The main components of the Jewish perceptions of regions considered to be included in the Land of Israel, or considered to be “abroad” are biblical heritage, geopolitical circumstances, economic needs, and demographics. In this paper, I concentrate on the demographic aspect and claim that the halakhic notion of the “impurity of gentile lands” also functioned as a means by which sages encouraged geographic continuity of Jewish settlement.

The impurity of foreign lands is presented in rabbinic literature as a decree that assigns space outside the borders of the Land of Israel the halakhic status of impurity. This impurity shapes the way the space of the Land of Israel is depicted compared to space considered a foreign land. The ruling that a place is polluted with the impurity of “foreign lands” anchors it as such in both consciousness and practice, although that place might have once been included within the biblical bounds of the Land of Israel.

The Bible already treats regions outside of the Land of Israel as unclean,[[1]](#footnote-1) but the halakhic status of this impurity is fixed in rabbinic literature. The impurity of foreign lands is mentioned frequently in the Mishnah and Tosefta. The decree is ascribed to the first named pair, Yose ben Yoezer of Zerida and Yose ben Yohanan of Jerusalem, in a baraita in the Babylonian Talmud and in the Palestinian Talmud: “Yose ben Yoezer of Zerida and Yose ben Yohanan of Jerusalem decreed the impurity of foreign lands and glass vessels” (B. Shabbat 14b; Y. Shabbat 1:3 [3d]).[[2]](#footnote-2)

The Reason for the Impurity of Foreign Lands

 The sources that attest to the decree of impurity of foreign lands do not explain the reasons for it. Gedalyahu Alon linked the impurity of foreign lands to gentile impurity, relying on a series of halakhot on the impurity of foreign lands that cannot be explained by a concern for corpse impurity. In his view, the aim of halakhot on the impurity of gentiles and gentile lands is to separate Israel from the nations. Alon dated these halakhot to the beginning of the Second Temple period or even earlier.[[3]](#footnote-3)

 The books of Ezra and Nehemiah already emphasize the need to maintain Jewish distinctiveness and total segregation from the people of the land. The most powerful expression of this separation is the uncompromising battle against marriage to foreign women, but it is not confined to the separation of Diaspora returnees from foreign wives. As noted, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah construct a tall fence between the Diaspora returnees, the Samaritans, and the rest of the surrounding nations. Moreover, the separation from and disregard for the remaining population, the offspring of those whom the forefathers of the returnees considered brethren, further demonstrates the drive to separation that characterizes these compositions.

 It seems that Mary Douglas’s theory suits Alon’s view that the notion of the impurity of the gentiles began in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. According to Douglas, a small and threatened group, living with a sense of being an “enclave,” tends to uphold laws of segregation and purity in order to maintain its distinctiveness. According to the events described in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Diaspora returnees felt they were a small and threatened group, which explains Ezra and Nehemiah’s uncompromising battle against intermarriage,[[4]](#footnote-4) and supports the view that the idea of gentile impurity began in the time of Ezra

 Alon concluded that the impurity of foreign lands served to distance Israel from the gentiles and from viewing them as unclean, but that the reason for the decree was later forgotten and was explained as corpse impurity, as the fear of the presence of human bones, since foreigners do not bury their dead.**[[5]](#footnote-5)** Alon’s account, which explains the decree on the impurity of foreign lands as resulting from the impurity of gentiles present in these lands, reflects a view that it is the ethnic factor that determines the purity of a place when it comes to the impurity of foreign lands. An unclean region is a place where gentiles live, and it is located outside the area of Jewish habitation in the Land of Israel.

 Christine Hayes differed with Alon’s view and argued that the initial reason for the impurity of foreign lands was the concern for corpse impurity.[[6]](#footnote-6) Hayes noted that the impurity of foreign lands generally appears, in the Tosefta as well as the Mishnah, in proximity to discussions of graveyard impurity or the impurity of a plowed field that may contain a grave (*beit ha-peras*),[[7]](#footnote-7) or even in the halakhot that draw a parallel between the impurity of foreign lands and the impurity of *beit ha-peras*.**[[8]](#footnote-8)** Hayes therefore explained the impurity of foreign lands as Maimonides and Rashi explained it—as corpse impurity that was decreed because gentiles bury their dead haphazardly.[[9]](#footnote-9) Hayes does not accept Alon’s view that the impurity of foreign lands stems from those gentiles who live there.[[10]](#footnote-10) She relies on a passage from the Temple Scroll to conclude that corpse impurity had been the reason for the impurity of foreign lands as early as the Hasmonean era.[[11]](#footnote-11) The passage warns not to desecrate the land as the gentiles do when they do not designate places to bury their dead:[[12]](#footnote-12) “You shall not do as the nations do; they bury their dead everywhere, they bury them even in their houses” (Temple Scroll XLVIII, 11–12). **[[13]](#footnote-13)**

 Hayes does not distinguish between impurity of what the sages call “gentile dwelling places” (*medorot goyim*), that is, impurity that occurs in a place where gentiles live among Jews and in the Land of Israel, and the impurity of foreign lands, which presents a difficulty for her approach. According to the Mishnah (Ohalot 18:7), the impurity of gentile dwelling places may be purified by an examination that is never mentioned in regard to the impurity of foreign lands.[[14]](#footnote-14)

 The passage from the Temple Scroll that Hayes relies on deals with graves within the Land of Israel, a term that in rabbinic literature corresponds to “gentile dwelling places” rather than to foreign lands. According to the Tosefta, “There is no gentile dwelling place or a *beit ha-peras* outside of the land [of Israel]” (T. Ohalot 18:11, according to MS Vienna [ed. Zuckermandel, p. 617]). Likewise, the sages’ need for two distinct terms—“gentile dwelling places”[[15]](#footnote-15) and “foreign lands”—indicates that they distinguished between these impurities. Indeed, because places where gentiles live outside the Land of Israel are already impure as foreign lands, the impurity of gentile dwelling places must only apply to the Land of Israel. The Tosefta lists places a priest incurs lashes for rebelliousness (*makot mardut*) for entering: “One who enters *beit ha-peras* or to measure gentile lands or goes outside the Land of Israel incurs lashes of rebelliousness” (T. Makkot 4:17, according to MS Erfurt [ed. Zuckermandel, p. 443]). The list is interpreted as relating to a priest who enters a *beit ha-peras* in order to “measure gentile lands” (MS Vienna has “gentile dwelling places”), or goes outside the Land of Israel for no reason.

Impure Space and Holy Space: The Impurity of Foreign Lands and the Borders of the Babylonian Returnees

At the beginning of seder Toharot appears the mishnah on the “ten sanctities,” which outlines the hierarchy of holiness of space:

6. There are ten grades of holiness: the land of Israel is holier than all other lands. And what is the nature of its holiness? That from it are brought the omer, the firstfruits and the two loaves, which cannot be brought from any of the other lands.

7. Cities that are walled are holier, for lepers must be sent out of them and a corpse, though it may be carried about within them as long as it is desired, may not be brought back once it has been taken out.

8. The area within the wall [of Jerusalem] is holier, for it is there that lesser holy things and second tithe may be eaten. The Temple Mount is holier, for *zavim*, *zavot*, menstruants and women after childbirth may not enter it. The *chel* is holier, for neither non-Jews nor one who contracted corpse impurity may enter it. The court of women is holier, for a *tevul yom* may not enter it, though he is not obligated a *hatat* for doing so. The court of the Israelites is holier, for a man who has not yet offered his obligatory sacrifices may not enter it, and if he enters he is liable for a *hatat*. The court of the priests is holier, for Israelites may not enter it except when they are required to do so: for laying on of the hands, slaying or waving.

9. The area between the porch (*ʾulam*) and the altar is holier, for [priests] who have blemishes or unkempt hair may not enter it. The Hekhal is holier, for no one whose hands or feet are unwashed may enter it. The Holy of Holies is holier, for only the high priest, on Yom Kippur, at the time of the service, may enter it. (M. Kelim 1:6–9)

The mishnah of the “ten sanctities” is organized in a circular hierarchical structure where the center is the temple and the exterior circle is the Land of Israel.[[16]](#footnote-16) It does not relate to the area surrounding the Land of Israel. Its halakhic status is unclean because of the decree on the impurity of foreign lands. Unclean space is that which surrounds the area of Jewish settlement; thus, the impurity of foreign lands is a marker that distinguishes between the area of Jewish settlement within the Land of Israel and areas where gentiles live. Some of the areas that surround the area of Jewish settlement and are not included in it are in fact included within the borders of the Land of Israel delineated in the book of Numbers (34:1–12), and even in the area divided among the tribes. Thus the status of the area between the borders of Babylonian returnees to Hamat in the northeast, as well as the northern portion of the territory of the tribe of Asher, which belongs to the land divided among the tribes in the book of Joshua, is considered polluted by the impurity of foreign lands.

This halakhic system correlates the borders of the area where the ethnos, that is, the Jewish people, resides, and the borders of the Land of Israel. The area where the Jewish people reside determines the borders of the holy land that is subject to the commandments, while the area surrounding it is polluted by the impurity of foreign lands.

The Impurity of Foreign Lands, Obligations That Apply Only in the Land of Israel, and the Area of Jewish Settlement

The discussion above elucidates that the borders of the Babylonian returnees signify the region of the Land of Israel where the Jewish population is concentrated (which is distinguished from the foreign population), and it sheds new light on the laws on the impurity of foreign lands.

The tannaitic sources show that the sages used the concept of the impurity of foreign lands as a means to define or expand the area of Jewish settlement. For this reason, the cities that Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi exempted from the commandments that apply only to the Land of Israel were not considered polluted with the impurity of foreign lands. If indeed the reason for the exemption from these obligations was to encourage Jews to settle in those cities, purification from the impurity of foreign lands was a factor that would encourage settlement in those places, where other places deemed clean of the impurity of foreign lands were required to fulfill these obligations. Thus, “If one buys a field in Syria near to the Land of Israel: If he can enter it in cleanness, it is deemed clean and is subject to [the laws of] tithes and *shevi’it* [the Sabbatical year]; but if he cannot enter it in cleanness, it [is deemed] unclean, but it is still subject to [the laws of] tithes and *shevi’it*” (M. Ohalot 18:7).[[17]](#footnote-17)

This interpretation also explains why the Tosefta emphasized the unique status of those cities “located within the Land of Israel”:[[18]](#footnote-18) “Cities that are within the Land of Israel like Sisita and its vicinity and Ashkelon and its vicinity, although they are exempt from tithes and *shevi’it* they are not considered foreign lands (T. Ohalot 18:4, according to MS Vienna [ed. Zuckermandel, p. 616]).[[19]](#footnote-19) This special, intermediate status resulted from Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi’s exemption for these places from the commandments that apply to the Land, which aimed to encourage their settlement. Although gentiles lived in these places, they were not deemed polluted with the impurity of foreign lands because such a decree would discourage Jewish settlement there.

The sages' effort to encourage Jews to settle in the space by means of declaring it clean of the impurity of foreign lands is further clarified in the explanation of the decree of the impurity of foreign lands regarding the area south of Ashkelon—the region of Gerar:[[20]](#footnote-20)

Why did they not decree concerning the air of Gerarike [that it is unclean as part of the land of gentiles]?

R. Simon in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi [said] “It is because it is terrible [uninhabitable] region…. But indeed, Gaza [which is in this territory], is a lovely region![[21]](#footnote-21)

According to the Palestinian Talmud, the reason the region between Ashkelon and Nahal Mitzrayim is not polluted with the impurity of foreign lands is because “its oases are poor,” that is, because it is not comfortable to live there. But the sages were interested in encouraging its settlement by Jews and thus did not include it in the decree of the impurity of foreign lands.

Thus, the constellation of considerations of whether to define a region as polluted with the impurity of foreign lands is influenced and even guided by the desire to encourage Jewish settlement in that region.

Syria and Its Purification from the Impurity of Foreign Lands

An examination of the halakhot on the removal of the impurity of foreign lands from regions of Syria also reflects a trend to encourage territorial continuity of settlement into Syria. Thus, for instance, Mishnah Ohalot 18:7 decrees

If one buys a field in Syria near the Land of Israel: If he can enter it in cleanness, it is deemed clean and is subject to [the laws of] tithes and *shevi’it* [produce]; but if he cannot enter it in cleanness, it [is deemed] unclean, but it is still subject to [the laws of] tithes and *shevi’it* [produce].

The dwelling places of non-Jews are unclean. How long must [the non-Jew] have dwelt in [the dwelling places] for them to require examination? Forty days, even if there was no woman with him. If, however, a slave or [an Israelite] woman watched over [the dwelling place], it does not require examination.

According to this mishnah, the space that is not polluted with the impurity of foreign lands can be expanded out from the Land of Israel into Syria and create territorial contiguity of clean status.

The establishment of territorial contiguity from the Land of Israel, which is clean of the impurity of foreign lands, into spaces outside of it, enables the purification of that space. This understanding sheds light on the halakhah that states that the roads that lead from Babylon to the Land of Israel, by which the Jews returned from Babylonian to Israel, are pure: “The status of the roads by which returnees from Babylon arrive, even though they are within foreign lands, is pure” (T. Ohalot 18:3). According to Midrash Tannaim, the reason is that “according to our way we learned that the travelers to the Land of Israel purify the foreign lands” (Midrash Tannaim [ed. Hoffmann, p. 112]).[[22]](#footnote-22)

That is, the purification of these roads was effected by Jewish presence on these roads. Since these areas’ purification occurs by means of dense and continuous Jewish presence, we thus learn that the impurity of foreign lands is a result of continuous gentile presence, rather than a fear of corpse impurity, as Hayes claimed.

Those halakhot that deal with the purification of the impurity of foreign lands share a goal of creating territorial continuity from the border of the Babylonian returnees into Syria, which is mostly included within the borders of returnees from Egypt or within the borders of the Promised Land, and stretches until the Euphrates. This continuity purifies those territories that extend from the Land of Israel and are appended to it from the impurity of foreign lands and obligates those areas with the commandments applied only to the Land of Israel, such as *shevi’it* and tithes.

Samaria – A Separating Strip of Samaritans

The link between the spread of Jewish settlement into a region defined as clean of the impurity of foreign lands also occurs in the opposition direction, in a halakhah that removes territories within the Land of Israel from the holiness of the Land and deems them polluted with the impurity of foreign lands.

According to the Tosefta, the land of the Samaritans is pure, in contrast to impure foreign lands:[[23]](#footnote-23) “The land of the Samaritans is pure, its mikvaot, dwelling places, and roads are pure, foreign land is impure, its mikvaot, dwelling places and roads are impure” (Mikvaot 6:1).

But in the Palestinian Talmud and the Babylonian Talmud, the area that separates Judea from the Galilee, where the Samaritan dwell, is space that is unclean with the impurity of gentile lands. This is reflected in the way the Talmud explains the halakhic difference mentioned in the Mishnah (Hagigah 3:2) between the people of Judea, who are fastidious with the purity of wine and oil all year round, and the people of the Galilee, who are not fastidious. According to Reish Lakish in the Babylonian Talmud, this is because “a strip of Samaritans separates them” (B. Hagigah 25a). According to the Yerushalmi, “Rabbi Simon, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi in the name of Rabbi Pedaya: ‘Because a *fiskia*[[24]](#footnote-24) of Samaritans interrupts’” (Y. Hagigah 3:4 [79c]).[[25]](#footnote-25) That is, the land of the Samaritans in Samaria that separates Judea and the Galilee is polluted with the impurity of foreign lands.

Rabbi Abahu holds that this “strip” is a space that had never been holy.[[26]](#footnote-26) “Rabbi Abahu said:[[27]](#footnote-27) There are Samaritan places exempted since the days of Joshua bin Nun and they remain exempted” (Y. Sheviit 6:1 [46c]).

Sussmann connected this memra with the final verse of the Rehov inscription, which starts with the words “the cities exempted in the area of Sebaste.” This is the only passage in the Rehov inscription that has no parallel in rabbinic literature.[[28]](#footnote-28) As Sussmann noted, the structure of the inscription indicates that this passage was appended to the text that was copied from a source that lacked this passage. It was added in the margin of the inscription after the word *shalom*, which ends the inscription, which starts with *shalom*. The section that deals with cities permitted in the area of Sebaste also does not appear on the plaster inscription from the synagogue, which demonstrates the precedence of the plaster inscription to the inscription on the mosaic floor.[[29]](#footnote-29)

According to Sussmann, the inscription indicates that these “the exempted cities” were permitted for *shevi’it* and exempted from tithes. That is, the region of Samaria defined by the Amoraim as a Samaritan “strip” or *fiskia*, where the Samaritans dwelled, became exempt from priestly tithes and *shevi’it* and was considered polluted with the impurity of foreign lands[[30]](#footnote-30) following a change in the Samaritans’ halakhic status to “gentiles in every way, from small to large, without rabbinic controversy.”[[31]](#footnote-31) Lieberman dated the change in the status of the Samaritans to total gentiles to the end of the fourth century CE.

Sussmann believed that the exemption stemmed from the change in the halakhic status of the Samaritans from Israelites to gentiles. Zeev Safrai assumed that the cities in the area of Sebaste were exempted because gentiles dwelled in these cities.[[32]](#footnote-32) In any case, whether the change in the region’s halakhic status was a result of the halakhic status of the Samaritans or of gentiles living among the Samaritans, it was the change in ethnonational status from Samaritan to gentile cities that caused a change in the halakhic status of the region north of Shechem.

We see that a region that was once inseparable from the Land of Israel and thus required to fulfill those obligations applied only to the Land of Israel and deemed pure of the impurity of foreign lands, became unclean and exempt from those commandments. This development shows the close link between the ethnic composition of the area and its definition and halakhic status.

The Definition of the Borders of the Land – the Exemptions of Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi

 Rabbi exempted places from the obligation of *shemita*,[[33]](#footnote-33) from setting aside priestly gifts and tithes, and from the impurity of foreign lands. Shmuel Safrai has shown that Rabbi’s exemptions from *shemita* stemmed from his general view that the obligation of *shevi’it* during the Second Temple period was a rabbinic legislation and that the sages thus have the power to waive it.[[34]](#footnote-34) As we noted above, T. Ohalot 18:4 mentioned that certain cities within the Land of Israel are exempt from tithes and *shevi’it*, but are not considered foreign lands. That is, the exemption from laws applied only to the Land of Israel does not necessarily result in the status of being unclean with the impurity of foreign lands. [[35]](#footnote-35)

Most of the places whose exemptions are ascribed to Rabbi (Beit Shean, Caesaria, Beit Guvrin, and Ashkelon) were mixed cities where Jews and gentiles both lived.[[36]](#footnote-36) It may be that Rabbi intended to lighten the burden on Jews who lived in these places.[[37]](#footnote-37) Aharon Oppenheimer and David Levine linked the process of urbanization of the Land of Israel and the Roman Empire in general in the Severan period and Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi’s exemptions, which sought to encourage Jews to settle in these cities.[[38]](#footnote-38)

We can suppose that the outcome Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi hoped for was dense Jewish settlement in a given place. This type of settlement would have caused a change in the status of the place, requiring it to fulfill those commandments applied only to the Land of Israel. At the end of the process, the current exemption from the commandment of *shevi’it* and setting aside priestly gifts and tithes was meant to encourage settlement and thus in the future expand the area required to fulfill these obligations. This approach sharply contrasts with the drive toward separation seen in Ezra and Nehemiah and in Yose ben Yoezer and Yose ben Yohanan, who decreed on the impurity of foreign lands. The change in orientation explains the vigorous opposition Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi’s *takkanot* engendered;[[39]](#footnote-39) this act, in which he defined and diminished the borders of the Land of Israel even in places considered in biblical literature to be the Land of Israel proper, sparked the strong dissent described in the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds.

This interpretation sheds new light on Rabbi's exemptions, since those places that Rabbi exempted were in the future to be required to fulfill commandments applied only to the Land of Israel due to the expected growth of Jewish settlement there.[[40]](#footnote-40) That is, Rabbi’s exemptions were meant to expand the range of Jewish settlement and integrate Jews into the Hellenistic cities on the borders of the land.

Conclusion

A comprehensive view of the laws of the impurity of foreign lands shows that the boundaries of the land clean of this impurity depend on where Jews dwell. An analysis of the system of laws dealing with the way a space is purified of the impurity of foreign lands demonstrates that the Land of Israel can be expanded and space once deemed unclean can be diminished by means of continuous settlement or by Jewish presence, like the roads used by the Babylonian returnees. The sages used this law as a tool to expand the area of Jewish settlement. That is, by means of a decree that is a kind of administrative order the sages expanded or diminished places laden with historical significance. The orientation reflected in rabbinic literature is to expand Jewish settlement into Syria, where there was an important concentration of Jews, though more sparse than in the Galilee. In the Jewish mind, which relied on the Bible, Syria was included in the territory of the returnees from Egypt.

Dating the decree of the impurity of foreign lands to the time of Yose ben Yohanan and Yose ben Yoezer, who were active in the Hasmonean period, allows us to understand it as motivated by a territorial orientation suited to a state. The segregationist approach that characterized the time of Ezra and Nehemiah and the decrees of sages of the Hasmonean period changed sharply with the decrees of Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi. Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi tried to expand the area of Jewish settlement by encouraging settlement in mixed cities, an act that spurred controversy among the sages.

On the other hand, the link between the demography of an area and its halakhic status also engenders the opposite halakhic definitions. An area located in the heart of the Land of Israel could become unclean with the impurity of foreign lands if gentiles or a population that is no longer defined as Jewish lives there. Such a dynamic demonstrates the direct and shifting connection between the borders of religious identity and Jewish nationalism and between the borders of the territory the sages identified with the Land of Israel.
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