מיתה.

He said to them: My sons, come and I will tell you something: Just as the *halakhot* of *teruma gedola* include a transgression punishable by death at the hand of God, as one who ate produce from which *teruma* has not been separated is punished with death from Heaven, so too, the *teruma* of the tithe, the portion the Levites must separate from their first tithe and give to priests, and untithed produce, these include a transgression punishable by death at the hand of God, if the produce is eaten without the tithes having been taken.

עמד והתקין להם: הלוקח פירות מעם הארץ – מפריש מהן מעשר ראשון ומעשר שני, מעשר ראשון מפריש ממונה תרומת מעשר ונותנה לכהן. ומעשר שני עולה ואוכלו בירושלים. מעשר ראשון ומעשר עני – המוציא מחבירו עליו הראיה!

Realizing that it was uncertain with regard to whether or not people were separating tithes, he arose and instituted an ordinance for them<sup>h</sup> with regard to doubtfully tithed produce: One who purchases produce from an *am ha'aretz*, which may or may not have been tithed, must separate from the produce first tithe and second tithe due to the uncertainty as to whether or not the *am ha'aretz* separated them. As for first tithe, he then separates *teruma* of the tithe from it and gives it to a priest, and with regard to second tithe, he goes up and eats it in Jerusalem. However, with regard to the giving of first tithe to the Levite, and the poor man’s tithe, which can be eaten by anyone, as the Levites and the poor only have monetary rights to the produce, the burden of proof rests upon the claimant. Since the Levites and the poor cannot prove that these tithes had not already been set aside by the *am ha'aretz*, they cannot force the buyer to give them those tithes.

תיתי תקן, ביטל וידי דחבירים, וגזר על דמאי של עמי הארץ.

In any case, the Gemara proves from the *baraita* that not all people would separate tithes in the time of Yohanan the High Priest. The Gemara answers: He instituted two ordinances: He canceled the declaration of tithes of those devoted to the meticulous observance of mitzvot [*haverim*], especially *halakhot* of *teruma* and tithes, and he decreed with regard to doubtfully tithed produce purchased from *amei ha'aretz*, because they may not have separated tithes at all.

**Rings – טבעות:** These rings, described in the mishna in tractate *Middot* and elsewhere, were large, fashioned out of metal, and attached to the ground. Prior to slaughter, the animal's head would be put through the ring and the animal would be tied. This would enable the slaughtering to be done in an unhurried manner, without endangering the one doing the slaughtering and without fear of the act being disqualified. There were twenty-four rings, one for each priestly watch.



Rings in the Temple courtyard

NOTES

From the time when the Sanhedrin ceased – **משבטלה סנהדרין**: The Jerusalem Talmud offers other reasons, not derived from the Bible, for this *halakha*. One explanation is that the authority of the Sanhedrin was sufficient to make sure people did not sing songs with ribald lyrics at parties with wine. After the dissolution of the Sanhedrin, the Sages saw that people were singing improper songs at these parties and consequently banned them entirely. The Gemara there also adds that in the time of the Sanhedrin, the Sages would institute additional days of rejoicing when the Jewish people were saved from trouble. Once the Sanhedrin was dissolved, these days could no longer be instituted.

HALAKHA

Song was also nullified from the places of feasts, etc. – **בטל השיר מבית המשתאות וכו'**: The Sages decreed that one may not play musical instruments or anything that produces the sound of music intended for enjoyment. The Rema writes that some authorities hold that the prohibition applies only to people, such as kings, who habitually listen to music, in addition to the prohibition with regard to drinking houses. It is also prohibited to listen to such instruments. These prohibitions are in commemoration of the destruction of the Temple. For the same reason it is prohibited even to sing, even without instruments, while drinking wine. The Bah, in accordance with the Gemara, rules stringently that one may not sing even if he is not drinking wine.

The custom throughout all of Israel is to sing and recite praises over wine to express thanks for the kindness of God. If singing is performed for the sake of a mitzva, such as at a feast for a circumcision or at a wedding, then all of the above is permitted (Rema). The halakhic authorities of our generation discuss the practical applications of this *halakha* (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim*, *Hilkhot Ta'anit* 5:14; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Orah Hayyim* 560:3).

וְאִיךָ הוּא בִּישָׁל אֶת הַמְעוֹרְרִים. מֵאֵי מְעוֹרְרִים? אָמַר רַחֲבָה: בְּכָל יוֹם וְיוֹם שֶׁהָיוּ עוֹמְדִים לְיוֹם עַל דּוֹבֵן וְאוֹמְרִים: "עוֹרָה לְמָה תִּישָׁן ה'." אָמַר לֵה: וְכִי יֵשׁ שִׁינָה לְפָנֵי הַמִּקְוֶה? וְהֲלֹא כָּבֵר נֹאמֵר: "הִנֵּה לֹא יָנוּם וְלֹא יִשָּׁן שׁוֹמֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל!" אֲלֵא. בְּמִן שִׁישְׂרָאֵל שְׂרוּיִן בְּצַעַר וְאוֹמוֹת הָעוֹלָם בְּנַחַת וְשִׁלּוּהַ, לְכֵן נֹאמֵר: "עוֹרָה לְמָה תִּישָׁן ה'."

"וְאֵת הַנוֹקְפִים." מֵאֵי נוֹקְפִים? אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שְׂמוּאֵל: שֶׁהָיוּ מְסַרְטִין לְעֵגֶל בֵּין קַרְנָיו בְּדֵי שִׁפּוֹל דָּם בְּעֵינָיו. אֲתָא אִיהוּ בְּטִיל, מִשּׁוּם דְּמִיחָזֵי כִי מוּמָא.

בְּמַתְנֵיתָא תֵּנָא: שֶׁהָיוּ חוֹבְטִין אוֹתוֹ בְּמַקְלוֹת, בְּדֶרֶךְ שְׁעוּשִׁין אוֹתוֹ לְפָנֵי עֲבוּדָה זָרָה. אָמַר לָהֶם: עַד מַתִּי אַתֶּם מְאָכְלִין נְבִילוֹת לְמוֹבְחָ! נְבִילוֹת? הָא שְׁחִיט לָהּ! אֲלֵא טְרִיפוֹת, שְׂמָא נִקְבַּ קְרוֹם שֶׁל מוֹחַ, עֲמַד וְהִתְקִין לָהֶם טְבָעוֹת בְּקַרְקַע.

"עַד יִמּוֹ הִיָּה פְּטִישׁ מִכָּה בִירוּשָׁלַיִם." בְּחוּלּוֹ שֶׁל מוֹעֵד.

"כָּל יִמּוֹ לֹא הִיָּה אָדָם צְרִיךְ לְשְׂאוֹל עַל הַדְּמָא" – בְּדָאָמֵן.

**מתני'** משבטלה סנהדרין – בטל השיר מבית המשתאות, שנאמר: "בשיר לא ישתו יין" וגו'.

מִשְׁמַתּוֹ נְבִיאִים הָרֵאשׁוֹנִים – בְּטָלוּ אוֹרִים וְתוּמִים. מִשְׁתַּרְבַּב בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ – בְּטָל הַשְּׂמִיר, וְנוֹפֶת צוֹפִים, וּפְסָקוֹ אֲנָשִׁי אֲמִנָה מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל, שְׁנֵאמַר: "הוֹשִׁיעָה ה' כִּי גָמַר חֲסִיד" וגו'.

The mishna further taught: **He also nullified the actions of the awakeners.** The Gemara poses a question: **What are awakeners?** **Rahava says: On each and every day when the Levites stood on the platform in the Temple they would say: "Awake, why do you sleep, O Lord?"** (Psalms 44:24). Therefore, they were called awakeners. **Yohanan the High Priest said to them: Does the Omnipresent sleep, that you call upon Him to awaken? But isn't it already stated: "Behold, He that keeps Israel neither slumbers nor sleeps" (Psalms 121:4)? Rather, when the Jewish people are in a state of suffering, and the nations of the world are in a state of calm and serenity, it is with regard to this that it is stated: "Awake, why do you sleep, O Lord?"** If the verse were to be recited every morning it would be interpreted in the wrong way, so Yohanan the High Priest therefore canceled the daily recitation of this verse.

The mishna also taught that Yohanan the High Priest canceled the **strikers**. The Gemara asks: **What are strikers?** **Rav Yehuda says that Shmuel says: They are those who would scratch the calf being prepared for slaughter as an offering between its horns, in order that blood should fall in its eyes, so that the animal would not see and resist being slaughtered. He came and nullified this practice, because it looked like they are causing a blemish.**

A different explanation of strikers was taught in a *baraita* (*Tosefta* 13:9): They are those who would beat the calf with sticks, to stun it before it was slaughtered, in the manner that they do it before idols. **Yohanan the High Priest said to them: Until when will you feed unslaughtered animal carcasses to the altar?** The Gemara asks: Are these animal carcasses actually unslaughtered animal carcasses? **They were slaughtered, i.e., they did not die of their own accord. Rather, he said that the beatings would cause them to become like animals with a wound that will cause them to die within twelve months [tereifot], as perhaps these beatings will perforate the membrane surrounding the brain, which would make the calf a tereifa. He therefore arose and instituted an ordinance for them to put rings<sup>b</sup> in the ground with which they could secure the animals, thereby making it easier to slaughter the animals without having to scratch them between the horns or hit them with sticks.**

The mishna stated that **until the days of Yohanan the High Priest the hammer of smiths would strike in Jerusalem.** The Gemara explains: This is referring to the intermediate days of a Festival. Though certain types of labor are permitted on those days, the banging of a hammer was outlawed, as the noise it made would detract from the feeling of sanctity of the day.

They further taught that in all of his days a person did not need to inquire with regard to doubtfully tithed produce. The Gemara notes that this is like that which we stated above, that he instituted an ordinance with regard to the tithing of doubtfully tithed produce.

**MISHNA** This mishna continues with the list of items that were nullified. **From the time when the Sanhedrin ceased<sup>n</sup> song was also nullified from the places of feasts,<sup>h</sup> i.e., it was no longer permitted to sing at a feast where wine was served, as it is stated: "With song they shall not drink wine" (Isaiah 24:9).**

**From the time when the early prophets died the Urim VeTummim was nullified. From the time when the Second Temple was destroyed the shamir worm ceased to exist and also the sweetness of the honeycomb, as the verse says with regard to the laws of the Torah: "More to be desired are they than gold, indeed, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb" (Psalms 19:11). And men of faith ceased from being among the Jewish people, as it is stated: "Help, Lord, for the pious man is finished; for the faithful fail from among the children of men" (Psalms 12:2).**



The gate is smitten unto ruin [*she'iyya*] – שְׂאִיָּה יִכַּת – שְׂעִיר: According to the *ge'onim*, who say that *she'iyya* refers to a type of woodworm, the reason why the destruction begins at the entrance to the house is that the door and its posts are generally made of wood. The destruction caused by the woodworm weakens the posts, causing the upper beams, whose weight is not properly supported, to collapse. The woodworms' burrowing can sound like a constant rapping, perhaps suggesting the comparison to the ramming of an ox.

Those who pull ships and lead the herd – נְגִידֵי וְדִבְקָרֵי: In inland rivers and streams, particularly when there was a need to travel against the current, there were several strategies employed to assist those directing the boat. Small boats, and some large ships, would use oars. Medium sized cargo ships would be pulled by ropes, and there was a path on the riverbank designated for those who pulled the ropes. Those who pulled the ropes, as well as those who plowed with oxen, would sing in order to set a specific pace to their walking. It was important for all those pulling the ropes to be working in unison. In tractate *Pesahim* (112b), there is an example of one of these rhythmic songs.



Roman relief of slaves pulling a boat containing wine barrels

Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says that Rabbi Yehoshua testified: From the day the Temple was destroyed there is no day that does not include some form of curse. And since then the dew has not descended for blessing, and the taste has been removed from fruit. Rabbi Yosei says: Since then, the fat of fruit has also been removed. Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: Since then, the lost purity has removed the taste and the aroma from fruit; the tithes that were not separated have removed the fat of the grain. And the Sages say: Promiscuity and witchcraft have consumed it all.

**GEMARA** The Gemara poses a question with regard to the first clause of the mishna: **And from where is it derived that the verse:** “With song they shall not drink wine” (Isaiah 24:9) **is written about the period from the time when the Sanhedrin was nullified? Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said: From that which the verse states: “The Elders have ceased from the gate, the young men from their music”** (Lamentations 5:14). This indicates that the dissolution of the Sanhedrin, who are the Elders from the gate, is linked to the end of the young men singing.

Rav said: The ear that hears song should be uprooted, as it is prohibited to listen to music after the destruction of the Temple. Rava said: If there is song in a house there will be destruction on the threshold, as it is stated: “Voices shall sing in the windows; desolation shall be in the doorposts; for its cedar work shall be uncovered” (Zephaniah 2:14).

The word “uncovered” [*era*] could be read to mean: Its city [*ira*]. The Gemara asks: **What is the meaning of: For its cedar work shall be its city?** Furthermore, Rabbi Yitzhak wondered when he said: **Is a house interlaced with cedars not as strong as a city, and therefore not threatened by desolation? Rather, it means that even a house interlaced with cedars will become unstable** [*mitro'e'a*] if song is heard there. Rav Ashi said: **Learn from it that when the destruction starts it starts with the threshold, as it is stated: “Desolation shall be in the posts.” And if you wish, say instead that they derive this idea from here:** “In the city is left desolation, and the gate is smitten unto ruin [*she'iyya*]<sup>NB</sup> (Isaiah 24:12). The term “ruin” here is referring to the destructive demon known as *She'iyya*, who strikes the gate first. **Mar bar Rav Ashi said: I saw it, this *She'iyya*, and it was goring and wreaking havoc like an ox.**

Rav Huna said: The song of those who pull ships<sup>N</sup> and lead the herd<sup>B</sup> is permitted, for their singing assists them to establish a rhythm in their work. However, that of weavers is forbidden, as they sing only for their own enjoyment. The Gemara relates that subsequently, Rav Huna nullified all types of song, and this led to a general blessing: **The price of one hundred ducks stood at a dinar, and one hundred *se'a* of wheat at a dinar, and there was no desire for them even at such a cheap price, due to their great abundance. Later, when Rav Hisda came and belittled this prohibition, people began to sing again. As a result, prices increased greatly, and this led to a situation whereby one wanted a single duck for one dinar and it could not be found.**

#### NOTES

The gate is smitten unto ruin [*she'iyya*] – שְׂאִיָּה יִכַּת שְׂעִיר: In a responsum of one of the *ge'onim*, perhaps Rav Hai Gaon, it states that the *she'iyya* is a type of a worm that eats through wood, and that is what Mar bar Rav Ashi was referring to when he claimed to have seen it.

The song of those who pull ships, etc. – זְמֵרָא דְנִגְדֵי וְדִבְקָרֵי: According to Rashi, the factor that determines the permissibility of the singing is whether the singing aids the labor. Those who pull ships or lead the herd must work in a steady rhythm, so their song is

allowed. The weavers do not require singing to help them in their work, so it is prohibited. This would mean that an active reason is needed to permit singing. The *ge'onim*, however, explain that the difference lies in the content of the songs. They explain that Rav Huna listened to the songs of those pulling ships and leading the herd and found nothing inappropriate, whereas the songs of weavers and tanners included licentious verses, and that is why he banned them. According to this, the default opinion is that singing is permitted.

רְבֵן שְׂמֵעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל אוֹמֵר, הָעֵיד רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ: מִיּוֹם שֶׁחָרַב בַּיִת הַמִּקְדָּשׁ – אֵין יוֹם שֶׁאֵין בוֹ קִלְלָה, וְלֹא יֵרֵד הַטֵּל לְבָרְכָה, וְנִשְׁלַט טַעַם הַפִּירוֹת. רַבִּי יוֹסֵי אוֹמֵר: אֶף נִשְׁלַט שׁוּמֵן הַפִּירוֹת. רַבִּי שְׂמֵעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר אוֹמֵר: הַטְּהָרָה – נִטְלָה אֶת הַטַּעַם וְאֶת הָרִיחַ. הַמַּעֲשָׂוֹת – נִטְלוּ אֶת שׁוּמֵן הַדָּגָן, וְחֻכְמֵים אוֹמְרִים: הַזְנוּת וְהַכְשָׁפִים כִּילּוּ אֶת הַכֵּל.

גַּמְ' וּמֵמַאי דְמִשְׁבֻּטְלָה סְנַהֲדְרֵי כְתִיב? אָמַר רַב הוֹנָא בְרִיהַ דְרַב יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, דְאָמַר קָרָא: “קִנְיִם מְשֻׁעַר שְׁבֹתוֹ בַּחוּרִים מְנַגְיָנְתָּם!”

אָמַר רַב: אוֹדְנָא דְשְׂמֵעָא זְמֵרָא תַעֲקֹר. אָמַר רַבָּא: זְמֵרָא בְּבֵיתָא חוּרְבָא בְּסִיפָא, שְׁנַאֲמַר: “קוֹל יִשׁוּר בַּחלוֹן חָרַב בְּסַף כִּי אֲרוּהַ עֵרָה.”

מַאי “כִּי אֲרוּהַ עֵרָה”? אָמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק: בֵּית הַמְּסוּבָךְ בְּאַרְזִים עִיר הוּא? אֲלֵא אֲפִילוּ בֵּית הַמְּסוּבָךְ בְּאַרְזִים מְתוּרְעָע. אָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי: שְׂמֵעַ מִינָהּ, כִּי מִתְחִיל חוּרְבָא בְּסִיפָא מִתְחִיל, שְׁנַאֲמַר: “חָרַב בְּסַף”. וְאִיבְעִית אִימָא. מְהָכָּא: “וּשְׂאִיָּה יִכַּת שְׂעִיר”. אָמַר מַר בַּר רַב אֲשִׁי לְדִידֵי חַזִּי לִיהַּ, וּמְנַגַּח כִּי תוֹרָא.

אָמַר רַב הוֹנָא: זְמֵרָא דְנִגְדֵי וְדִבְקָרֵי – שְׂרִי, דְגִרְדָּאֵי – אָסִיר. רַב הוֹנָא בְטִיל זְמֵרָא. קָם מֵאָה אוּוּוֹי בּוּזָא וּמֵאָה סָאָה חִיטֵי בּוּזָא וְלֹא אִיבְעִי אֲתָא רַב חֲסִדָּא וְלִזְוִיל בֵּיהּ, אִיבְעִיא אוּוּוֹא בּוּזָא וְלֹא מִשְׁתַּבַּח.

בְּאַרְבַּעָה מִיַּי וְזָמַר – בארבעה מיני זמר – With four types of instruments – Despite the fact that the verse singles out four particular instruments, Rav Se'adya Gaon explained that the prohibition applies to all instruments, and the verse mentions only those that are most important.

אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף: זְמָרֵי גְבָרִי וְעֵינֵי נָשִׁי – פְּרִיצוֹתָא; זְמָרֵי נָשִׁי וְעֵינֵי גְבָרִי – כְּאִשׁ בְּנִעוֹרֹת, לְמֵאֵי נַפְקָא מִיְנָה? לְבִטּוּלֵי הָא מְקָמֵי הָא.

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: כָּל הַשּׁוֹתֶה בְּאַרְבַּעָה מִיַּי וְזָמַר – מִבֵּיא חֲמֵשׁ פּוֹרְעֵנִיּוֹת לְעוֹלָם, שְׁנֵאמַר: "הוּי מְשֻׁבְּמֵי בִבְקָר שְׂכָר יוֹדְפוּ מֵאַחֲרֵי בִנְשָׁף וְזוֹ יְדֻלִּיקֵם, וְהָיָה כְּנוֹר וְנִבֵּל תָּף וְחִלְלִל וְיוֹן מִשְׁתֵּיֵהֶם וְאֵת פֶּעַל ה' לֹא יִבִּיטוּ."

מֵה כְּתִיב אַחֲרָיו? "לִכְן גָּלָה עִמִּי מִבְּלֵי דְעֵת" – שְׁגוֹרְמִין גְּלוּת לְעוֹלָם; "וּכְבוֹדוֹ מִתֵּי רָעַב" – שְׁמִבְיָאִין רָעַב לְעוֹלָם; "וְהִמּוֹנוּ צָחָה צָמָא" – שְׁגוֹרְמִין לְתוֹרָה שְׁתִּשְׁתַּבַּח מְלוֹמְדֵיהָ; "וַיִּשָׁח אָדָם וַיִּשְׁפֹּל אִישׁ" – שְׁגוֹרְמִין שְׁפִלוֹת לְשׁוֹנָא שֶׁל הַקְּדוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא, וְאִין "אִישׁ" אֵלָא הַקְּדוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא, שְׁנֵאמַר: "ה' אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה"; "וְעֵינֵי גְבוּהִים תִּשְׁפֹּלְנָה" – שְׁגוֹרְמִין שְׁפִלוֹת שֶׁל יִשְׂרָאֵל.

וּמֵה כְּתִיב אַחֲרָיו? "לִכְן

Rav Yosef said: If men sing and women respond, this is licentiousness. If women sing and men respond, it causes the evil inclination to burn as if one were setting fire to chips of kindling. The Gemara poses a question: **What difference is there?** Rav Yosef indicates that in any case both are prohibited. The Gemara answers: **To nullify one before the other**, i.e., if it is impossible to ban singing entirely, they should at least stop the most problematic form.

Rabbi Yoḥanan says: **Anyone who drinks wine with the accompaniment of four types of instruments<sup>n</sup> brings five types of retribution to the world**, as it is stated: "Woe to them who rise early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink; who tarry late into the night, until wine inflames them. And the harp and the psaltery, the drum and the pipe and wine, are at their feasts, but they do not regard the work of the Lord" (Isaiah 5:11–12).

After listing the sin of those who drink wine with musical accompaniment, the verse states their punishment: **What is written afterward?** "Therefore, My people have gone into captivity, for want of knowledge" (Isaiah 5:13), meaning that they cause exile to the world; "and their honorable men are famished" (Isaiah 5:13), as they bring famine to the world; "and their multitude are parched with thirst" (Isaiah 5:13), that they cause the Torah, which is compared to water, to be forgotten by those who learn it. "And mankind is bowed down, and man is humbled" (Isaiah 5:15), that they cause the enemy of the Holy One, Blessed be He, i.e., God Himself, to be brought down, as "man" in the phrase "and man is humbled" means nothing other than the Holy One, Blessed be He, as it is stated: "The Lord is a man of war" (Exodus 15:3). The verse continues: "And the eyes of the lofty are humbled" (Isaiah 5:15), that they cause the Jewish people to be brought down. These are the five retributions.

And what punishment is written afterward for the people who drank wine with musical accompaniment? "Therefore,

## Perek IX

### Daf 48 Amud b

#### NOTES

וּמִיָּמֵינוּ – There were times an answer rose up, etc. – וְיָמֵינוּ: The precise description of the way the *Urim VeTummim* was constructed is unclear, and various interpretations are offered by the biblical commentaries. The standard explanation is that the ephod and the breastplate themselves were only part of the *Urim VeTummim*, and that a different part, perhaps what is called the *tummim*, consisted of a parchment inscribed with names of God, which was inserted between the folds of the breastplate. The Gemara in *Yoma* 73a–b explains that the *Urim VeTummim* were not used mechanically; rather, the priest required the help of the Divine Spirit in order to understand and interpret what he saw properly. The discussion of the Gemara indicates that the occasional inability to receive a response from the *Urim VeTummim* was a sign that this device was gradually being removed from Israel (see Maharsha).

הִרְחִיבָה שְׂאוֹל נַפְשָׁהּ וּפְעָרָה פִּיהָ לְבָלֵי חֶק וְיָרַד הַדְּרָה וְהִמּוֹנָה וְשִׂאוֹנָה וְעָלוּ בָהּ."

"מִשְׁמַתּוֹ נְבִיאִים הִרְאִינֵנוּ." מֵאֵן נְבִיאִים הִרְאִינֵנוּ? אָמַר רַב הוֹנָא: זֶה דָּוִד וְשִׂמְוֵאל וְשִׁלְמֹה. רַב נַחֲמָן אָמַר: בִּימֵי דָּוִד וְזִמְנֵי סְלִיק וְזִמְנֵי לֹא סְלִיק, שְׁהָרִי שְׂאֵל צְדוּק – וְעֵלְתָּה לוֹ, שְׂאֵל אַבְיָתָר – וְלֹא עֵלְתָּה לוֹ, שְׁנֵאמַר: "וַיַּעַל אַבְיָתָר."

מִתֵּיב רַבָּה בַּר שְׁמוּאֵל: "וַיְהִי לְדָרֶשׁ אֱלֹהִים בִּימֵי זְכַרְיָהוּ הַמְּבִיֵּן בְּרֵאת אֱלֹהִים." מֵאֵי לֹא בְּאוֹרִים וְתוֹמִים! לֹא, בְּנְבִיאִים.

the netherworld has enlarged her desire, and opened her mouth without measure, and down goes their glory and their tumult and their uproar, and he who rejoices among them" (Isaiah 5:14). Their punishment is that they shall descend into the netherworld.

**S** The mishna taught: **From the time when the early prophets died, the *Urim VeTummim* was nullified.** The Gemara poses a question: **Who are the early prophets?** Rav Huna says: **This is referring to David, and Samuel, and Solomon, and after their death the *Urim VeTummim* was no longer used.** Rav Nahman said: **In the days of David there were times an answer rose up<sup>n</sup> for them from the *Urim VeTummim* and there were times an answer did not rise up**, i.e., they did not receive an answer. The proof for this is that Tzadok, the High Priest in David's time, asked the *Urim VeTummim* and an answer rose up for him, whereas Abiathar asked and an answer did not rise up for him, as it is stated: "And Abiathar went up" (II Samuel 15:24), and he was removed from serving as the High Priest as a result.

Rabba bar Shmuel raises an objection: The verse states concerning Uzziyah: "And he set himself to seek God in the days of Zechariah, who had an understanding of the vision of God" (II Chronicles 26:5). **What**, is the verse not stating that Uzziyah would seek God by asking questions of the *Urim VeTummim*, despite the fact that he lived after the time of Solomon? The Gemara rejects this claim: **No**, he would seek God by asking questions of the prophets, but not of the *Urim VeTummim*.



The cities with fields that were allocated to the Levites were nullified – **בְּטִלוּ עִירֵי מְגֵרָשׁ**: The reason for this appears to be that these cities were connected to the settlement of the tribes of Israel in their portions of Eretz Yisrael, as each tribe would set aside some cities with fields for the Levites or priests. As the destruction of the Temple led to the nullification of the division of the land between the tribes, the *halakha* of these cities was no longer kept.

## BACKGROUND

In the upper story – **בְּעֵלְיָה**: Meetings held by the Sages in the attics of homes are mentioned many times in the Talmud. These meetings were held when there was a need for privacy, or even secrecy. This could be due to either limitations placed on the authority of the Sages by the gentile government, or the desire to hold discussions out of the public eye with regard to issues that were significant to the masses.

## PERSONALITIES

Hillel the Elder – **הִלֵּל הַזֶּקֶן**: Hillel the Elder and his colleague Shammai were the last of the *zugot*, the pairs of *tanna'im* who led the Sanhedrin throughout much of the Second Temple period. Hillel served as *Nasi* of the Sanhedrin and Shammai was the deputy *Nasi*, approximately one hundred years prior to the destruction of the Second Temple, at the beginning of Herod's reign. Tradition has it that Hillel began as an impoverished student who took on menial labor in order to pay to attend the lectures of Shemaya and Avtalyon. Ultimately, the Gemara compares him to Ezra the Scribe, crediting him with reestablishing Torah study at a period in history when it was being forgotten (*Sukka* 20a). His disciples were praised as well.

According to the Gemara, Hillel the Elder had eighty students. Thirty of them were worthy of having the Divine Presence rest upon them as it did for Moses, thirty were worthy of the sun standing still for them as it did for Joshua, and twenty were considered to be average, with the greatest among them Yonatan ben Uzziel and the least among them Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai (*Sukka* 28a).

Shmuel HaKatan – **שְׁמוּאֵל הַקָּטָן**: Shmuel HaKatan was a *tanna* living at the time of the destruction of the Second Temple. Even the earlier generations were unsure why he was called *hakatan*, meaning the small one. Some say it was because he acted humbly toward others; others say it was because he was only a bit lower in his spiritual level than the prophet Samuel. Due to his humble personality, he was selected to compose the blessing against heretics in the *Amida* prayer, for no one would suspect him of harboring personal antagonism toward the subjects of that blessing.

Shimon and Yishmael – **שִׁמְעוֹן וְיִשְׁמָאֵל**: Shimon is Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel the First, and Yishmael is Rabbi Yishmael, the High Priest. According to the tradition found in the Midrash, they were both executed by the Roman government, probably due to their positions of prominence within the Jewish community, which was in a state of rebellion at the time. The difference between these two and the others killed is that they were executed by the sword as an official government action, while the others were killed either during or at the end of the siege.

Rabbi Yehuda ben Bava – **רַבִּי יְהוּדָה בֶּן בָּבָא**: Rabbi Yehuda ben Bava was one of the *tanna'im* active during the period between the destruction of the Second Temple and the destruction of the city of Beitar. He began his studies while the Temple was still standing, but was most active during the years when the Sanhedrin was located in Yavne. His testimonies and other teachings are mentioned in many sources.

Rabbi Yehuda ben Bava was famous for his piety. In fact, there is a tradition that whenever it says: An incident occurred with a pious person, it is referring to either Rabbi Yehuda ben Bava or to Rabbi Yehuda ben Ilai. According to the Gemara in tractate *Sanhedrin*, he was cruelly executed by the Romans after ordaining five Sages to serve as judges. It was said that if not for him, the *halakhot* of fines would have disappeared from among Israel. According to calculations, he must have been over the age of ninety when he died.

The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a proof from a *baraita* (*Tosefta* 13:2) with regard to when the *Urim VeTummim* ceased: From the time when the First Temple was destroyed, the cities with fields that were allocated to the Levites were nullified,<sup>N</sup> and the *Urim VeTummim* ceased, and the monarchy ceased from the house of David.

And if a person would whisper to you saying that the *Urim VeTummim* was still extant, as it states with regard to when the Second Temple first stood: “And the Tirshatha said to them that they should not eat of the most sacred things, until there stood a priest with the *Urim VeTummim*” (*Ezra* 2:63), which seems to indicate that they merely had to wait until the Second Temple was built for the reappearance of the *Urim VeTummim*; you should say to him that this is not referring to an expectation of a short-term development, but it is like a person who says to his friend, with regard to something that will occur in the distant future: Until the dead live and the Messiah, the son of David, comes. In any case, the *baraita* indicates that the *Urim VeTummim* ceased only from the time when the First Temple was destroyed, and not in the time of Solomon.

Rather, Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: Who are the early prophets, with regard to whom it states that use of the *Urim VeTummim* ceased immediately after their death? This term early prophets serves to exclude Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, who are the latter prophets. The *Urim VeTummim* was used throughout the First Temple period, up to, but not including, their time. As the Sages taught in a *baraita* (*Tosefta* 13:3): From the time when Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi died the Divine Spirit departed from the Jewish people, as these three were considered to be the last prophets. And even after the *Urim VeTummim* ceased to exist, they would nevertheless still make use of a Divine Voice to receive instructions from Above, even after this time.

For on one occasion the Sages were reclining in the upper story<sup>B</sup> of the house of Gurya in Jericho. A Divine Voice from Heaven was issued to them, and it said: There is one person among you for whom it is fitting that the Divine Presence should rest upon him as a prophet, but his generation is not fit for it; they do not deserve to have a prophet among them. The Sages present directed their gaze to Hillel the Elder.<sup>P</sup> And when he died, they eulogized him in the following manner: Alas pious one, alas humble one, student of Ezra.

And again, on another occasion several generations later, the Sages were reclining in an upper story of a house in Yavne, and a Divine Voice from Heaven was issued to them, and said: There is one person among you for whom it is fitting that the Divine Presence should rest upon him, but his generation is not fit for it. The Sages present directed their gaze to Shmuel HaKatan.<sup>P</sup> And when he died, they eulogized him in the following manner: Alas humble one, alas pious one, student of Hillel.

And he too, Shmuel HaKatan, said the following statement of divinely inspired prediction at the time of his death: Shimon, i.e., Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, and Yishmael,<sup>P</sup> i.e., Rabbi Yishmael ben Elisha the High Priest, are slated for the sword, and their colleagues for killing, and the rest of the people for plunder, and great troubles are destined to befall the people. The Gemara relates: And they also sought to say about Rabbi Yehuda ben Bava,<sup>P</sup> when eulogizing him: Alas pious one, alas humble one, but the moment was disturbed and they could not do so. That is because eulogies are not given for those killed by the monarchy, which was Rabbi Yehuda ben Bava's fate, in order not to arouse the monarchy's wrath.

תָּא שְׂמַע: מְשַׁחֲרֵב בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ רָאשׁוֹן בְּטִלוּ עִירֵי מְגֵרָשׁ, וּפְסָקוּ אוֹרֵים וְתוֹמִים, וּפְסָק מֶלֶךְ מִבֵּית דָּוִד.

וְאִם לְחַשְׁךְ אָדָם לֹמַר: “וַיֹּאמֶר הַתִּרְשָׁתָא לְהֵם אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵאכְלוּ מִקְדָּשׁ הַקְּדָשִׁים עַד עֹמֵד כְּהֵן לְאוֹרִים וְלִתְמִים!” אָמַר לוֹ: כְּאֲדָם שְׂאוֹמֵר לְחַבְּירוֹ “עַד שְׂחִיזוֹ מֵתִים וְיֵבֵא מְשִׁיחַ בֶּן דָּוִד!”

אֲלֵא אָמַר רַב נַחְמָן בַּר יִצְחָק: מֵאַן נְבִיאִים הָרֵאשׁוֹנִים? לְאַפְּוִקֵי מַחְגֵי זְכַרְיָה וּמְלָאכִי, דְּאַחֲרוֹנִים נִיבְהוּ: דְּתַנּוּ רַבְנֵי: מִשְׁמַתּוֹ חֲגֵי זְכַרְיָה וּמְלָאכִי נִסְתַּלְקָה רוּחַ הַקְּדוֹשׁ מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל, וְאַף עַל כֵּן הָיוּ מְשַׁתְּמִשִׁים בְּבֵת קוֹל,

שְׁפַעַם אַחַת הָיוּ מְסוּבִין בְּעֵלְיָת בֵּית גּוּרְיָא בִּירֵיחוֹ, נִתְנָה עֲלֵיהֶן בֵּת קוֹל מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאָמְרָה: יֵשׁ בְּכֶם אָדָם אֶחָד שְׂרָאוֹי שְׁתִּשְׂרָה שְׂכִינָה עָלָיו, אֲלֵא שְׂאִין דּוֹרוֹ רְאוּי לְכָךְ. נִתְנָה עֵינֵיהֶם בְּהִלֵּל הַזֶּקֶן, וּבְשִׁמְתָא, הַסְפִּידוּהוּ: הֵי חָסִיד, הֵי עָנִי, תִּלְמִידוֹ שֶׁל עֶזְרָא!

וְשׁוּב פַּעַם אַחֲרַת הָיוּ מְסוּבִין בְּעֵלְיָת בְּיַבְנֵה, נִתְנָה לָהֶן בֵּת קוֹל מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאָמְרָה לָהֶן: יֵשׁ בְּכֶם אָדָם אֶחָד שְׂרָאוֹי שְׁתִּשְׂרָה שְׂכִינָה עָלָיו, אֲלֵא שְׂאִין דּוֹרוֹ וְכֹאִין לְכָךְ. נִתְנָה עֵינֵיהֶם בְּשְׁמוּאֵל הַקָּטָן, וּבְשִׁמְתָא, הַסְפִּידוּהוּ: הֵי עָנִי, הֵי חָסִיד, תִּלְמִידוֹ שֶׁל הִלֵּל.

וְאַף הוּא אָמַר בְּשַׁעַת מִיתָתוֹ: שְׁמַעוֹן וְיִשְׁמָעֵאל לְחַרְבָּא, וְחַבְּרוּהֵי לְקַטְלָא, וְשְׂאָר עַמָּא לְבִיזָא. וְעַקְוֵן סְגִיָּאִין עֲתִידִין לְמִיתֵי עַל עַמָּא. וְאַף עַל רַבִּי יְהוּדָה בֶּן בָּבָא בְּקִשְׁוֹ לֹמַר “הֵי חָסִיד, הֵי עָנִי”, אֲלֵא שְׁנִטְרַפָּה שְׁעָה, שְׂאִין מְסַפְּדִין עַל הַרוּגֵי מַלְכוּתָא.

Scalpel [*izemel*] – איזמל: From the Greek σμίλη, *smilē*, meaning a knife used for cutting and carving, a surgeon's knife, or a knife used in pruning branches.



Ancient Roman scalpel

Tufts [*sefogin*] – ספוגין: From the Greek σπόγγος, *spongos*, meaning sponge. This is a type of marine organism, *Spongia officinalis*, that is taken from the ocean and used in bathing. The word was extended to mean anything soft like a sponge.



Live sponge



Skeleton of sponge

Vessel [*itenei*] – איטני: There are several opinions with regard to both the origin of this word and its meaning. Some say it is from the Greek, and some say it is a variant form of the Aramaic *udnei*, which is a vessel with a handle. Others say it is an Aramaic variant of the Hebrew *teneh*, small basket, which may in turn be derived from the Akkadian.

#### BACKGROUND

A leaden vessel – איטני של אבר: The assumption underlying all of the details here is that the *shamir* would break only hard substances. Therefore, it was wrapped in tufts of wool and pieces of barley bran, both of which are soft, and it was put into a container made of lead, a soft metal.

”מִשְׁחָרֵב בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ בְּטֵל הַשְּׁמִיר”  
 כו'. תְּנוּ רַבָּנַן: שְׁמִיר – שָׁבוּ בְּנֵה שְׁלֹמֹה  
 אֶת בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ, שְׁנֵאָמַר: ”וְהַבֵּית  
 בַּהֲבִנְתּוֹ אָבֹן שְׁלֹמֹה מִסַּע נִבְנָה” –  
 הַדְּבָרִים כְּכַתְּבָן, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה.

אָמַר לוֹ רַבִּי נְחֵמְיָה: וְכִי אֶפְשָׁר לוֹמַר  
 בְּזֶן וְהֵלֵא כְּבָר נֹאמַר: ”כָּל אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹנִים  
 יִקְרָת וְגו' מְגִרֹת בְּמִגְרָה!” אִם בֶּן,  
 מֵה תִלְמוּד לֹמַר: ”לֹא נִשְׁמַע בְּבֵית  
 הַהֲבִנְתּוֹ?” שְׁהֵיה מִתְקִין מִבְּחוּץ  
 וּמְכַנֵּס מִבְּפָנִים. אָמַר רַבִּי: נִרְאִין דְּבָרֵי  
 רַבִּי יְהוּדָה בְּאֲבָנֵי מִקְדָּשׁ, וְדְבָרֵי רַבִּי  
 נְחֵמְיָה בְּאֲבָנֵי בֵיתוֹ.

וְרַבִּי נְחֵמְיָה, שְׁמִיר לְמֵאֵי אֶתָּא? מִיִּבְעֵי  
 לֵיה לְכַדְתֵּנָא: אֲבֹנִים הֲלָלוּ אִין בּוֹתְבִין  
 אוֹתָן בְּדִין, מְשׁוּם שְׁנֵאָמַר: ”פְּתוּחֵי  
 חוֹתָם.” וְאִין מְסֻרְטִין עֲלֵיהֶם בְּאִיזְמַל,  
 מְשׁוּם שְׁנֵאָמַר: ”בְּמִלּוּאוֹתָם,”

אֲלֵא בּוֹתֵב עֲלֵיהֶם בְּדִין, וּמִרְאָה לְהֵן  
 שְׁמִיר מִבְּחוּץ וְהֵן נִבְקָעוֹת מֵאֵלֵיהֶן,  
 כְּתֵאֵינָה זֶה שְׁנִבְקָעַת בִּימּוֹת הַחֲמִיָּה  
 וְאֵינָה חֲסִירָה כְּלוּם, וְכִבְקָעָה זֶה  
 שְׁנִבְקָעַת בִּימּוֹת הַגְּשָׁמִים וְאֵינָה  
 חֲסִירָה כְּלוּם.

תְּנוּ רַבָּנַן: שְׁמִיר זֶה בְּרִייתוֹ בְּשַׁעֲרֵה,  
 וּמִשִּׁשֶּׁת יָמֵי בְּרֵאשִׁית נִבְרָא, וְאִין כָּל  
 דְּבָר קִשָּׁה יָכוֹל לְעִמּוֹד בְּפָנָיו. בְּמָה  
 מְשַׁמְרִין אוֹתוֹ? בּוֹרְכִין אוֹתוֹ בְּסַפּוּגִין  
 שֶׁל צֶמֶר, וּמְנִיחִין אוֹתוֹ בְּאִיטְנֵי שֶׁל  
 אָבֵר מְלִיאָה סוּבֵי שַׁעֲרֵין.

§ The mishna taught: From the time when the First Temple was destroyed the *shamir* ceased to exist. The Sages taught: This *shamir* is the creature with which Solomon built the Temple, as it is stated: “For the house, when it was built, was built of whole stone from the quarry” (1 Kings 6:7). Now these words should be understood exactly as they are written, that King Solomon took whole stones and shaped them by having the *shamir* do the cutting. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

Rabbi Neḥemya said to him: And is it possible to say so? But isn't it already stated: “All these were costly stones, according to the measures of hewn stones, sawed with saws” (II Kings 7:9), which indicates that saws, which are iron implements, were used to shape the stones? If so, what is the meaning when the verse states: “And hammer, ax, and any tool of iron were not heard in the house when it was being built” (1 Kings 6:7)? It means that he would prepare the stones outside<sup>h</sup> the Temple Mount using tools, and bring them inside already cut, so that no iron tools were used inside the Temple itself. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: The statement of Rabbi Yehuda that no iron tools were used appears to be correct with regard to the Temple stones, and the statement of Rabbi Neḥemya that tools were used appears to be correct with regard to the stones of the king's own house.

The Gemara poses a question: And according to Rabbi Neḥemya, who maintains that they used iron tools even in the cutting of the stones for the Temple, for what purpose did the *shamir* come? The Gemara answers: It was necessary for that which is taught in a *baraita*: These stones<sup>h</sup> in the breastplate and ephod, upon which were inscribed the names of the tribes, they may not be written on with ink, because it is stated: “Like the engravings of a signet” (Exodus 28:21), which means the names must be engraved onto the stones. And they may not be scratched on with a scalpel [*izemel*],<sup>l</sup> because it is stated: “In their full settings” (Exodus 28:20), indicating that the stones must be complete and not missing any of their mass.

The *baraita* continues: Rather, one writes the letters on them in ink, and shows them, i.e., he places the *shamir* close to the ink markings from outside, without having it touch the stones, and they split open along the lines of the ink of their own accord, like this fig that splits in the summer without losing anything of its mass, and like this field in a valley that cracks in the rainy season without losing anything of its mass. The *shamir* was used in this way for these engravings.

The Sages taught: This *shamir*, its size is that of a barleycorn, and it was created in the six days of creation, and nothing hard can withstand it. In what is it kept, so that it will not break everything in the vicinity? They wrap it in tufts [*sefogin*]<sup>l</sup> of wool and place it in a leaden vessel [*itenei*],<sup>bl</sup> full of barley bran, which is soft and will not be broken by the *shamir*.

#### HALAKHA

He would prepare the stones outside, etc. – שְׁהֵיה מִתְקִין – שְׁהֵיה מִתְקִין: The Sanctuary and the Courtyard should be constructed, if possible, with large stones. The stones may not be cut and chiseled on the Temple Mount itself, but all preparations must be performed outside of the Temple Mount. They are then brought into the building, in accordance with Rabbi Neḥemya (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 1:8; see *Kesef Mishne*).

These stones, etc. – אֲבֹנִים הֲלָלוּ וכו': The Rambam omits this *halakha*, to the surprise of the *Mishne LaMelekh*, who cites the Ramban's opinion that this *halakha* applies to the stones of the breastplate but not to those of the ephod. Perhaps the Rambam is of the opinion that this is only a mitzva *ab initio*, but is not an indispensable requirement (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:7, in the *Mishne LaMelekh*).



Shiny [*peranda*] – פֶּרְנָדָא: There are several theories with regard to the origin of this word, although apparently it comes from the Persian *parund*, a type of elaborate silk.

Silk [*shira*] – שִׁירָא: From the Greek σήρικόν, *sērikon*, meaning silk.

## NOTES

Shiny silk – שִׁירָא פֶּרְנָדָא: According to Rashi this means a type of silk. Following this opinion, the *Tosefot HaRosh* states that the Gemara does not mean that this substance ceased to exist entirely, as elsewhere the Gemara mentions that it was used by *amora'im*. Rather, it became rarer than in earlier times.

Comes from elevated areas [*tzipiyya*] – הַבָּא מִן הַצִּיפִּיָּא: The *Tosefot Yom Tov*, citing Rabbi Ovadya Bartenura and others, maintains that *tzipiyya* is the name of a place. This name had been *Zofim* in biblical times, but it changed over the course of time. Many commentaries explain *tzufim* not as a name but as a general word for mountains. The Rambam in his Commentary to the Mishna indicates that *tzufim* is the name of an excellent type of honey.

Who plunders the day of small things – מִי בּוֹ לַיּוֹם: This exposition appears to be based on the fact that the vowel of the word *baz* is not a *kamatz*, as would be the case if it were derived from the root *beit, vav, zayin*, to despise, but a *patah*, which indicates that it stems from the root *beit, zayin, zayin*, to plunder.

אָמַר רַבִּי אָמִי: מִשְׁחָרַב מִקְדָּשׁ רֵאשׁוֹן – בְּטֹלָה שִׁירָא פֶּרְנָדָא, וְזִכְוִית לְבָנָה. תַּנְיָא נִמְי הָבִי: מִשְׁחָרַב מִקְדָּשׁ רֵאשׁוֹן – בְּטֹלָה שִׁירָא פֶּרְנָדָא, וְזִכְוִית לְבָנָה, וְרִכָּב בְּרוּל; וַיֵּשׁ אֲוֹמְרִים: אִף יַיִן קָרוֹשׁ הֵבֵא מִשְׁנֵי, הַדּוּמָה בְּעֵיגוּלֵי דְבִילָה.

”וְנוֹפֵת צוֹפִים.” מֵאֵי נּוֹפֵת צוֹפִים? אָמַר רַב: סוֹלֵת שְׂצָפָה עַל גְּבֵי נֶפֶה, וְדוּמָה לְעִסָּה שְׁנוֹלוּשָׁה בְּדָבֵשׁ וְשֶׁמֶן, וְלוֹי אָמַר: שְׁתֵּי כְּבוֹרוֹת הַנְּדָבְקוֹת בְּתַנּוּר, וְתוֹפְחוֹת וּבָאוֹת עַד שְׂמֻגִיעוֹת זֶה לְזֶה; וְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֹוי אָמַר: זֶה דָּבֵשׁ הֵבֵא מִן הַצִּיפִּיָּא. מֵאֵי מִשְׁמַע? כְּדַמְתָּגֵם רַב שֵׁשֶׁת: כְּמָא דְנִתְּוֵן דְּבִרְיָאָתָהּ וְשִׁיטְוֵן בְּרוּמֵי עֲלָמָא וּמְתִיין דִּבְשָׂא מְעִשְׂבֵי טוּרָא.

תַּנּוּן תַּתְּמֵן: כָּל הַנְּצוּק טְהוּר, חוּץ מִדְּבֵשׁ וְזִפִּים וְהַצִּפִּיָּים. מֵאֵי זִפִּים? אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: דְּבֵשׁ שְׂמֻזִּיפִין בּוֹ; וְרִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: עַל שֵׁם מְקוּמוֹ, כְּדָכְתִּיב: זִיף וְטֹלֵם וּבְעָלוֹת.”

כִּיֹּצֵא בְּדָבָר אֲתָה אֹמֵר: ”בְּבֹא הַזִּפִּים וַיֹּאמְרוּ לְשֹׂאֵל הַלֵּא דָּוִד” וְגו’. מֵאֵי זִפִּים? אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: בְּנֵי אָדָם הַמְזוּיִפִּין דְּבִרְיָהֶם; וְרַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר אֹמֵר: עַל שֵׁם מְקוּמוֹ, כְּדָכְתִּיב: ”זִיף וְטֹלֵם וּבְעָלוֹת.”

”וּפְסָקוּ אַנְשֵׁי אֲמִנָּה.” אָמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק: אֵלוּ בְנֵי אָדָם שְׁהֵן מֵאֲמִינֵן בְּהַקְדוּשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא; דְּתַנְיָא, רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר הַגְּדוֹל אֹמֵר: כָּל מִי שֵׁשׁ לוֹ פֶּת בְּסֵלוֹ וְאֹמֵר ”מָה אוֹכֵל לְמַחֵר” – אֵינוֹ אֶלָּא מְקַטְנֵי אֲמִנָּה.

וְהֵינּוּ דְאָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר, מֵאֵי דְכָתִיב: ”כִּי מִי בּוֹ לַיּוֹם קִטְנוֹת?” מִי גֵרַם לְצַדִּיקִים שְׂוִיתָבּוֹבוּ שׁוֹלְחָנָן לְעֵתִיד לָבֵא? קִטְנוֹת שְׁהִיָּה בְּהֵן, שְׁלֵא הָאֲמִינוּ בְּהַקְדוּשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא. רַבָּא אָמַר: אֵלוּ קִטְנֵי בְנֵי רְשָׁעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל,

§ Rabbi Ami says: From the time when the First Temple was destroyed, shiny [*peranda*]<sup>1</sup> silk [*shira*]<sup>2</sup> and white glass ceased to exist. This is also taught in a *baraita*: From the time when the First Temple was destroyed, shiny silk, white glass,<sup>3</sup> and iron chariots ceased; and some say that even congealed wine<sup>4</sup> that comes from Senir, the Hermon, which is similar to round fig cakes after it congeals, ceased to exist as well.

The mishna taught: And the sweetness of the honeycomb [*nofet tzufim*] also ceased when the First Temple was destroyed. The Gemara asks: What is *nofet tzufim*? Rav says: Fine flour that floats up and remains on the top of the sieve [*nafa*], which is similar in taste to dough kneaded with honey and oil. And Levi says that *nofet tzufim* is the term for two loaves stuck together in an oven, which keep swelling until they reach each other. And Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi says: This is honey that comes from elevated areas [*tzipiyya*].<sup>5</sup> The Gemara explains: From where may it be inferred that this is what *nofet tzufim* is? As Rav Sheshet would translate the words: “As the bees do” (Deuteronomy 1:44): Like the bees spread out and fly all over the world and bring honey from mountainous plants. Similarly, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi states that honey comes from elevated areas.

We learned in a mishna there (*Makshirin* 5:9): Anything that is poured remains ritually pure. In other words, even if a liquid is poured into a ritually impure utensil, the stream of the liquid does not defile the contents that remain in the ritually pure utensil from which they were poured, apart from *zifim* honey and wafer batter. These substances are too viscous to be considered liquids. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of *zifim*? Rabbi Yohanan says: Honey of such rare quality that they could falsify [*mezayyefin*] it,<sup>6</sup> by diluting it with other substances, and it would not be noticed. And Reish Lakish says: It is named after its place, as it is written: “Ziph and Telem and Bealoth” (Joshua 15:24).

Similarly, you can say with regard to the verse: “When the *zifim* came and said to Saul, does not David hide himself with us” (Psalms 54:2). What is the meaning of *zifim*, mentioned in this verse? Rabbi Yohanan says: It means people who would falsify [*hamzayyefin*] their words. And Rabbi Elazar says: They are called after their place, as it is written: “Ziph and Telem and Bealoth.”

§ The mishna states that from the time when the Second Temple was destroyed men of faith ceased. Rabbi Yitzhak says: These are people who believe in the Holy One, Blessed be He, and place their trust in Him in all their ways. As it is taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Eliezer the Great says that whoever has bread in his basket to eat today and says: What shall I eat tomorrow, meaning he does not know how he will acquire bread for tomorrow, he is nothing other than from those of little faith. One must trust in God to provide him with his sustenance.

And this is what Rabbi Elazar said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “For who plunders the day of small things”<sup>7</sup> (Zechariah 4:10)? What caused the table, i.e., the reward, of the righteous to be plundered, meaning wasted, in the future? It was the small-mindedness they possessed. And what is this small-mindedness? That they did not believe in the Holy One, Blessed be He, with a complete faith. Rava said: Who plunders the day of small things? These are the small children of the wicked ones of the Jewish people, who die young,

## BACKGROUND

White glass – זִכְוִית לְבָנָה: Apparently, this means totally transparent glass. Even though glassmaking is an ancient art, it was difficult to manufacture transparent glass due to the presence of impurities in the raw materials. White glass is mentioned throughout the ages as being an expensive type of glass.

Congeaed wine – יַיִן קָרוֹשׁ: In the Hermon region they would congeal wine by placing it in snow. This would cause the wine to appear like a cake of pressed figs. This may have been done as a means of preservation, or to raise the alcohol content of the wine, as some of the water in the wine would freeze separately, leaving the latter more concentrated.

Honey that they could falsify it – דְּבֵשׁ שְׂמֻזִּיפִין בּוֹ: The higher the concentration of sugar in honey, the easier it is to add other substances, such as flour, without there being a noticeable impact on the honey’s taste. After the honey absorbs the additives, it is difficult to differentiate between unadulterated honey and the inferior product.