

Az ószövetségi kánon kialakulása – rabbinikus szövegek

I. m. *Jadajim* 3:5

I. Az a tekercs, amelyről letörölték az írást és nyolcvanöt betű megmaradt rajta, annyi, mint amennyi a „valahányszor elindult a láda, ezt mondta Mózes” (Num 10:35–36) részben van, tisztálanná teszi a kezeket.

II. A [Tóra] bármelyik lapja, amelyre nyolcvanöt betű van írva, annyi, mint amennyi a „valahányszor elindult a láda, ezt mondta Mózes” részben van, tisztálanná teszi a kezeket.

III. minden szent könyv tisztálanná teszi a kezeket.

IV. Az Énekek éneke és a Prédikátor könyve tisztálanná teszi a kezeket.

V. Rabbi Jehuda szerint az Énekek éneke tisztálanná teszi a kezeket, de vita van a Prédikátor könyvről. Rabbi Joszé szerint a Prédikátor könyve nem teszi tisztálanná a kezeket, de vita van az Énekek énekéről. Rabbi Simeon szerint a Prédikátor könyve egyike [azoknak], amikor Sammáj iskolája volt engedékeny, Hillél iskolája pedig szigorú.

VI. Rabbi Simeon ben Azzaj mondta: „Azon a napon, amikor Rab bi Eleázár ben Azarját a jesiva vezetőjévé nevezték ki, azt a hagyományt kaptam a hetvenkét véntől, hogy az Énekek éneke és a Prédikátor könyve tisztálanná teszik a kezeket.”

VII. Rabbi Akiva így felelt: „Nem így van! Azt ugyanis senki sem vitatta Izraelben, hogy az Énekek éneke tisztálanná teszi a kezeket. Mert az egész világ nem ér annyit, mint az a nap, amelyen az Énekek éneke Izraelnek adatott; mert minden könyv szent, de az Énekek éneke a legszentebb. Így ha vitatkoztak, csak a Prédikátor könyvről vitatkoztak.”

VIII. Rabbi Johanan ben Jehosua, Rabbi Akiva apósának fia ezt mondta: „Ben Azzajnak van igaza: vitatkoztak, és elfogadták.”

Ford.: *Törpék az óriások vállán. Válogatott Misna traktátusok.* (Szerk. Görgey Etelka.)
Sárospataki Református Teológiai Akadémia, 2010, 88–89, kis változtatásokkal.

Mishna - Mas. Yadayim Chapter 3

Mishnah 1. If a person puts his hands inside a house smitten with leprosy,¹ his hands become unclean in the first degree.² [these are] the words of r. Akiba. But the sages say: his hands become unclean in the second degree. Whoever conveys uncleanness to the garments at the time when he touches [the uncleanness]³ conveys a first degree of uncleanness to the hands.⁴ [these] are the words of r. Akiba. But the sages say: in such a case he conveys a second degree of uncleanness. They said to r. Akiba: where do we find anywhere that the hands become unclean in the first degree? He said to them: but how is it possible for them to become unclean in the first degree without his whole body becoming unclean,⁵ save only in these cases?⁶ foodstuffs and vessels which have been rendered unclean by liquids convey a second degree of uncleanness to the hands. [these are] the words of r. Joshua. But the sages say: that which has been rendered unclean by a father of uncleanness conveys uncleanness to the hands, but that which has been rendered unclean by an offspring of uncleanness⁷ does not convey uncleanness to the hands. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: a practical instance occurred when a certain woman came before my father and said to him, my hands protruded into the air-space inside an earthenware vessel.⁸ he said to her: my daughter, what was the cause of its uncleanness?⁹ but i did not hear what she said to him. The sages said: the matter is clear. That which has been rendered unclean by a ‘father of uncleanness’ conveys uncleanness to the hands, but if by an offspring of uncleanness’ it does not convey uncleanness to the hands.

Mishnah 2. Everything which renders terumah unfit¹⁰ conveys a second degree of uncleanness to the hands.¹¹ one [unwashed] hand can convey uncleanness to the other hand. [these¹¹ are] the

words of r. Joshua.11 but the sages say: that which is in the second degree of uncleanness cannot convey a second degree of uncleanness. He said to them: but do not the holy scriptures which are in the second degree of uncleanness¹² render unclean the hands?¹³ they said to him: the laws of the torah may not be argued from the laws of the scribes, nor may the laws of the scribes be argued from the laws of the torah, nor may the laws of the scribes be argued from [other] laws of the scribes.¹⁴

Mishnah 3. The straps of the tefillin¹⁵ [when connected] with the tefillin render unclean the hands.¹⁶ r. Simeon says: the straps of the tefillin do not render unclean the hands. Mishnah 4. The margin on a scroll¹⁷ which is above¹⁸ or below or at the beginning¹⁹ or at the end renders unclean the hands. R. Judah says: the margin at the end does not render unclean [the hands] until a handle is fastened to it.²⁰

Mishnah 5. A scroll²¹ on which the writing has become erased and eighty-five letters remain thereon, as many as are in the section beginning, ‘and it came to pass when the ark set forward’,etc.²² renders unclean the hands. A single sheet²³ on which there are written eighty-five letters, as many as are in the section beginning, ‘and it came to pass when the ark set forward’, renders unclean the hands. All the holy writings²⁴ render unclean the hands. The song of songs and ecclesiastes render unclean the hands.²⁵ r. Judah says: the song of songs renders unclean the hands, but there is a dispute about ecclesiastes.²⁶ r. Jose says: ecclesiastes does not render unclean the hands, but there is a dispute about the song of songs. R. Simeon says: [the ruling about] ecclesiastes is one of the leniencies of beth shammai and one of the stringencies of beth hillel.²⁶ r. Simeon b. Azzai said: i received a tradition from the seventy-two²⁷ elders on the day when they appointed r. Eleazar b. Azariah head of the academy²⁸ that the song of songs and ecclesiastes render unclean the hands. R. Akiba said: far be it! No man in israel disputed about the song of songs [by saying] that it does not render unclean the hands. For the whole world is not as worthy as the day on which the song of songs was given to israel; for all the writings are holy but the song of songs is the holy of holies. So that if they had a dispute, they had a dispute only about ecclesiastes. A. Johanan b. Joshua the son of the father-in-law of r. Akiba said: in accordance with the words of ben azzai so they disputed,²⁹ and so they reached a decision.³⁰

NOTES: (1) V. Neg. XII-XIII. (2) The house smitten with leprosy is a ‘father of uncleanness’ and therefore according to R. Akiba conveys uncleanness of the first degree to the hands. (3) I.e., where one touches any of the uncleannesses specified in Zab. V. 7: e.g., the spittle of a zab. (4) Although he who had come into contact with such uncleanness does not convey further uncleannesses to a man. (5) For to suffer firstgrade uncleanness one must have contracted it from a ‘father of uncleanness’; but if the hands had come into contact with such a grade of uncleanness the whole body becomes unclean. (6) Which are exceptions. (7) Liquids are ‘offsprings of uncleanness’. (8) Which had been rendered unclean. (9) Was it rendered unclean by a ‘father of uncleanness’ or by an ‘offspring of uncleanness’, such as a liquid? (10) Terumah is rendered unfit by anything which is in the second degree of uncleanness. Cf. Zab. V, 12 and supra III, 1, n. 2. They are enumerated in the eighteen decrees of Beth Shammai. Cf. Shab. 14a. (11) Both statements are by R. Joshua. (12) Among the eighteen decrees enacted by Beth Shammai was that the Holy Scriptures rendered terumah unfit on coming into contact with it; the reason being that the priests stored the terumah side by side with the Scrolls of the Holy Scriptures with the result that the mice which gnawed the terumah nibbled also at the Scrolls. The object of this decree was to prevent this desecration. Cf. Shab. 14a and Rashi loc. cit. Holy Scriptures were thus declared to be in the seconddegree of uncleanness so as to render terumah unfit. (13) In order to ensure that the Holy Scriptures would not be touched by the bare hands, it was further enacted that hands which touched a Scroll of the Scriptures became unclean in the second degree and therefore rendered terumah unfit. Cf. Shab. 14a and Tosaf. s. v. zjutv . (14) The Scribes, i.e., Solomon,

enacted that hands must be cleansed since they convey uncleanness, v. Introduction. The Scribes, i.e the Rabbis, enacted that the Holy Scriptures convey uncleanness. Hence one cannot deduce that just as in the case of the Holy Scriptures a second degree of uncleanness conveys a second degree of uncleanness, so in the ease of other defilements, a second degree of uncleanness conveys a second degree. (15) V. Glos. (16) The tefillin contain four sections of the Pentateuch. The Sages thus extend the principle that hands which have touched the Holy Scriptures render terumah unfit. (17) I.e., a scroll of a Book of the Holy Scriptures. (18) I.e., above the writing on the scroll. The width of the margin above must be three fingerbreadths and the width of that below must be one span. Cf. Men. 30a. (19) At the beginning of the scroll there must be a margin sufficient in width for winding round the cylinder, and at the end there must be a margin sufficient for winding round the whole circumference of the scroll when it is rolled up; cf. B. B. 13a. (20) R. Judah is of the opinion that until a handle is fastened to the scroll the margin at the end has no holiness attached to it, as it can be cut away if desired. (21) Sc. of the Pentateuch. (22) Num. X, 35-36. These two verses were considered to constitute a separate Book, of Shab. 116a. (23) One of the sheets of a Pentateuch scroll. Lit., 'a scroll'. (24) I.e., not only the Books of the Pentateuch but also the Prophetic Books and the Hagiographa. (25) Since they are part of the Holy Scriptures. (26) The earliest discussion as to whether Ecclesiastes should be regarded as a sacred book took place between Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel. According to the former, Ecclesiastes did not convey uncleanness to the hands, i.e., was not to be regarded as a sacred work and therefore not to be included in the Canon, but according to Beth Hillel it did convey uncleanness to the hands and therefore was to be included in the Canon; cf. 'Ed. V, 3. The basis of Beth Shammai's contention was evidently that recorded in Shab. 30b where it is stated that the Sages did not intend to include Ecclesiastes in the Canon of the Bible, because its statements seemed to contradict one another. They finally decided to include it because It begins and ends with words which indicate its sacred character. A further reason which supports the view of Beth Shammai is given by R. Simeon b. Menasyah who expressed the view that the Song of Songs conveyed uncleanness to the hands because it was inspired by the Holy Spirit, whereas Ecclesiastes was inspired solely by the Wisdom of Solomon himself. Cf. Tosef. ad loc. and Meg. 7a. (27) The Greater Sanhedrin consisted of seventy-one members; of. Sanh. I, 6. Various suggestions have been made to account for the additional one member referred to in this Mishnah. According to Tosaf. Sanh. 16b s. v. sjt there was an additional member of the Sanhedrin known as the Mufla, i.e., the distinguished member of the Sanhedrin who was first in authority. Lauterbach suggests that the number seventy-two included both Rabban Gamaliel and K. Eleazar b. 'Azariah. Cf. J. E. s. v. Sanhedrin and Ber. 28a. (28) V. Ber. 27b. (29) About both the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes. (30) That both render unclean the hands.

b. *Megillá* 7a;

R. Eliezer of Modi'im says: Write this', namely, what is written here and in Deuteronomy; for a memorial', namely, what is written in the Prophets; 'in a book', namely, what is written in the Megillah. Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel; [The scroll] of Esther does not make the hands unclean.¹⁴ Are we to infer from this that Samuel was of opinion that Esther was not composed¹⁵ under the inspiration of the holy spirit? How can this be, Seeing that Samuel has said that Esther was composed under the inspiration of the holy spirit? — It was composed to be recited [by heart], but not to be written. The following objection was raised: 'R. Meir says that [the scroll of] Koheleth¹⁶ does not render the hands unclean, and that about the Song of Songs there is a difference of opinion. R. Jose says that the Song of Songs renders the hands unclean, and about Koheleth there is a difference of opinion. R. Simeon says that Koheleth is one of those matters in regard to which Beth Shammai were more lenient and Beth Hillel more stringent, but Ruth and the Song of Songs and Esther [certainly] make the hands unclean!' — Samuel

concurred with R. Joshua.¹⁷ It has been taught: R. Simeon b. Menasia said: Koheleth does not render the hands unclean because it contains only the wisdom of Solomon.¹⁸ They said to him], Was this then all that he composed? Is it not stated elsewhere, And he spoke three thousand proverbs,¹⁹ and it further says, Add thou not unto his words?²⁰ Why this further quotation? — In case you might object that he composed very much, and what it pleased him to write he wrote and what it did not please him he did not write. Therefore it says,²¹ Add thou not to his words.²² It has been taught: R. Eleazar said: Esther was composed under the inspiration of the holy spirit, as it says, And Haman said in his heart.²³ R. Akiba says: Esther was composed under the inspiration of the holy spirit, as it says, And Esther obtained favor in the eyes of all that looked upon her.²⁴ R. Meir says: Esther was composed under the inspiration of the holy spirit, as it says, And the thing became known to Mordecai.²⁵ R. Jose b. Durmaskith said: Esther was composed under the inspiration of the holy spirit, as it says, But on the spoil they laid not their hands,²⁶ Said Samuel: Had I been there,²⁷ I would have given a proof superior to all, namely, that it says, They confirmed and took upon them,²⁸ [which means] they confirmed above²⁹ what they took upon themselves below.

(14) Like the scrolls of other books of the Scripture. V. Shab.14. (15) Lit., ‘said’. (16) Ecclesiastes. (17) That the Megillah was not meant to be written. (18) And not inspired wisdom. (19) I kings, V, 12. Since these were not written and Ecclesiastes was, we may conclude that the latter was inspired. (20) Prov. XXX, 6. (21) Lit., ‘come and hear’. (22) Which shows that whatever he wrote down was inspired. (23) Esth. VI, 6. How could the author know this if he was not inspired? (24) Ibid. II, 15. Cf. previous note. (25) Ibid. 22. Who revealed it to him if not the holy spirit? (26) Ibid. IX, 10. Cf. note 8. (27) among the Tannaim who discussed this matter. (28) Ibid. 27. (29) In heaven.

[t. *Jadajim* 2:13–14]

b. *Hagigá* 13a

And R. Aha b. Jacob said: There is still another Heaven above the heads of the living creatures, for it is written: And over the heads of the living creatures there was a likeness of a firmament, like the colour of the terrible ice, stretched forth over their heads above.² Thus far you have permission to speak, thenceforward you have not permission to speak, for so it is written in the Book of Ben Sira:³ Seek not things that are too hard for thee,⁴ and search not things that are hidden from thee. The things that have been permitted⁵ thee, think thereupon; thou hast no business with⁶ the things that are secret.⁷

(2) Ezek. I, 22. (3) Cf. Ecclesiasticus III, 21, 22. The author, whose full name seems to have been Jesus b. Simeon b. Eleazar b. Sira, is the only writer of the Old Testament or Apocrypha who signed his work (v. ibid. I, 27). His date falls in the first third of the second century B.C.E. He wrote in Hebrew, the Greek translation being made by his grandson, of whom it is known that he went to Egypt in 132; the greater part of the Hebrew original has been recovered from the Cairo Genizah. According to Tosef. Yad. II, 13, the writings of Ben Sira do not defile the hands, i.e., are uncanonical, and so rank the works of ‘Minim’ or heretics. Eccl. Rab. XII, 11 forbids one to have Ben Sira’s book in the house. R. Akiba (J. Sanh. 28a) includes the readers of uncanonical writings such as those of Ben Sira among those who have no share in the world to come; v. further the discussion in Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 680f and nn. a.l. on R. Akiba’s prohibition. The exclusion of Ecclesiasticus from the canon and the prohibitions with which it was surrounded were probably due to its epicurean and Sadducean tendencies. Notwithstanding, the book

remained popular with Jews, and is frequently quoted in early Jewish literature as well as in the Talmud and Midrash. V. J.E. vol. XI, pp. 388f. (4) E.V. 'that are above thy strength'. (5) E.V. 'commanded'. (6) E.V. 'no need of'. (7) For a variant version of this quotation v. Gen. Rab. VIII, which contains two additional clauses.

b. *Sabbat* 13b. erratum: 30b!

Rab Judah son of R. Samuel b. Shilath said in Rab's name: The Sages wished to hide the Book of Ecclesiastes,⁸ because its words are self-contradictory; yet why did they not hide it? Because its beginning is religious teaching⁹ and its end is religious teaching. Its beginning is religious teaching, as it is written, What profit hath man of all his labor wherein he laboureth under the sun?¹⁰ And the School of R. Jannai commented: Under the sun he has none, but he has it [sc. profit] before the sun.¹¹ The end thereof is religious teaching, as it is written, Let us hear the conclusion of the matter, fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole of man.¹² What is meant by, 'for this is the whole of man'? — Said R. Eleazar, The entire world was created only for the sake of this [type of] man. Simeon b. 'Azzai-others state, Simeon b. Zoma-said: The entire world was created only to be a companion to this man. And how are its words self-contradictory? — It is written, anger is better than play;¹³ but it is written, I said of laughter, It is to be praised.¹⁴ It is written, Then I commended joy;¹⁵ but it is written, and of joy [I said] What doeth it?¹⁶ There is no difficulty: 'anger is better than laughter': the anger which the Holy One, blessed be He, displays to the righteous in this world is better than the laughter which the Holy One, blessed be He, laughs with the wicked in this world.¹⁷ 'And I said of laughter, it is to be praised': that refers to the laughter which the Holy One, blessed be He, laughs with the righteous in the world to come. 'Then I commended joy': this refers to the joy of a precept.¹⁸ 'And of joy [I said], what doeth it': this refers to joy [which is] not in connection with a precept.¹⁹ This teaches you that the Divine Presence rests [upon] man] neither through gloom,²⁰ nor through sloth, nor through frivolity, nor through levity, nor through talk, nor through idle chatter,²¹ save through a matter of joy in connection with a precept, as it is said, But now bring me a minstrel. And it came to pass, when the minstrel played, that the hand of the Lord came upon him.²²

Rab Judah said: And it is likewise thus for a matter of halachah. ²³ Raba said: And it is likewise thus for a good dream.²⁴ But that is not so, for R. Giddal said in Rab's name: If any scholar sits before his teacher and his lips do not drip bitterness,²⁵ they shall be burnt, for it is said, his lips are as lilies [shoshanim], dropping liquid myrrh [mor'ober]:²⁶ read not mor'ober, but mar'ober [dropping bitterness]; read not shoshanim but sheshonin [that study]?²⁷ There is no difficulty: the former applies to the teacher; the latter to the disciple. Alternatively, both refer to the teacher, yet there is no difficulty: the one means before he commences; the other, after he commences. Even as Rabbah before he commenced [his discourse] before the scholars used to say something humorous, and the scholars were cheered; after that he sat in awe and began the discourse.

The Book of Proverbs too they desired to hide, because its statements are self-contradictory. Yet why did they not hide it? They said, Did we not examine the Book of Ecclesiastes and find a reconciliation? So here too let us make search. And how are its statements selfcontradictory? — It is written, Answer not a fool according to his folly;²⁸ yet it is also written, Answer a fool according to his folly.²⁹ There is no difficulty: the one refers to matters of learning;³⁰ the other to general matters. Even as a certain person came before Rabbi and said to him, 'Your wife is my wife and your children are mine.'³¹ ...

NOTES: 8. V. supra p. 55, n. 2. Weiss, Dor, 1, p. 212 conjectures that this was at the time of the Synod in the upper chamber of Hanania b. Hezekiah b. Garon (v. p. 54, n. 1), when it was

desired to 'hide' Ezekiel too. This activity was occasioned by the spread of books of Hellenistic tendencies, in consequence of which existing material was closely scrutinized as to its fitness. 9. Lit., 'words of the Torah'. 10. Eccl. 1, 3. 11. I.e., one profits if he toils in the Torah, which existed before the sun; Pes. 54a; Ned. 39b. 12. Ibid. XII, 13. 13. Ibid. VII, 3. 14. Ibid. II, 2. 15. Ibid. VIII, 15. 16. Ibid. II, 2. 17. The latter is an idiom for prosperity and well being: the sufferings inflicted upon the righteous are preferable to the prosperity conferred upon the wicked. 18. The celebrations of such, e.g., a marriage. 19. The Rabbis frowned upon this. But in all probability this does not apply to a simple and harmless gathering, but to attendance at theatres and circuses, at which the Jewish authorities looked askance, perhaps because they originated in idolatry and also because images of royalty were placed there. — Lev. R. XXXIV. The early Christians too were opposed to this, Tertullian (*De Spectaculis*, X) describing the theatre as a place of sexual immorality, 20. Judaism does not encourage asceticism; cf. Ned. 10a. 21. Or, vain pursuits. 22. II Kings III, 15. Maharsha observes that the verse is quoted merely to show that the Divine Presence does not rest on a man plunged in gloom, Elisha requiring the minstrel to dissipate the gloom occasioned by Jehoram's visit. 23. Serious study must be preceded by some lighthearted conversation. 24. If one goes to sleep in good spirits, he has happy dreams. 25. Caused by his awe and reverence. 26. Cant. V, 13. 27. Translating: the lips of those who study drop bitterness.-This shows that one must not study light-heartedly. 28. Prov. XXVI, 4. 29. Ibid. 5. 30. Then he may be answered.

b. *Bava Batra* 14b–15a

„Rabbijaink tanították: A Próféták rendje — Józsue, Bírák, Sámuel, Királyok, Jeremiás, Ezekiel, Izajás, és a Tizenkettő (...). Az Írások rendje — Rut, a Zsoltárok könyve, Jób, Példabeszédek, Prédikátor, Énekek éneke, Siralmak, Dániel, Eszter tekercse, Ezdrás, és a Krónikák könyve. Ki írta ezeket? Mózes írta saját könyvét, Bálám szakaszát, és Jóböt. Józsue írta saját könyvét, és a Tórában levő [utolsó] nyolc verset. Sámuel írta saját könyvét, és a Bírákat, és Rutot. Dávid írta a Zsoltárok könyvét (...) Jeremiás írta saját könyvét, és a Királyok könyvét, és a Siralmakat. Hiszkija és társai írták Izajást, a Példabeszédeket, az Énekek énekét, és a Prédikátort. A nagy gyülekezet férfiai írták Ezekielt, a Tizenkettőt, Dánielt, és Eszter tekercsét. Ezdrás írta saját könyvét, és a Krónikák könyveit az ó koráig (...) És ki fejezte be? Nehemiás, Hakhalia fia”.

Visi: Ibn Ezra idézet