

חגגות AND חסידות IN AGGADIC LITERATURE
AS REFLECTED IN THE SOURCES LISTED
IN THE OTZER HA-AGGADA

H. RICHARD WHITE

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
for the Master of Arts in Hebrew Literature Degree
and Ordination

Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion
New York, N. Y.

March 7, 1966

Advisor: Professor Eugene B. Borowitz

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
LIBRARY

The subject of this thesis is the rabbinical attitude toward sexual immorality. The major source of primary source location information was the lists of the aggadic citations in the Otsar Ha-Aggada¹ for the words זָנָה² and זָנִיתָ.³ I also made extensive use of the indices of the Soncino Midrash⁴ and Ginsberg's Legends of the Jews.⁵ I have endeavored, for the most part, to limit my selection of usable material to those teachings which might influence, instruct or have some bearing on today's society and its attitudes toward sex and sexual morality. I shall reserve my personal comments for the concluding section of the thesis.

The root זָנָה in Biblical Hebrew means to be a harlot or commit harlotry. We read in Numbers: "And Israel abode in Shittim, and the people began to commit harlotry (זָנָה) with the daughter of Moab."⁶ Another example is the following: "And the daughter of any priest, if she profane herself by playing the harlot, (זָנָה) she profaneth her father: she shall be burnt with fire."⁷ We read in Genesis: "And it came to pass about three months after, that it was told Judah, saying: 'Tamar thy daughter-in-law hath played the harlot; (זָנָה)'"⁸ Contact with foreign gods was considered as prostitution since Israel's covenant with God was likened to a marriage covenant. "And the Lord said unto Moses: 'Behold, thou art about to sleep with thy fathers; and this people will rise up and go astray (זָנָה) after the foreign gods of the land,....'"⁹ The Jastrow dictionary¹⁰ tells us that in Biblical Hebrew means basically to run to and fro, to run after, especially to run about as a prostitute, to be faithless.¹¹ "Rashi" defines זָנָה as "to go astray to run away (of a woman from her

husband).¹² R. Akiba said: "'Zonah' implies one who is a prostitute."¹³ The rabbis, however, expanded the meaning of זנות to include any non-marital intercourse. Such intercourse was considered as an act of prostitution. Their abhorrence and condemnation of prostitution extended to all instances of intercourse outside of marriage. The sages said: "'Zonah' is none other than a female proselyte, a freed bondswoman (these are assumed to have had non-marital intercourse) and one who has been subjected to any meretricious intercourse."¹⁴ Clearly, then, the act of זנות means non-marital intercourse whether involving prostitution or another morally or legally illicit intercourse. זנות is even sometimes used in place of זנות for adultery. This is illustrated by these two aggadic statements: "All such women ... play the harlot (זנות) and attribute the results to their husbands"¹⁵ and, "Why did Rosh Lakish not give the reason that R. Johanan gave? He might argue that adultery (זנות) is exceptional."¹⁶ The particular type of sexual wrongdoing which is meant by the word זנות is dependent on the particular situation to which it is applied. It (זנות) is, however, sometimes used as a general term denoting sexual immorality without any specifications. An example of this is the rabbinic statement, "God said: 'Was Israel not redeemed from Egypt purely as a reward for this precept, to wit, for having kept themselves from זנות?'" You likewise find that all the miracles which God wrought in Egypt were wrought solely on account of their having kept themselves from זנות.¹⁷ The text does not explain just what it was that brought such reward to the Israelites. The word זנות has so many possible meanings that it renders us no assistance in specifying the meaning of זנות in

this mishnah. In this case, as in many other unspecified situations, it is necessary and certainly justifiable to translate the word מִדָּבָר by the general term, 'sexual immorality.'

The word רִיחַ is used, in this case, to mean spices: "And they buried him in his own sepulchres which he had made for himself in the city of David and laid him in the bed which was filled with (רִיחַ שְׂמֶנֶת) sweet odours and diverse kinds of spices.' (II Chronicles 16:14). What is "Besamin a-camin"? R. Eleazar said: 'Diverse kinds of spices.' But R. Samuel b. Nahmani said: 'Scents which incite all those who smell them to immorality.' (Deriving רִיחַ from רָחַץ to commit whoredom).¹⁸

The word רִיחַ is also used to mean pseudo-wheat (Jastrow dictionary: darnel or rye grass). "Even the earth acted lewdly; wheat was sown and it produced pseudo-wheat, for the pseudo-wheat we now find came from the age of the deluge."¹⁹

The word מִשְׁמָחָה is often used in the same sense as מִדָּבָר. These two statements exemplify this: "She shall watch over thee, 'mesimach' (against lewdness), discernment shall guard thee.' (Proverbs 2:2) Said the rabbis to Raba: 'How is this word 'mesimach' to be understood?' This, then, is how it is to be understood, 'Against things of lewdness (מִדָּבָר)-she (discernment, i.e. the Torah) shall watch over thee'²⁰ and 'For everything', says the Holy One, blessed be He, in effect, 'I will control Myself, but for lewdness (מִדָּבָר) I shall display anger!' "²¹ In the section (in Numbers Rabbah) immediately preceding this, adultery was the subject under discussion. A little further on we read: "Hence is it inferred that Israel are called 'holy'? It is when they keep themselves from adultery (שְׂכָרָה) and lewdness

(נ'ג),²² נ'ג here is left unspecified. Apparently נ'ג , like ג'ג is adaptable to various situations and also like ג'ג is used in a general unspecified sense of sexual immorality. The Jastrow dictionary defines נ'ג as obscenity, libidinousness, carnality or excessive in carnal gratification.²³ Such a definition differs little from the meaning of ג'ג , and I found the two terms to be apparently interchangeable. If they have a distinctive difference when applied to the subject of sexual immorality, I did not find any evidence of such a difference in my research.

Sexual immorality was looked upon by the rabbis not only as a heinous sin, an abhorrent thing in itself, but as a release of all moral restraint. Exemplifying this doctrine, Abba b. Kahana said: "He (Balaam) said thus to him (Balak). 'The God of these hates lewdness, and they are very partial to linen. Come, and I will advise thee. Erect for them tents enclosed by hangings, in which place harlots, old women without, young women within, to sell them linen garments.' So he erected curtained tents from the snowy mountain (Herman) as far as Beth ha-Yeshimoth and placed harlots in them—old women without, young women within. And when an Israelite drank, and was merry, and issued forth for a stroll in the market place, the old woman would say to him, 'Dost thou not desire linen garments?' The old woman offered it at its current value, but the young one for less. This happened two or three times. After that she would say to him, 'Thou art now like one of the family; sit down and choose for thyself.' Gourds of Ammonite wine lay near her, and at that time Ammonite and heathen wine had not yet been forbidden. She said to him, 'Wouldst thou like to drink a

glass of wine?' Having drank, (his passion) was inflamed, and he exclaimed to her, 'Yield to me!' Thereupon she brought forth an ikon from her bosom and said to him, 'Worship this!' 'But I am a Jew,' he protested. 'What does that concern thee?' she rejoined, 'nothing is required but that thou should uncover thyself' -whilst he did not know that such was its worship. 'Nay,' (said she), 'I will not leave thee ere thou has denied the Torah of Moses thy teacher,....' ²⁴ Here sexual immorality leads to a general moral decay eventually denying all divine authority as enforcer of the moral code. This statement is found in tractate Hagigah: "Aher went forth into evil courses. He went forth, found a harlot and demanded her." ²⁵ This shows again that sexual immorality was associated with the further sins of denial of God and His Law.

This principle is inherent in the difference between הִלָּךְ and שָׁרָה . The latter deals with sexual immorality as a breach of conscience, a destruction of mental resistance to sin leading to other moral lapses.

The basic meaning of the root פָּרַד in Biblical Hebrew is to "break through." We read in the book of Micah: "They have broken forth (פָּרְדוּ) and passed on By the gate, and are gone out thereat." ²⁶ It (פָּרַד) is used to denote a breaching or breaking down of a fence (פָּרַד). We find this in the fifth chapter of Isaiah " (פָּרַד) I will break the fence thereof, and it shall be trodden down." ²⁷ פָּרַד is also used to designate the making of a breach or breaking down of a wall of a city. "And Jehoash king of Israel took Amaziah king of Judah, the son of Jehoash the son of Ahaziah, at Beth Shemesh, and came to Jerusalem, and broke down (פָּרַד) the wall of Jerusalem...." ²⁸

It is used allegorically to denote a breaking forth, usually in a damaging sense. "And David was displeased, because the Lord had broken forth (פָּרַח, פָּרַח עַל) upon Uzzah."²⁹ Plainly, the Biblical meaning of פָּרַח was breaking through a barrier.

In Rabbinic Hebrew the most usual use of the word פָּרַח is its physical meaning—breach. An excellent example is this statement in Berakoth: "You have already built and you cannot overthrow; you have made a fence and you cannot break it down (פָּרַח אֶת הַמִּצְעָד)."³⁰ There is also this very well known example: "The breach (פָּרַח) invites the thief."³¹ Another example (this time with a verb) is (וַתִּפְרַח הַקִּיר) "Widens an opening."³² This meaning, breach, is sometimes used in a metaphorical, pejorative sense. "...the Sanhedren who fenced in the breaches in Israel (פָּרַח בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל)."³³ Here breaches means moral lapses. "May it be Thy will, Lord our God, to close up our breaches and the breaches of all Thy people the house of Israel in mercy!"³⁴ Here "breaches" connotes some sort of difficulties or troubles.

A very interesting use of פָּרַח is its meaning of a breakdown in human will power, a desolving of conscience. This statement in tractate Demai illustrates the point: "Nor may he be addicted to making vows" (פָּרַח אֶת הַנֶּשֶׁבֶת)³⁵ The very idea of addiction represents complete loss of resolution to resist. The two statements: "... but in the later generations when the daughters of Israel freely indulged in witchcraft, (וַתִּפְרַח בְּנֵי אִשְׂתֵּי כַּסְפִּית) one may pass them by"³⁶ and "So that the daughters of Israel should not become unrestrained in unchastity" (וְלֹא תִפְרַח בְּנֵי אִשְׂתֵּי כַסְפִּית),³⁷ (with the meanings "freely indulge" and "unrestrained") show that with פָּרַח there is no hesitancy or

compunction involved - a complete breakdown of will power. A corollary of this is the word *זְנוּנָה* meaning a loose woman.³⁸ Again, there is the abstract noun *זְנוּנוּת* meaning licentiousness or obscenity.³⁹ There is also this: "For the robbers (*שׁוֹרְדִים*) shall enter into it, and profane it,"⁴⁰ The loose women and robbers have lost contact with their consciences. A breach has been made in the laws of moral conduct. The term *זְנוּנָה*, therefore, has a more complex social connotation than *זָנוּת*. It represents more than the simple sexual offense indicated by the word *זָנוּת*: it deals with the effect of such an offense upon the barriers which the mind and conscience make use of to resist wrongdoing in general.

"For it is the way of the daughters of Israel to be neither noisy, nor haughty of gait, nor immoderate in laughter." (*לֹא תִהְיֶינָה בָּנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּהִלּוּל וּבְהִנּוּק וּבְהִתְנַחֲפוּת פֶּה*)⁴¹ The meaning of *זְנוּנָה* in this case is a lapse in propriety.

"It was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: 'Come and see how far purity has spread (*זָנוּת*) in Israel!'"⁴² Here our meaning is an enlargement, a quantitative growth. "... any cohabitation which results in no increase (*זָנוּת*) is nothing but meretricious intercourse."⁴³ Though the context is different here, the meaning is still quantitative increase.

In order to encourage Jews to stay chaste the rabbis intimated great reward for it. They attributed the miracles in Egypt and the deliverance from Egypt to the chastity of the Israelites dwelling there. To illustrate this we have the Midrashic statement, "God Said: 'Was Israel not redeemed from Egypt purely as a reward for this precept, to wit, for having kept themselves from whoredom?' (*וְלֹא נִשְׁמַט יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרָיִם כִּי שָׁמַר מִזְנוּת*) You

likewise find that all the miracles which God wrought for Israel in Egypt were wrought solely on account of their having kept themselves from immorality." ($\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \text{ } N \text{ } ^{44}$) In the opposite vein, to discourage unchastity, the rabbis portrayed many punishments for it. One of them was the lowering of the sinner by God. The statement by R. Hisda that, "Every harlot who allows herself to be hired will at the end have to hire,...."⁴⁵ (the Soncino footnote explains that it means she will be despised by all) was plainly based on the belief in the direct, causative relationship between sin and calamity. Another punishment was the dreaded disease-leprosy. We have the following statement in Midrash Tanhuma: "Why do cases of leprosy occur? It is because of unchastity. ($\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \text{ } ^{46}$) So you find in Jerusalem: because they were steeped in unchastity, ($\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \text{ } ^{47}$) they were afflicted (punished) with leprosy."⁴⁸ The rabbis also offered general but extreme statements condemning lewdness. We have the midrashic statements, "For everything," says the Holy One, blessed be He, in effect, 'I will control Myself, but for lewdness ($\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \text{ } ^{49}$) I shall display anger! Behold I will give them up to foreign governments"⁵⁰ and "The Holy One, blessed be He, is long-suffering for everything save immorality." ($\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \text{ } ^{51}$)⁴⁸ Perhaps their strongest condemnation of lewdness is contained in their opinion that sexual immorality was the causative agent of general calamity affecting good and evil alike. The teaching by our rabbis in Midrash Tanhuma that, "For the sin of unchastity, ($\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \text{ } ^{52}$) androlepsia"⁴⁹ (punishment of men regardless of guilt or innocence) comes to the world and the destruction of good and bad alike."⁵⁰ Supporting this we have the statement in Genesis Rabbah,

"Wherever you find lust, (חילול) an epidemic visits the world which slays both good and bad."⁵¹ Thus the dreaded phenomenon of large-scale general disaster is attached to the sin of sexual immorality. This sin seems to bring a guilt or uncleanness to a people or area which exceeds the actual evil doers. The evil is so great, it lays bare the area or people, regardless of guilt or innocence, to blind, general disaster.

There is an interesting account of R. Eleazar b. Dordia. "Surley it has been taught: It was said of R. Eleazar b. Dordia that he did not leave out any harlot in the world without coming to her. Once, on hearing that there was a certain harlot in one of the towns by the sea who accepted a purse of 'denarii' for her hire, he took a purse of 'denarii' and crossed seven rivers for her sake. As he was with her, she blew forth breath and said: 'As this blown breath will not return to its place, so will Eleazar b. Dordia never be received in repentance.' He thereupon went, sat between two hills and mountains and exclaimed: 'O, ye hills and mountains, plead for mercy for me!' They replied: 'How shall we pray for thee? We stand in need of it ourselves, for it is said, 'For the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed!' '...Said he: 'The matter then depends upon me alone!' Having placed his head between his knees, he wept aloud until his soul departed. Then a 'bath-kol' was heard proclaiming: 'Rabbi Eleazar b. Dordia is destined for the life of the world to come!'"⁵² Here is a case of a rabbi who was acknowledged to be addicted to sexual immorality. The story of his repentance and death is somewhat fantastic and probably contrived, but it is just such a fantasy and contrivance that point out

the ethical position of the rabbis and show that Eleazar b. Dordia's conduct violated their teachings.

Our tradition fully realized that the lure of sexual immorality is very real and very strong. This is expressed beautifully in an agadic statement in the Palestinian Talmud, tractate Sanhedrin: "Just as it is impossible to pull a nail from the door without (taking some) wood (out), so it is impossible to keep apart from unchastity (*ni'ni*) without taking something out of life."⁵³ The weapon which our tradition prescribed to win the battle of the mind, to turn the thoughts in the right direction was the study of Torah. "R. Hananiah, prefect of the priests, says: 'He who takes to heart the words of the Torah is relieved of many preoccupations-preoccupations with hunger, foolish preoccupations, unchaste preoccupations. (*ni'ni*) preoccupations with the evil impulse, preoccupations with an evil wife,....'"⁵⁴ George Foot Moore, in his work entitled, Judaism, states: "To escape falling into it (unchastity), everything is to be avoided which in any way, physically or mentally, tends to excite this state. If it occurs in spite of these precautions, the rabbis understood human nature well enough to know that the remedy is not to struggle against it, which only keeps it in the centre of attention, but to divert the mind from it altogether by an engrossing occupation with something else. Their way was to concentrate all the faculties on the study of the Law in the school."⁵⁵ When improper thoughts of sex threatened to take possession of the mind, theology was the ultimate weapon to avoid such lewd thoughts.

The rabbis themselves took practical measures wherever possible

to cut out or reduce the possibility of sexual immorality. In tractate Gittin we read the following: "Why has it been laid down that if a man divorces his wife on account of a scandal he should not remarry her,...? In order that the daughters of Israel should not become disolute...." (ת'רצא ת'ג'ג)⁵⁶ So did the rabbis take legal steps to implement their moral campaign against unchastity. Although marriage by the method of intercourse was legally acceptable, Rab tried to discourage it for moral reasons. "For all these Rab inflicted no punishment excepting for betrothing (a woman) by intercourse without 'shiddukin' -others state, even with 'shiddukin,' on account of licentiousness." (ת'ג'ג ת'ג'ג)⁵⁷ Thus did Rab try to combat an act which could conceivably lead to licentiousness. The rabbis even went to the extent of violating Torah law to avoid immorality. Rab again was the spokesman: "But is it possible that according to the law of the Bible it would not be a divorce (the plea of "force majeure" as recognized in the Bible, Deut. 22:26) and on account of 'the chaste women' and on account of the 'loose women' (ת'ג'ג ת'ג'ג) we should allow a married woman to the world? (i.e. to marry another man) -Yes, everyone who betroths, in accordance with the sense of the Rabbis he betroths, and the Rabbis have annulled his betrothal."⁵⁸

Our rabbis recognized the grave responsibility of leadership not only to act in an official capacity but to make their personal lives a fit public example for those who looked to them for guidance. "One day (some Romans) saw him (R. Meir) and ran after him, so he ran away from them and entered a harlot's house. (so as not to be identified with R. Meir, who naturally would not enter such a place)... Others

say that Elijah the prophet appeared to them as a harlot who embraced him. 'God forbid,' said they, 'Were this R. Meir, he would not have acted thus!' (and they left him)"⁵⁹ The obvious assumption here is that the exemplar of the people, R. Meir, would not do what is immoral, namely visit a prostitute. A more obvious example is this statement by Raba: "... such as R. Hanina and R. Oshia, who were cobblers in Erets Yisrael and dwelt in a street of harlots and made shoes for harlots and went in to them (to deliver the shoes): they (the harlots) looked at them, but they (these scholars) would not lift their eyes to look at them, and their (the harlots) oath was, 'By the life of the holy Rabbis of Erets Yisrael.'"⁶⁰ People looked to their leaders to demonstrate the moral life. R. Hanina and R. Oshaia did not fail them. Again referring to this vital role of leadership, "R. Abba b. Kahana said: 'Sarah went down to Egypt and guarded herself against immorality ($\eta / \gamma \lambda$), and all the women guarded themselves for her sake. Joseph went down to Egypt and guarded himself against immorality ($\eta / \gamma \lambda$), and all the men guarded themselves for his sake.'"⁶¹ This shows how people imitate the conduct of important and renowned leaders. "R. Simeon b. Yohai said: If demoralization ($\eta \gamma \tau \theta$) does not proceed from the leaders, it is not real demoralization." (since the leaders are in a position to stop it)⁶² R. Simeon b. Yohai emphasized the responsibility of the leaders in setting the moral standard. His opinion was that when immorality proceeds from the leaders themselves it is unstoppable (unless leadership changes). These references to Sarah and Joseph, to R. Hanina and R. Oshaiah and to R. Simeon b. Yohai clearly demonstrate the rabbis' opinion that the religious leaders who

are the teachers of morality must also be the pace-setters of morality.

The resistance of R. Hanina and R. Oshaia to the temptation of the prostitutes to whom they sold shoes⁶³ is an indicator of the rabbinical attitude toward intercourse with prostitutes. So deliberate and determined was their resistance (R. Hanina and R. Oshaiah) that they created, "ad hoc," a fence, as it were, to the prohibition against intimacy with prostitutes by the avoidance of gazing upon them. The utter abhorrence of prostitution by our tradition is clearly shown by this graphic story told in tractate Berakoth: "For a certain student once left his 'tefillin' in a hole adjoining the public way, and a harlot passed by and took them, and she came to the 'Beth ha-Midrash' and said: 'See what So-and so gave me for my hire,' and when the student heard it, he went to the top of a roof and threw himself down and killed himself."⁶⁴ The very doubt cast upon the student's character and conduct by the harlot's aspersion drove him to suicide. While this story may portray an over-sealous reaction on the part of the student (indeed suicide was hardly continenced by the rabbis) the lack of condemnation of his action should certainly show a great distaste for prostitution. Another agadic passage shows how serious a sin was whoredom. "Vespasian sent Titus.... This was the wicked Titus who blasphemed and insulted Heaven. What did he do? He took a harlot by the hand and entered the Holy of Holies and spread out a scroll of the Law and committed a sin on it."⁶⁵ Here contact with a prostitute, a heinous sin, is juxtaposed to the most holy symbols. Nor is it to be imagined that such a sin would go unpunished by God. "Raba said: 'The verse, 'For an account of a harlot, to a loaf of bread,' should have read, 'On account of a loaf of

bread, to a harlot!' 'But,' said Raba, (the meaning is:) 'Whoever has intercourse with a harlot will in the end go seeking a loaf of bread.'⁶⁶

This passage was, no doubt, based on the belief that God brings low the sinner and that contact with a prostitute was a serious transgression פִּיגְמָהּ פִּיגְמָהּ יָא. Another colorful and well-known aggadic passage tells how the fringes serve as a reminder to avoid intimacy with whores and at the same time how such intimacy is condemned by Judaism. "Once a man who was very scrupulous about the precept of 'zizith,' heard of a certain harlot in one of the towns by the sea who accepted four hundred gold ('denars') for her hire. He sent her four hundred gold ('denars') and appointed the day with her. When the day arrived, he came and waited at her door, and her maid came and told her, 'That man who sent you four hundred gold ('denars') is here and waiting at the door'; to which she replied, 'Let him come in.' When he came in she prepared for him seven beds, six of silver one of gold; and between one bed and the other there were steps of silver, but the last were of gold. She then went up to the top bed and lay down upon it naked. He too went up after her in his desire to sit naked with her, when all of a sudden the four fringes (of his garment) struck him across the face; whereupon he slipped off and sat upon the ground. She also slipped off and sat upon the ground and said, 'By the Roman Capitol (a form of oath), I will not leave you alone until you tell me what blemish you saw in me.' 'By the Temple,' he replied, 'Never have I seen a woman as beautiful as you are; but there is one precept which the Lord our God has commanded us, it is called 'zizith,' and with regard to it the expression 'I am the Lord your God' is twice written,

(Numbers 15:41. The expression is repeated in this verse) signifying, I am He who will exact punishment in the future, and I am He who will give reward in the future. Now (the 'zizith') appeared to me as four witnesses (testifying against me).⁶⁷ As a result of his action, she went and converted to Judaism through this man's teacher.⁶⁷ Drawing yet another lesson from this story, the resisting of temptation to unchastity by the man so impressed the prostitute with Judaism, that she converted. This is powerful encouragement for a Jew to realize the close connection between the reputation of Jewish morality and the avoidance of unchastity.

One of the issues of morality which is in flux today is that of pre-marital intercourse. The position which rabbinic Judaism takes on this vexing problem is both clear and uncompromising. "R. Issac son of R. Joseph said in the name of R. Johanan: 'Each of the teachers defined the duration (of coition) from his own experience. But they included Ben Azzi who was unmarried! -If you wish, I can say that he had married and separated (from his wife), or that he heard it from his master, or that, 'The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him.' "(Psalm 25:14. The knowledge was revealed to him,)⁶⁸ The assumption here is that an unmarried man should not have experienced intercourse. "R. Johanan said: 'Concerning three does the Holy One, blessed be He, make proclamation every day (as having earned His special approval): a bachelor who lives in a large town without sinning, a poor man who returns lost property to its owner, and a wealthy man who tithes his produce in secret. (without ostentation)'"⁶⁹ Our tradition makes it very clear that intercourse for the bachelor is not considered to be a necessary evil and doubly so not a virtue or prerogative of bachelorhood. This is also true for men and

women who are "engaged." Such men and women should give at least some consideration to the wisdom of Rab. "For all these Rab inflicted no punishment, excepting for betrothing (a woman) by intercourse without 'shidukkin' -others state, even with 'shidukkin', on account of licentiousness." (לכנס'ת)⁷⁰ Such intercourse did not always (apparently) lead to marriage. It may therefore teach us something about "engagement." Rab was trying to eliminate a situation in which deceptive and illicit intercourse were very possible. The overall rabbinic attitude toward pre-marital sexual intercourse is well summed up by Louis M. Epstein's statement: "The various restrictions set up against the mingling of the sexes, the constant watch by the community over the conduct of young people, all were intended to prevent unmarried sex relations so that the bride might be virgin and the groom be pure at their marriage."⁷¹

Another aspect of this problem is consideration of the female partner to illicit sex, of her mental health and her hopes and chances for marriage. Alluding to this, R. Eleazar stated that, "An unmarried man who cohabitated with an unmarried woman without matrimonial intention renders her thereby a harlot!"⁷² While Rabbi Eleazar's statement deals with the eligibility of the girl to marry into the priesthood and hence the value of the girl vis a vis marriage and indirectly her chances for marriage, his statement is certainly applicable morally as a plea for consideration for the girl involved.

Most of the aggadic statements which I have already quoted make no distinction between the bachelor and the married man. To the contrary, I think it is clear that they cover both. As Epstein puts it, "During the Second Commonwealth, the age of exaggerated moral dis-

cipline, when every innocent sociability between the sexes was condemned, and unmarried contact between a man and a woman was, of course, cause for public outrage."⁷³ Saadya Gaon summed it up in a terse but definitive statement in his book, Emunot ve Daot, "Man shall have no other desire except for his wife that he may love her and she may love him."⁷⁴

There is much talk now about the interrelationship between wealth and prosperity and sexual immorality. Perhaps not so much coincidentally, the rabbis too faced this problem and saw a causative relationship between wealth and immorality. "They said in the school of R. Jannai: 'Thus spoke Moses before the Holy One, blessed be He: 'Sovereign of the Universe, the silver and gold which Thou didst shower on Israel until they said, 'Enough,' that it was which led to their making the calf.'" They said in the school of R. Jannai: 'A lion does not roar over a basket of straw but over a basket of flesh.' R. Oshaia said: 'It is like the case of a man who had a lean but large-limbed cow. He gave it lupines to eat and it commenced to kick him. He said to it: 'What led you to kick me except the lupines that I fed you with?' 'This bears out the popular saying: 'A full stomach is a bad sort,' as it says, 'When they were fed they became full, they were filled and their heart was exalted; therefore they have forgotten Me.'" (Hosea 13:6)⁷⁵ This is a clear warning against the apparently inherent evil value or tendencies in an affluent society. A corollary to this is the Mishnaic statement, "...Even if she brought him a hundred bondwomen he may compel her to work in wool; for idleness leads to unchastity (דאן איהו)."⁷⁶ Idleness too was regarded as a danger to sexual morality. Of course

the more wealth we have, the more our leisure increases. The danger, then, is "double-barrelled." As Epstein puts it: "Worldly wisdom is broadening, to be sure, but it begets certain moral laxities. Luxury and indulgence, the portion of the rich city-dweller, foster harlotry."⁷⁷

Marriage between a man and a much younger woman has a reputation of having little chance of success. The aggadic literature delivers a stern warning concerning the dangers inherent in such a match. "Now, how do Abaye and Raba utilize the verse, 'Do not profane thy daughter to cause her to be a whore'? (וְלֹא תִפְסֵהָ) -R. Mani said: (according to them) 'This refers to one who marries his (young) daughter to an old man. As it has been taught: 'Do not profane thy daughter to cause her to be a whore;' R. Eliezer said: 'This refers to marrying one's (young) daughter to an old man.'"⁷⁸ This is, no doubt, an allusion to the sexual and psychological difficulties which may arise in this type of marriage.

The aggada also delivers a lesson on the vital importance of parental exemplary conduct to children. We find the following in Midrash Rabbah: "Behold everyone that useth proverbs shall use this proverb against thee, saying: 'As the mother, so her daughter' (Ezekiel 16:44)Said he (Jose of Meon):' ...A cow does not gore unless her calf kicks; a woman is not immoral (/C 'JJ) until her daughter is immoral....' (The real character of the parent is seen in his off-spring)"⁷⁹ And R. Huna said, "(in the name of R. Johanan) It can be compared to a wise man who opened a perfumery shop for his son in a street frequented by harlots. The street did its work, the business

also did its share (perfumery being one of the things most needed by prostitutes); and his youth likewise contributed its part, with the result that the son fell into evil ways. When the father came and caught him among prostitutes, he began to shout; 'I will slay thee!' But his friend was there, and he said: 'Thou wert the means of destroying (the character) of this youth, and yet thou dost shout at him!'⁸⁰ The onus of responsibility for youth immorality is placed squarely on the shoulders of parents.

Procreation was heavily emphasized as the guiding motive of intercourse. R. Huna, speaking for R. Judah, said, "Any cohabitation which results in no increase is nothing but meretricious intercourse."⁸¹ Such an attitude would tend to argue against birth control and (much more important) to limit sex to the married state. Epstein says, "Marriage is a legitimate physical satisfaction; it furthers God's universal purpose in the perpetuation of the human species...."⁸² While I thoroughly agree with the first part of his statement, I found no indication of it in my study of the rabbinical sources.

The inequality of privileges and restrictions between the sexes, which is sometimes referred to as the "dual standard," was cited by the rabbis for its futility. We have these two statements in tractate Sotah: "If a man is lewd (זלזל), his wife will think of faithlessness (זלזל) against him"⁸³ and "R. Johanan also said: 'Whoever is faithless (זלזל), his wife is faithless to him... the proverb tells, 'He among the full-grown pumpkins and his wife among the young ones.'"⁸⁴ Thus, the rabbis warned that the unfairness of the

husband would be likely to receive its just reward. If a husband wants a faithful wife, he too must be faithful.

All this has related to the realm of physical action, but what about human decorum? Here too the rabbis tried to combat lewdness and anything which might lead to it or encourage it. George Foot Moore wrote, "Modesty is not only associated with chastity, but is itself a virtue highly esteemed in men and women."⁸⁵ Our tradition condemns vulgarity in speech even to the extent of condemning our father Jacob. Commenting on the Biblical verse, "And Jacob said unto Laban: 'Give me my wife, for my days are fulfilled, that I may go in unto her,'" (Genesis 29:21) "R. Aibu observed: 'Even the most dissolute (דליל) does not use such language!'"⁸⁶ "R. Joseph said: 'When men sing and women join in it is licentiousness (לשון הרע); when women sing and men join in it is like fire in tow.' (A woman's singing aroused sexual passion. The latter is more serious, because it implies a wilful act on the part of the men to listen to the female voices)."⁸⁷ This leaves no room for doubt. The rabbis sought a radical separation of the sexes. Such a doctrine would place a nearly complete ban on any social vocal contact between men and women. "R. Judah said in Rab's name: 'The men of Jerusalem were vulgar. One would say to his neighbor, 'On what did you dine today: on well kneaded bread or on bread that is not well kneaded, (The whole is a vulgar metaphor for the satisfaction of one's lust) on white wine or on dark wine, on a broad couch or on a narrow couch; with a good companion or with a poor companion?' R. Hisda observed: 'And all these are in reference to immorality (לשון הרע).'"⁸⁸ It is clear

that the rabbis looked askance at vulgar boasting about sex and on speaking "lightly" of it.

A rather radical attitude was taken toward clothing. "It confirms what was said by R. Samuel b. Nahmani in the name of R. Jonathan: 'Every bride who is modest in the house of her father-in-law is rewarded by having kings and prophets among her descendants. How do we prove this? From Tamar, as it is written, 'And Judah saw her and thought her to be a harlot, for she had covered her face.' (Genesis 38:15) Now because she had covered her face did he think her to be a harlot? Rather, what it means is that because she had covered her face in the house of her father-in-law and he did not know her, she was rewarded by having among her descendants kings and prophets;....'"⁸⁹ This, I think, amply illustrates that the rabbis had a rather extreme approach toward modesty. It probably refers to the wearing of a veil. Summing up the rabbinic position on modesty and decorum Epstein said, "... to the rabbis, exchange of greetings, or of glances, or touching one another physically, exposure of any hidden part of the body on the part of the woman, listening to a woman's voice or smelling her perfume on the part of the man, constituted levity and flirtation."⁹⁰ Illustrating this extreme position, he (Epstein) quotes this passage from tractate Yoma: "'...Kimhit, who was the mother of seven high priests. She ascribed that honor to the fact that the walls of her house never beheld the hair of her head nor the hem of her undergarments.'"⁹¹

The realm of thought was also subject to the rabbinical doctrine of modesty. Moore said, "The Jewish teachers recognized that the imagi-

nation of sin is not only a temptation but if dallied with instead of resolutely expelled is itself a sin."⁹² We read in tractate Shabbat, "And Moses was wroth with the officers of the host." (Numbers 31:14) R. Nahman said in Rabbah B. Abbahu's name: 'Moses said to Israel: 'May-be ye have returned to your first lapse (sin).' (When they sinned with the daughters of Moab. V. Numbers 25) 'There lacketh not one of us,' (Numbers 31:49) they replied. 'If so, 'he queried, 'Why an atonement?' 'Though we escaped from sin' said they, 'Yet we did not escape from meditating upon sin.' Straightaway, 'And we have brought the Lord's offering.' (Numbers 31:50, to make atonement for their impure thoughts) The School of R. Ishmael taught; 'Why were the Israelites of that generation in need of atonement? Because they gratified their eyes with lewdness.' (וַיִּבְרְכוּ) R. Shesheth said: 'Why does the Writ enumerate the outward ornaments with the inner? (Numbers 31:50) To teach you: Whoever looks upon a woman's little finger is as though he gazed upon the 'pudenda.'" (The first is where the finger-ring is worn, and since it is enumerated, it follows that even for looking upon that, they needed atonement.)⁹³ And similarly, we read in Midrash Rabbah, "The eye and the heart are two agents of sin.... Compare with what Moses said, 'After which ye used to go a-whoring (Numbers 15:39),' implying that whoredom (וַיִּבְרְכוּ) depends on them (the eyes and heart). The eyes see the harlot and heart entertains impure thoughts about her."⁹⁴ In more graphic terms, this passage in tractate Kallah admonishes us, "He who gazes on a woman intently is as though he lay with her."⁹⁵ The rabbis vigorously condemned sexually improper thoughts. Meditating upon lewd thoughts constituted, in their opinion, a sin which a

man ought to endeavor greatly to resist. Jesus b. Sirach offered this advice: "Turn your eyes away from a shapely woman, and do not look intently at beauty belonging to another; many have been misled by a woman's beauty, and by it passion is kindled."⁹⁶

Our tradition makes a definite connection between the gentiles and immorality. This association is evident in the "halachic" treatment of female proselytes vis a vis sex. "(It was) rather in respect of harlotry, and harlotry with a minor is an unusual occurrence. Let however, a preventive measure be made in respect of a proselyte and an emancipated slave with whom harlotry is not unusual!- He holds the same view as R. Jose. For it was taught: Proselytes, captives or slaves who were redeemed, or embraced the Jewish faith or were emancipated, must wait three months; so R. Judah. R. Jose permits immediate betrothal and marriage. Rabbah said: 'What is R. Jose's reason? He is of the opinion that a woman who plays the harlot makes use of an absorbent in order to prevent conception.'⁹⁷ The sages concurred with this when they taught: "'Zonah' is no other than a female proselyte, a freed bondswoman, and one who has been subjected to any meretricious intercourse."⁹⁸ Other nations, by inference through individuals and directly by name were denounced as immoral. "Raba once sent a present to Bar-Sheshak (a heathen friend) on a heathen feast day, saying, 'I know that he does not worship idols;' but on paying him a visit, he found him sitting up to his neck in a bath of rosewater while naked harlots were standing before him."⁹⁹ Here, even a "good heathen" was pictured as dissolute. The gentile antagonists of the Jews were especially marked off as immoral. "R. Judah said in Rab's name: 'The

wicked Sennacherib advanced against them (The Israelites in the days of Hezekiah) with a force consisting of forty-five thousand princes, each enthroned in a golden chariot and accompanied by his ladies and harlots,"¹⁰⁰ The Arabs were cited especially in this regard. "There is no harlotry (*זנות*) like the harlotry (*זנות*) of the Arabs."¹⁰¹ The Romans, too, were condemned with perhaps the bitterness of reality since they transplanted their values to Palestine. "R. Judah commenced by observing, 'How fine are the works of this people! (the Romans) They have made streets, they have built bridges, they have erected baths.' R. Jose was silent. R. Simeon b. Yohai answered and said, 'All what they made they made for themselves; they built market places, to set harlots in them;....'"¹⁰² We also have this statement in Midrash Rabbah: "In their childhood, both brothers went to school, but when they reached their thirteenth year and were of age, their ways parted. Jacob continued his studies in the 'Beth ha-Midrash' of Shem and Eber, and Essau abandoned himself to idolatry and an immoral life."¹⁰³ Essau, in the "midrash," is usually symbolic of Rome. "The last will and testament of Canaan addressed to his children- 'Speak not the truth; hold not yourselves aloof from theft; lead a dissolute life, (*אנ'ש*)"¹⁰⁴ Thus lewdness was attributed to the offspring of Canaan. The Egyptians, too, were a choice target. "'And every daughter ye shall save alive;' What need did Pharaoh have to save the girls? What they said in fact was: 'Let us kill the males so that we may take unto ourselves the females for wives,' for the Egyptians were steeped in immorality." (*אנ'ש*)¹⁰⁵ So did the "midrash" picture immorality as the root of Egypt's harshest treatment of the Hebrews. Referring again to the

Egyptians and Canaanites, Midrash Rabbah teaches us: "Similarly when Israel were in Egypt the Egyptians practiced whoredom (זנות); as it says, 'Whose flesh is as the flesh of asses.' (Ezekiel 23:20) When they entered the land of Canaan the Canaanites practised whoredom (זנות) and witchcraft; as it says, 'Because of the multitude of the harlotries of the well favoured harlot, the mistress of witchcraft.' (Nahum 3:4) The Holy One, blessed be He, said to them: 'My children, be careful that you do not act either in accordance with the practice of those or in accordance with the practice of those.'¹⁰⁶ The last part of this teaching delivers a vital message to us, namely: do not follow the majority culture to become immoral!

Sexual morality was attributed by the rabbis to Israel. We read in Talkut Shimon: "When they came to Shittim and the people began to commit harlotry, the (other) nations rejoiced and said: 'That crown that was in their hand, already it is no more, that glory by which they were praiseworthy (to be praised), behold, it is gone. They are now ours.'¹⁰⁷ Up to this point, at least, chastity was the crown of Israel. The demise of that crown was due to the intentional subversion of the gentiles. An even more distinctive difference was made by R. Aibu when he said, "What makes atonement for Israel is that when Israelites eat and drink and make merry they bless and praise and extol the Holy One, blessed be He, whereas when the other nations eat and drink they turn to lewdness."¹⁰⁸ (וְהַיְהוּדִים בְּעֵת אֲכִילָתָם וּשְׁתֵּיתָם וְהִתְחַלְּצוּ וְהִתְפָּאֲרוּ וְהִתְבָּרְכוּ וְהִתְשַׁבְּחוּ וְהִתְפָּאֲרוּ וְהִתְבָּרְכוּ וְהִתְשַׁבְּחוּ) His point (R. Aibu's) was clearly that Israel was chaste and the gentiles were dissolute.

There are several aggadic statements which seem to mitigate somewhat or run counter to the "mainstream" rabbinic doctrines on sexual immorality which we have already seen. "R. Hiyya b. Joseph (further) asked of Samuel: 'What (is the reason for the distinction) between a man who rebels (against his wife) and a woman who rebels (against her husband)?' (i.e., why does the former lose only half "tropaic"¹⁰⁹ a day while the latter loses a full "tropaic" each day?) The other replied, 'Go and learn it from the market of the harlots; who hires whom?' (The man naturally hires the woman; which shows that the male feels the deprivation more than the female. His compensation therefore, must be proportionately higher.) Another explanation: (the manifestation of) his passions is external; hers is internal."¹¹⁰ Here, Samuel voices the opinion that the physical need of men for sexual intercourse exceeds that of woman. While this does not represent any kind of a 7235 for promiscuity, it does show an awareness of the greater temptation which a man must combat. Such sympathy is not in keeping with the majority of aggadic material on the subject which is somewhat stern and uncompromising as indeed a moral code must be.

"R. Hisda said: 'Immorality (קדושת הבית) in a house is like a worm in the sesame plant.' Further said R. Hisda: 'Anger in a house is like a worm in a sesame plant. Both these statements refer to a woman, but in the case of a man there is no objection.'¹¹¹ It seems that R. Hisda takes a more lenient view of the husband's waywardness. Nevertheless R. Hisda is not giving the "green light" to the male. He is saying simply that immorality in the woman of the house is a greater threat to the family's existence. "Ulla said: 'Both Tamar (With her

father-in-law, Judah V. Genesis 38:14) and Zimri (With the Midianitish woman. V. Numbers 25:14) committed adultery (זִמְרִי וּפְנִיחָה בְּאֶרְצָם) and gave birth to kings and prophets. Zimri committed adultery and on his account many tens of thousands of Israel perished.' (In the plague. V. Numbers 25:9) R. Nahman B. Isaac said: 'A transgression performed with good intention is better than a precept performed with evil intention.... Read then: (A transgression performed with good intention is) as good as a precept performed for an ulterior motive, as it is written, 'Blessed above women shall Jaal, the wife of Heber the Kenite, be. Above women in the tent shall she be blessed,' (Judges 5:24 and by 'women in the tent,' Sarah, Rebecca, Rachael and Leah are meant.'" R. Johanan said: 'That wicked wretch (Sisera) had sevenfold intercourse (with Jaal) at that time,....'¹¹² Is, indeed, such a transgression performed with good intention acceptable or laudable? Perhaps Ulla and R. Nahman b. Isaac were trying to justify embarrassing verses in the Bible. The statements by them are certainly shocking when compared to the moral lessons of the rabbis which I have already stated. It seems to me that R. Johanan is objecting to R. Nahman's praise of Jaal. It must also be said that the temptation to have pre-marital sexual relations was far greater for the youth of the rabbinic era than that which the youth of today face. This was due to the early marriage age in the rabbinic era.

While the "halacha" is primarily concerned with the moral restrictions placed on women, the "aggada" supplies us with a clear-cut moral code for men. The rabbis expressed an emphatic condemnation of and distate for sexual immorality. They made every effort possible to

restrict it even to the extent of going against Torah law and discouraging legal but morally dangerous practices. They, themselves, tried to make personal examples of their own moral conduct. Pre-marital sex was explicitly and roundly condemned. The society of rabbinic times made a maximum effort to eliminate pre-marital sex. It also appears that among the youth of that society, such intercourse was considered sinful. Judaism also points toward the damage done by such sex to the girl or woman involved, the diminution of her chances for marriage and the psychological hurt to her. Any contact with a prostitute was also thoroughly abhorrent, a flagrant sin by man against God. In their moral exhortations against illicit sex, the rabbis included the married man. They condemned "male adultery" on his part. The rabbis also saw a proportionate relationship between sexual immorality and prosperity and leisure. They also pointed out the responsibility of parents to instruct their children in morality by both precept and example. Our rabbis also pointed to the danger inherent in marriages involving large age differences. They tend to increase the chance of adultery. Procreation was to be the "raison d'etre" of intercourse and, intercourse was strictly limited to marital relations.

Our tradition also condemns vulgarity in speech and thought and immodesty in dress. The rabbis realized that it is impossible to utterly avoid lewd thoughts entirely, but they taught that such thoughts must be promptly expelled, not savored. It is perfectly clear that the rabbis made a maximum effort to discourage any social practice or custom which might in any way arouse the passions of anyone whether an individual or the public at large.

CONCLUSIONS

The belief that sexual promiscuity is permissible for the man but not for the woman is a belief widely held by the males in our society. It is only recently that this idea has been coming under some fire and been subjected to at least some public discussion. Most men, however, cling to the "dual standard" approach. There is the all too popular idea now, and one which receives commercial encouragement, that a man, particularly the young unmarried man should be intimate with many girls. Indeed having the knack for frequently enticing beautiful young girls into intimacy is the basic requirement, the "sine qua non" for "masculinity." Among young men, feminine conquests are often viewed as a source of pride and accomplishment. Not all, it is true, really pursue this image and its goals, but few do not give it at least lip service. Very few actually attack it lest their virility and masculinity be cast into doubt by those who subscribe to the image. Many seem to take it for granted that the only way to learn the "facts of life" is through practical experience and many parents either acquiesce to this approach or actually encourage it. Bachelorhood seems to be, in our society, a time of enjoying "free-lance" sex, a time for "sowing wild oats." I have clearly shown that this attitude is totally contrary and repugnant to the moral standards and values expressed in Jewish tradition. It is true, of course, that we have problems today which make our situation different and, perhaps, more difficult than that of the society of the rabbinic era. The length of education and its importance in economic terms rule out the feasibility of early marriage

for a great number of diligent youngsters. Their sexual development and their opportunity to express it in a marriage relationship are in a state of conflict. It is, I think, unfair to simply dismiss such a dilemma by the blanket application of the rabbinic ethic without consideration of modern conditions. It is also blind to reject that ethic "out of hand."

Judaism also rejects as sinful "male adultery." There are, I think, few married men now who agree with this attitude. Here too, enjoyment and boasting of extra-marital affairs is a source of pride to many men. Their attitude, of course, is not reciprocal. They would instantly divorce their wives if they were to be discovered committing adultery. The rabbis ruled out such conduct on the part of the male. I can see no justifiable excuse today for ignoring or decrying the rabbis' teachings on this subject. (except in certain medical difficulties which render intercourse impossible and where divorce might be construed as unethical) Another aspect of extra-marital or pre-marital intercourse is the lack of consideration for the female partner which often accompanies such relations. Such an attitude certainly makes a man something less than the noble God-like being which the rabbis strove to help him be!

The rabbis vigorously condemned intercourse with a prostitute. If we are to sanction loopholes in their teachings, perhaps prostitution might be the best answer to non-marital sex. But, here too, there are vexing ethical questions. What about the dignity and future, the morality of the women involved? What about the temptation which prostitution would present to all men? Our rabbis, no doubt, had these

considerations, among others, in mind when they so earnestly attacked prostitution.

I was particularly impressed with the gap between the rabbis' views on modesty and avoidance of anything which might arouse the passions or encourage promiscuity and the widespread commercial application of such arousal and encouragement prevalent in our society today. Movies, books, magazine and television commercials, and comedy routines based predominantly on sex are, I think, bolder and more widespread than ever before. They run directly counter to the teachings of the rabbis and their attempts to ennoble the lives of men. Indeed one who follows the rabbinical morality on this point would be horrified, outraged at this flagrant approval and glorification of sexual arousal and immorality.

There are indeed, many problems in the application of the teachings of our rabbis to our modern society, but I do not think that traditional rabbinical ethics must be accepted in full or rejected in full. I do not think that the answers for maintaining a stable, dignified and essentially monogamous society of one thousand five hundred to two thousand two hundred years ago are applicable to our situation today in their entirety, but I do think that the human experience and long hours of thought and discussion by generations of brilliant leaders spent in an effort to outline for man the kind of life most consistent with his dignified and honorable title of a God-like being (*עליון*), certainly provide some guidance for our and any other generation. Epstein put it this way: "Modern civilization, in which emancipated Jewry has shared to the full, has, no doubt, made Jewish life broader and richer in many ways. But it is questionable whether it has given the Jew a

better code of sex morality than the one depicted here (in rabbinical thought), which grew out of his native moral reactions and bore the stamp of religious authority. Many of the prohibitions and inhibitions in this code seem unreasonable and yet perhaps not as much so as are the laxities of our modern standards of sex conduct. To find in a report of the sexual behavior of the American male an indication that the conduct of the orthodox Jew rates high according to the accepted norms of chastity and purity is sufficient recommendation for our supposedly antiquated code with all its shortcomings."¹¹³

LIST OF FOOTNOTES

1. אורח האלה, דרב נח, ש"ס, ת"ש. (פירוש קוק: פ"ד, פ"ד)
2. ע"ג, א, קוק.
3. תת"ח, א, קוק.
4. Dr. H. Freedman and Maurice Simon, eds., Midrash Rabbah (London: The Soncino Press, 1939), X, 13-137.
5. Louis Ginsberg, The Legends of the Jews (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1946), VII, 1-515.
6. Numbers 25:1.
7. Leviticus 21:9.
8. Genesis 38:24.
9. Deuteronomy 31:16.
10. Marcus Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and The Midrashic Literature (New York: Fardes Publishing House, Inc., 1950)
11. Jastrow, p. 406.
12. Talmud Babli: Yebamoth 61 b.
13. Ibid
14. Ibid
15. Talmud Babli: Yebamoth 118 b.
16. Talmud Babli: Gittin 17 a-b.
17. Midrash Rabbah: Numbers 9:14.
18. Talmud Babli: Baba Kamma 16 b.
19. Midrash Rabbah: Genesis 28:8.
20. Talmud Babli: Abodah Zarah 17.
21. Midrash Rabbah: Numbers 9:7.
22. Ibid

23. Jastrow, I, 394.
24. Talmud Babli: Sanhedrin 106 a.
25. Talmud Babli: Hagigah 15.
26. Micah 2:13.
27. Isaiah 5:5.
28. II Kings 14:13.
29. II Samuel 6:8.
30. Talmud Babli: Berakoth 63 a.
31. Talmud Babli: Sukkah 26.
32. Talmud Babli: Baba Bathra 53 a.
33. Talmud Babli: Baba Bathra 91 b.
34. Talmud Babli: Berakoth 19. a.
35. Talmud Babli: Demai 2:3.
36. Talmud Babli: Erubin 64 b.
37. Talmud Yerushalmi: Yebamoth 1:2.
38. Talmud Babli: Kethuboth 3 a.
39. Talmud Babli: Sotah 48 a.
40. Talmud Babli: Nedarim 62 a.
41. Midrash Rabbah: Numbers 9:12.
42. Talmud Babli: Shabbath 13 a.
43. Talmud Babli: Yebamoth 61.
44. Midrash Rabbah: Numbers 9:14.
45. Talmud Babli: Abodah Zarah 17 a.
46. Midrash Tanhuma: Tazriya 11.
47. Midrash Rabbah: Numbers 9:7.
48. Midrash Rabbah: Genesis 26:5.

49. Jastrow, I, 81.
50. Midrash Tanhuma: Bereshith 12.
51. Midrash Rabbah: Genesis 26:5.
52. Talmud Babli: Abodah Zarah 17 a.
53. Talmud Yerushalmi: Sanhedrin 11.
54. Abot de Rabbi Nathan: 20.
55. George Foot Moore, Judaism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), II, 271.
56. Talmud Babli: Gittin 46 a.
57. Talmud Babli: Kiddushin 12 b.
58. Talmud Babli: Kethuboth 3 a.
59. Talmud Babli: Abodah Zarah 18.
60. Talmud Babli: Pesachim 113 a-b
61. Midrash Rabbah: Song of Songs 4:12:1.
62. Midrash Rabbah: Genesis 26:5.
63. Talmud Babli: Pesachim 113 a-b.
64. Talmud Babli: Berakoth 23 a.
65. Talmud Babli: Gittin 56.
66. Talmud Babli: Sotah 4 b.
67. Talmud Babli: Menahoth 44 a.
68. Talmud Babli: Sotah 4 b.
69. Talmud Babli: Pesachim 113 a-b.
70. Talmud Babli: Kiddushin 12 b.
71. Louis M. Epstein, Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1948), p. 168.
72. Talmud Babli: Yebamoth 59 b.
73. Epstein, p. 167.

74. R. Saadya Gaon, Emunot ve Daot.
75. Talmud Bali: Berakoth 32 a.
76. Talmud Babli: Kethuboth 59 b.
77. Epstein, p. 6.
78. Talmud Babli: Sanhedrin 76.
79. Midrash Rabbah: Genesis 80:1.
80. Midrash Rabbah: Exodus 43:7.
81. Talmud Babli: Yebamoth 61.
82. Epstein, p. 14.
83. Talmud Babli: Sotah 10 a.
84. Ibid
85. Moore, II, 272.
86. Midrash Rabbah: Genesis 70:18.
87. Talmud Babli: Sotah 48 a.
88. Talmud Babli: Shabbath 62 b - 63 a.
89. Talmud Babli: Megillah 106.
90. Epstein, p. 16.
91. Talmud Babli: Yoma 47 a, quoted by Epstein, p. 35.
92. Moore, II, 267.
93. Talmud Babli: Shabbath 64 a.
94. Midrash Rabbah: Numbers 10:2
95. Talmud Babli: Kallah ch. 1.
96. Apocrypha: Sirach 9:8.
97. Talmud Babli: Yebamoth 35 a.
98. Talmud Babli: Yebamoth 61 b.
99. Talmud Babli: Abodah Zarah 65.

100. Talmud Babli : Sanhedrin 95.
101. Pirke de Rabbi Nathan: 28.
102. Talmud Babli: Shabbath 33 b.
103. Midrash Rabbah: Genesis 63:9.
104. Talmud Babli: Pesachim 113 b.
105. Midrash Rabbah: Exodus 1:18.
106. Midrash Rabbah: Leviticus 23:7.
107. Yalkut Shimoni: Pinchas
108. Midrash Rabbah: Esther 3:13.
109. Herbert Danby, The Mishnah (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), pp. 797-798. (Appendix II)
110. Talmud Babli: Kethuboth 64b.
111. Talmud Babli: Sotah 3 b.
112. Talmud Babli: Nazir 23b.
113. Epstein, p. 7

מוסד ברג קוק: ירושלים. אוסף האסדה, כרך נח 717 ע' 170
תש"ז.

ספר עמנויות והדעות לרגלנו סצ'ה שאלן. אבן תבין.
תש"ה, דה-גר אודונוסון: ירושלים

Danby, Herbert. The Mishnah. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Epstein, Louis M. Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1948.

Ginzberg, Louis. The Legends of the Jews. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909.

The Holy Scriptures. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955.

Jastrow, Marcus. A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and The Midrashic Literature. New York: Pardes Publishing House, Inc., 1950.

Midrash Rabbah. Vilna: Romm, 1921.

Moore, George Foot. Judaism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Rosenblatt, Samuel. Saadia Gaon The Book of Beliefs and Opinions.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948.