

# XI

## BAVLI MENAHOT CHAPTER ELEVEN

FOLIOS 94A-100B

### 11:1

- A. The two loaves [of Pentecost/Shabuot] are kneaded one by one and baked [in the oven] one by one [one, then the next].
- B. The [twelve loaves of] show bread are kneaded one by one and baked two by two.
- C. And in a mold did one make them.
- D. And when he takes them from the oven, he puts them into [another] mold, so that they [their shapes] will not be spoiled.
- I.1 A. *What is the source of this rule?*
- B. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. ["And you shall take fine flour and bake it into twelve loaves of it; two tenths of an ephah shall be in each loaf. And you shall set them in two rows, six in a row, upon the table of pure gold. And you shall put pure frankincense with each row, that it may go with the bread as a memorial portion to be offered by fire to the Lord. Every Sabbath day Aaron shall set it in order before the Lord continually on behalf of the people of Israel as a covenant for ever. And it shall be for Aaron and his sons, and they shall eat it in a holy place, since it is for him a most holy portion out of the offerings by fire to the Lord, a perpetual due" (Lev. 24: 5-9).] — "two tenths of an ephah shall be [in each cake]:"
- D. This teaches that that they should be equal in volume.
- E. [Sifra adds:] "in each cake:"
- F. [Sifra adds:] Every act of kneading and cutting of the dough [of the Twelves Loaves of show bread] should be done for each loaf by itself [M. Men. 11:1B].
- G. How do we know that in the case of the two loaves, the acts of kneading and cutting the dough should be done for each loaf by itself?
- H. Scripture says, "...shall be in each cake."

- I. Then how do we know that the [the twelve loaves] are to be put down into the oven two by two [M. **Men. 11:1B**]?
  - J. Scripture says, “And you shall set them.”
  - K. Might one suppose that the two loaves also should be put down into the oven two by two?
  - L. Scripture says, “...them...”
  - M. this offering is baked two by two, but the two loaves are baked each by itself [M. **Men. 11:1A**].
    - N. *But has not the word “them” already yielded a deduction on its own [that baking the show bread will be done by pairs]?*
    - O. *If that were the sense, then Scripture should have said “you shall set them” using a single construction. What is the point of saying “you shall set them” using two distinct words? It is so that two lessons may be derived.*

**I.2.** A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. “And you shall set them:”
- C. into the mould.
- D. There were three molds there [in line with M. **Men. 11:1C-D**]. One was for the bread in the oven, one was for the dough, and one was for when one took the bread out of the oven.
- E. And one puts the dough into the mould so that they will not spoil the bread [T. **Men. 11:3A-B**].
  - E. *But why not put it back into the original mould?*
  - F. *It is because after baking it swells up [so will not fit].*

**I.3.** A. It has been stated:

- B. As to the show bread, how do they make it?
- C. **[94B]** R. Hanina said, “Like a broken box.” [Cashdan: in the shape of an open box with two of the sides, front and back, removed; each cake had a base and two sides that rode perpendicularly.]
- D. R. Yohanan said, “**Like a rocking ship** [T. **Men. 11:6B**].” [Cashdan: like the sides of a ship that narrowed downwards until the keel is reached; the side of each cake narrowed downwards, until at the bottom there was only a fingerbreadth between the sides, like a V.]
- E. *Now there are no problems from the viewpoint of him who has said, “Like a broken box.”. For then we can make sense of where the dishes of frankincense were placed [namely, on the base of the topmost cake (Cashdan)]. But from the viewpoint of him who has said, “Like a rocking ship,” where were the dishes of frankincense placed?*
- F. *There was a place made for them [in the topmost cake, a projection or ledge of dough on which the dishes were placed (Cashdan)].*
- G. *Now there are no problems from the viewpoint of him who has said, “Like a broken box.”. For then we know how the rods lay [on the sides of the cakes]. [Cashdan: there were **twenty-eight rods, each shaped like the half of a hollow reed** [T. **Men. 11:7A**]; fourteen were used for one row of the show bread,*

*fourteen for the others. But from the viewpoint of him who has said, “Like a rocking ship,” how could the rods lie on the side of the cakes [Cashdan: for since the sides of each cake tapered upwards almost to a point, there was certainly no place on the top for three rods]?*

- H. *Projects were attached to them on top. [Cashdan: at the top of each side of the cakes, projections made of dough were attached horizontally like arms, and upon these projects the rods lay.]*
- I. *Now there are no problems from the viewpoint of him who has said, “Like a broken box.”. For then we can understand how the props supported the cakes. [Cashdan: for each row of the show bread there were two props that stood upright on opposite sides of the table. The sides of each cake rose up perpendicularly at the edge of the table. The proper that stood close to the table supported the sides of the cakes so that they could bear the pressure of the upper crops.] But from the viewpoint of him who has said, “Like a rocking ship,” how could the props hold up the cakes? [Cashdan: for the props came into contact only with the top point of each side of the cakes, since only the top reached the edge of the table, and that contact afforded little support.]*
- J. *They were made obliquely. [Cashdan: from the props jutted forth curved brackets to fit in the outer curve of the sides of the cakes; the sides of the cakes thus rested on these brackets.]*
- K. *Now there are no problems from the viewpoint of him who has said, “Like a rocking ship,”. For then we can make sense of the need for props [Cashdan: and brackets, since the cakes had no base]. But from the viewpoint of him who has said, “Like a broken box,” how come there had to be props?*
- L. *Otherwise, they might break under the pressure of the cakes at the top. [Cashdan: the props thus strengthened the sides of each cake to withstand the pressure of the cakes above it.]*
- M. *Now there are no problems from the viewpoint of him who has said, “Like a rocking ship.” For then we can understand that the props rested on the table. [Cashdan: since the cakes were v-shaped, there were obviously spaces underneath the sides of each cake, so the bracket under the lowest cake rested on the table.] But from the viewpoint of him who has said, “Like a broken box,” where were the props placed? [Cashdan: as the sides of the cakes were flush with the edge of the table, there was no room on the table for the props.]*
- N. *Then were they set on the ground?*
- O. *Yes indeed, for said R. Abba bar Mammel, “In the opinion of him who says, ‘Like a rocking ship,’ the props stood on the table, but in the view of him who says, ‘like a broken box,’ they rested on the ground.”*

**I.4.** A. *In accord with which view is that which R. Judah said, “The cakes held up the props, and the props held up the cakes”?*

B. *It is in accord with him who has said, “Like a rocking ship.” [Cashdan: for the curved sides of the cakes lay on the brackets and held them firm, while the brackets and props supported the cakes.]*

C. **[95A]** *An objection was raised: There was an oven mould in the form of a beehive, and it resembled a square plate [T. Men. 11:2A]. [Cashdan:*

in this mould the cake was baked; it is evident that the cake was not v shaped, but had a square base, like the bottom of a box.]

D. Read the statement: the top of it was like a square plate.

**I.5.** A. *There is a Tannaite formulation in accord with the opinion of him who has said, "Like a rocking ship," for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. There were four golden props that put forth branches on top like brackets. These supported the cakes, which were like a ship's keel.

**I.6.** A. *The question was raised: was the show bread invalidated on the journeys [when the Tabernacle was dismantled, since when that took place, the show bread was taken off the table], or was the show bread not invalidated on the journeys?*

B. R. Yohanan and R. Joshua b. Levi:

C. *One of them said, "It was invalidated."*

D. *The other of them said, "It was not invalidated."*

E. *One who said, "It was invalidated," cites the verse, "As they encamp so they shall journey" (Num. 2:17). Since, when they encamped, the show bread was invalidated by being taken outside of the curtains of the Tabernacle, so when they journeyed, it was rendered invalidated for it was taken outside the tabernacle [which had been dismantled].*

F. *The other of them said, "It was not invalidated," cites the verse, "And the continual bread shall remain thereon" (Num. 4: 7) [Cashdan: even though the tabernacle has been dismantled, the bread is still holy].*

G. *And as to the other, is it not written, "As they encamp so they shall journey" (Num. 2:17)?*

H. *To the contrary! Just as when the people encamped, it was not rendered invalid if it had not been taken outside of the tabernacle, so when they journeyed, it was not rendered invalid if it was taken outside [but was simply left on the table].*

I. *And as to the other, is it not written, "And the continual bread shall remain thereon" (Num. 4: 7)?*

J. *When R. Dimi came, he said, "When the bread was properly set forth on the table, there is no controversy [since it was entirely valid]. Where there is a controversy, it is when it had been removed. The one who said, 'It was invalidated,' cites the verse, 'As they encamp so they shall journey' (Num. 2:17). Since, when they encamped, the show bread was invalidated by being taken outside of the curtains of the Tabernacle, so when they journeyed, it was rendered invalidated for it was taken outside the tabernacle [which had been dismantled]. The other of them said, 'It was not invalidated,' cites the verse, 'Then the tent of meeting shall set forward' (Num. 2:17) — even though it was journeying, it remains the tent of meeting."*

K. *And as to the other, is it not written, "As they encamp so they shall journey" (Num. 2:17)?*

L. *To the contrary! Just as when the people encamped, it was not rendered invalid if it had not been taken outside of the tabernacle, so when they*

*journeyed, it was not rendered invalid if it was not taken outside [but was simply left on the table].*

M. *And as to the other, is it not written, “Then the tent of meeting shall set forward’ (Num. 2:17)?*

N. *That serves to set forth the order of the flags [the order of march].*

O. *And as to the other?*

P. *That derives from “the camp of the Levites in the midst of the camps” (Num. 2:17).*

Q. *An objection was raised: At the time that the tabernacle was dismantled during the wanderings in the desert, sacrifices that might have been made were invalid, and persons afflicted with flux [Lev. 15] and with the skin ailment [Lev. 13-14] were expelled from their camps [where during the time that the tabernacle was set up, they could remain]. [Freedman, Zebahim: those afflicted with flux were sent out of the camp of the Levites, with the skin ailment out of the camp of the Israelites] [T. Kel. B.Q. 1:12F, with variations]. Does this [sacrifices that might have been made were invalid] not mean even the show bread?*

R. *No, it means, except for the show bread.*

S. *Come on, now! If you maintain that it is still the tent of meeting [even when dismantled], then the Holy Things should remain valid. And if you maintain that it is not the tent of meeting at that time, then even the show bread should be invalid!*

T. *Rather, when Rabin came, [he said,] “One position [it has not been invalidated] pertains to the show bread when it is still arrayed on the table, the other [it has been invalidated] concerns the show bread that had been removed from the table, so there is no dispute at all.”*

**I.7.** A. [Commenting on the statement, **At the time that the tabernacle was dismantled during the wanderings in the desert, sacrifices that might have been made were invalid**, since they were taken outside of the tabernacle] said Abbayye, “That is to say that the tabernacle might be dismantled for a night trek [if the cloud was lifted, a sign to march on, at night, the tabernacle was dismantled and the people started out right away and did not wait for dawn (Cashdan)]. *For if you take the position that the tabernacle might not be dismantled for a night trek, why did the Holy Things become invalid on the principle that they had been taken outside of the tabernacle? For they obviously had been invalidated simply by being kept overnight.*”

B. *So what else is new! “That they might go by day and by night” (Exo. 13:21)!*

C. *“Well, what might you otherwise have supposed? That pertains to a case in which the journey had already begun by day, but if they had not set forth by day, they would not then set forth by night. So we are informed that that is not the case.*

**I.8.** A. [To the statement, **and persons afflicted with flux [Lev. 15] and with the skin ailment [Lev. 13-14] were expelled from their camps [where**

**during the time that the tabernacle was set up, they could remain,]** *an objection was raised:* when the curtains of the tabernacle were folded up, those who were afflicted with flux and with the skin ailment were permitted to enter the camp.

- B. *Said R. Ashi, "There is no real contradiction. The one represents the view of R. Eliezer, the other of rabbis, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **[95B]** "R. Eliezer says, 'Might one suppose that, if, when the Passover offering was presented in uncleanness by reason of corpse uncleanness affecting the majority of the community, those afflicted with flux and with the skin ailment pushed their way through and entered the Temple, they would be liable? Scripture states, 'They shall put out of the camp every person afflicted with the skin ailment and every one who is afflicted with flux, and whoever is unclean by corpse uncleanness' (Num. 5: 2). When those who have contracted corpse uncleanness are put out of the sanctuary, those afflicted with flux and with the skin ailment are put out of their camps; when those unclean by corpse uncleanness are not put out, those afflicted with flux and with the skin ailment also are not put out. "

## 11:2

- A. **All the same are the two loaves and the show bread:**
  - B. **their kneading and their rolling out are [done] outside [the Temple courtyard], and their baking, inside.**
  - C. **And they [= baking them] do not override [the prohibitions of] the Sabbath [= M. 11:9J].**
  - D. **R. Judah says, "All acts of preparing them are inside."**
  - E. **R. Simeon says, "One should always be accustomed to state [the rule as follows]: 'The two loaves and the show bread are valid [if made] in the courtyard and are valid [if made] in Bethpage.'"**
- I.1** A. *There is a contradiction in the body of the rule! You say first of all, **their kneading and their rolling out are [done] outside [the Temple courtyard], so dry measures were not sanctified, and then you say, and their baking, inside, so the dry measures were sanctified!***
- B. *Said Raba, "This question was raised by a tough man, tough as iron, and who is that? It is R. Sheshet. Yet what's the problem! Perhaps while the tenth ephah measure does not sanctify its contents, the oven does sanctify its contents!"*
  - C. *But if there is a question to be raised, this is the right question to ask: since **their baking, inside**, therefore the oven does sanctify its contents. But then you say, **And baking them does not override the prohibitions of the Sabbath**. But the cakes, now sanctified by the oven, would be invalidated by being kept overnight [until required on the Sabbath, having been baked on Friday]!*
  - D. *Said Raba, "This question was raised by a tough man, tough as iron, and who is that? It is R. Sheshet."*
  - E. *Said R. Ashi, "So what's the problem! Perhaps the sense of **inside** is simply, a place in which people are meticulous!"*



- F. *But this statement of R. Ashi is really something of a joke. For how can you possibly want matters? If the baking had to have meticulous men in supervision, then kneading and shaping also required meticulous men in charge, and if the kneading and shaping of the dough did not demand the supervision of meticulous men, then the baking likewise did not need their supervision. So we have to say that this statement of R. Ashi is really something of a joke.*

**II.1 A. R. Judah says, “All acts of preparing them are inside.” R. Simeon says, “One should always be accustomed to state [the rule as follows]: ‘The two loaves and the show bread are valid [if made] in the courtyard and are valid [if made] in Bethpage.’”**

- B. *Said R. Abbahu bar Kahana, “And both authorities interpret the same verse of Scripture: ‘And it is in a manner common, yes, though it were sanctified this day in the utensil’ (1Sa. 21: 6). R. Judah takes the view that David found the priests baking the show bread on a weekday, and said to them, ‘Are you baking it on a weekday? Since it will then have been sanctified today by being kept in a utensil of service, it will then be invalidated by being kept overnight [so it is wrong to bake it on a weekday].’ R. Simeon maintains that David found the priests baking the show bread on the Sabbath and said to them, ‘Should you not have baked it on a week day? For in any event it is not the oven that sanctifies the bread but the table [and the bread will be put there only on the Sabbath].’”*
- C. *But can you really say that he found them while they were baking it? And lo, is it not written, “So the priest gave him holy bread, for there was no bread there but the show bread that was taken from before the Lord” (1Sa. 21: 7).*
- D. *But what is the sense of the statement, “And it is in a manner common, yes, though it were sanctified this day in the utensil’ (1Sa. 21: 6)? They said to him, “There is no bread here except for the show bread that is taken from before the Lord.” And David said to them, “There is no question concerning that bread, since it is not subject to the law of sacrilege [the priests’ having a right to it now], it is entirely common. But even the bread that has been sanctified today in a utensil give me to eat, [96A] for I am in danger of losing my life [and the law may be suspended to save a life]!”*
- E. *Now R. Judah and R. Simeon differ concerning the tradition on the matter, and a close reading of the language shows that this is so: R. Simeon says, “One should always be accustomed to state [the rule as follows]: ‘The two loaves and the show bread are valid [if made] in the courtyard and are valid [if made] in Bethpage.’”*
- F. *That’s decisive.*

**11:3-6**

**11:3**

- A. The baked cakes of a high priest:**
- B. their kneading and their rolling out are [done] inside.**
- C. And they override [the prohibitions of] the Sabbath.**
- D. Grinding their [grain] and sifting it do not override the Sabbath.**

- E. A general principle did R. Aqiba state, “Any sort of work which it is possible to do on the eve of the Sabbath does not override the Sabbath, and [any sort of work] which it is not possible to do on the eve of the Sabbath does override the Sabbath [M. **Shab. 19:1**].”

### 11:4

- A. All meal offerings are subject to preparation in a [consecrated] utensil [if they are prepared] inside, and are not subject to preparation in a [consecrated] utensil [if they are prepared] outside.
- B. How so?
- C. The two loaves: (1) their length is seven [handbreadths], (2) and their breadth, four, and (3) their horns [small pieces of dough placed on the four upper corners, like the horns of the altar], four fingerbreadths [high].
- D. The show bread: (1) its length is ten [handbreadths], and (2) its breadth, five, and (3) its horns, seven fingerbreadths.
- E. R. Judah says, “So that you not err [make use of the mnemonic]: ZDDYHZ [= 7, 4, 4, 10, 5, 7].”
- F. Ben Zoma says, “And you shall place on the table show bread in my sight [before my face] continually (Exo. 25:30)-that it should have a face.”

### 11:5

- A. “The table: Its length is ten [handbreadths] and its breadth, five [Exo. 25:33, two amahs by one, and the amah is five handbreadths, M. **Kel. 17:10**].
- B. “The show bread: its length is ten [handbreadths] and its breadth, five.
- C. “One sets it lengthwise against the breadth of the table, and two and a half handbreadths does he double over [as a wall upward] on this side and on that [of the bread].
- D. “It turns out that its length fills the whole breadth of the table,” the words of R. Judah.
- E. R. Meir says, “The table: its length is twelve [handbreadths, and its breadth, six]. [The amah is six handbreadths.]
- F. “The show bread: its length is ten [handbreadths] and its breadth, five]:
- G. “One sets it lengthwise against the breadth of the table, and two handbreadths on either side [of the bread] does he double [turn up as a wall], with two handbreadths space in the middle [between the two sets of six loaves], so that the wind blows between them [preventing mould].”
- H. Abba Saul says, “There [in the open area (F)] did they set the two dishes of frankincense of the show bread.”
- I. They said to him, “Has it not already been stated, And you shall put pure frankincense upon each row (Lev. 24: 7)?”
- J. He said to them, “And has it not already been said, ‘And next to him shall be the tribe of Manasseh’ (Num. 2:20)?”

### 11:6

- A. Four golden props were there [at the corners of the table], with their heads shaped into branches [like a Y],



- B. with which they would support them [the loaves of bread], two [props] for this row [of bread], and two for that row.
- C. And [there were, inserted into the props] twenty-eight [golden] rods [reeds], [each shaped] like half of a hollow reed,
- D. fourteen for this row, and fourteen for that row.
- E. Neither the work of ordering of the reeds nor the work of their removal overrides the Sabbath.
- F. But one enters on the eve of the Sabbath, draws them out, and places them parallel to the length of the table.
- G. All the utensils which were in the sanctuary [are laid out] lengthwise parallel to the length of the Temple [= east to west].

**I.1 A.** All meal offerings are subject to preparation in a [consecrated] utensil [if they are prepared] inside, and are not subject to preparation in a [consecrated] utensil [if they are prepared] outside:

- B. They asked Rabbi, "How do we know this?"
- C. He said to them, "Lo, Scripture says, 'And he said to me, This is the place where the priests shall boil the guilt offering and the sin offering, where they shall bake the meal offering, that they bring them not forth into the outer court' (Eze. 46:20) — the meal offering is set along side the guilt offering and the sin offering; just as the guilt offering and the sin offering have to be prepared in a utensil of service, so the meal offering has to be prepared in a utensil of service."

**II.1 A.** "The table: Its length is ten [handbreadths] and its breadth, five [Exo. 25:33, two amahs by one, and the amah is five handbreadths, M. Kel. 17:10]. The show bread: its length is ten [handbreadths] and its breadth, five. One sets it lengthwise against the breadth of the table, and two and a half handbreadths does he double over [as a wall upward] on this side and on that [of the bread]. It turns out that its length fills the whole breadth of the table," the words of R. Judah. R. Meir says, "The table: its length is twelve [handbreadths, and its breadth, six]. [The amah is six handbreadths.] The show bread: its length is ten [handbreadths] and its breadth, five!:"

- B. Said R. Yohanan, "In the opinion of him who says that two and a half handbreadths of each cake were turned up at either end, it will be seen that the table sanctified everything that was placed on it, up to a height of fifteen handbreadths, and according to the position of him who maintains that the two handbreadths of each cake were turned up at either end, it will emerge that the table sanctified everything that was placed on it to a height of twelve."
- C. *But lo, there were rods* [placed between the cakes, so six cakes rose to a greater height than fifteen handbreadths, that is, add five times the thickness of the rods (Cashdan)]!
- D. *The rods were sunk in.*
- E. *But what was the operative consideration behind the provision of the rods? It was that the bread would get moldy. But in accord with what you have said, the bread would still get moldy!*

- F. *The rod was raised slightly, [and the ends of the rods rested in the grooves of the upright props, so the upper cake did not touch the one below it, and air could circulate between the cakes (Cashdan)].*
- G. *So that little space also should be taken into account [raising the row higher than fifteen handbreadths]!*
- H. *Since it did not add up to so much as a handbreadth, it was not taken into account.*
- I. *But what about the dishes of frankincense [which surely would raise the rows higher than fifteen handbreadths]?*
- J. *They were located in the airspace of the bread [between the two perpendicular sides (Cashdan)], and rose only to the same height as the bread.*
- K. *What about the corners?*
- L. [Cashdan:] *The corners bent inward, and the bread rested upon them.*
- M. **[96B]** *What about the border of the table?* [Cashdan: the border was a rim or ledge which rose above the table, so the bread would be placed above the ledge, and the border was a handbreadth wide, so the rows of bread would be sixteen handbreadths above the table.]
- N. *The statement accords with him who has said, “The border of the table was underneath the table.”* [Cashdan: the border was a frame that joined together the four legs of the table; the top of the table was a flat board, not attached to the frame, so either side of the board could have been used as a table top].
- O. *But from the perspective of him who has said, “The border of the table was above the table”?*
- P. *It slanted so that the bread was located on the table.*
- Q. *That accords with what has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- R. **R. Yosé says, “There were no props there, but the height of the table was a handbreadth, and it supported the bread, as it is said, ‘And you shall make around it a frame a handbreadth wide’ (Exo. 25:25).”**
- S. **They said to him, “And is it not the fact that the rim of the table was only at the feet of the table, not at its surface?” [T. Men. 11:6D].**

**II.2.** A. Said R. Yohanan, “In the opinion of him [=1.S] who says, ‘The rim was beneath the table,’ a board that can be used on either side [lacking a rim or edge to mark its surface] is susceptible to uncleanness. In the opinion of him who says, ‘The rim was above the surface of the table,’ whether or not a board that can be used on either side [lacking a rim or edge to mark its surface] is susceptible to uncleanness is subject to doubt.”

**II.3.** A. *It follows that the table is subject to receiving uncleanness. Yet it is a wooden utensil that was made to be stationary, and a wooden utensil that is made to be stationary is not susceptible to uncleanness. Why not? To be susceptible to uncleanness, we require that it be comparable to a sack. Just as the sack is movable whether full or empty, so anything that is movable whether full or empty will be susceptible to uncleanness.*

B. *But a table too may be moved whether full or empty, at least in line with the position of R. Simeon b. Laqish.*

- C. *For said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "What is the meaning of the phrase, 'upon the pure table' (Lev. 24: 6)? It is that it can become unclean. And yet, it is an article made of wood, and the fact is that an object made of wood that is made to set at rest cannot receive uncleanness. So the usage bears the lesson that they would lift it up and show the pilgrims the show bread that was on it, saying, 'Behold God's love for you!' [The table could be moved and therefore was subject to uncleanness, so 'pure' used in connection with the table bears the sense of, 'free from the uncleanness that can be contracted.']"*
- D. *What is the meaning of "Behold God's love for you"?*
- E. *It is in accord with what R. Joshua b. Levi said, for said R. Joshua b. Levi, "The great miracle that took place with the show bread was that when it was removed it was as fresh as when it was set on the table, in line with this verse: 'to put hot bread in the day that it was taken away' (1Sa. 21: 7)."*
- II.4.** A. *But you can derive the rule that the table is subject to receiving uncleanness from the simple fact that it was overlaid with gold [and therefore is a metal utensil, which is susceptible to uncleanness even though made to remain stationary, not being similar to a sack]. For we have learned in the Mishnah: **The table and the side table (1) which were damaged or (2) which one covered with marble and on which one left a place for placing the cups are unclean. R. Judah says, "A place for leaving pieces" [M. Kel. 22:1]. So if there was sufficient room it is susceptible, but if not, it is not. [It follows that if a utensil is overlaid, its status is dictated by the classification of the material used in the overlay].***
- B. *And if you wish to claim that in the passage just now cited, the overlay was fixed, [while the golden overlay of the table in the sanctuary was not fixed but removable, so it was not classified as a metal utensil,] lo, R. Simeon b. Laqish raised this question to R. Yohanan: "Does the rule that if a utensil is overlaid, its status is dictated by the classification of the material used in the overlay apply only to a fixed overlay, or does it apply also to one that is removable? And, moreover, does it apply only where [97A] the rims were overlaid, or also where the rims were not overlaid?" And he replied, "It is immaterial whether the overlay was fixed or removable, whether the rims were overlaid or not."*
- C. *And if you wish to claim that the acacia wood was valued, so it would not be nullified by an overlay, well, that position would pose no problem to R. Simeon b. Laqish, who has said, "That rule pertains only to utensils made of ordinary wood, which came from abroad, but utensils of fine wood are valued and not nullified by overlaying." But from the perspective of R. Yohanan, who has said, "Even utensils of fine wood are nullified by an overlay," what is to be said?*
- D. *The table of the sanctuary was exceptional, since the All-Merciful classified it as wood: "The altar was of wood, three cubits high, and the length was two cubits, and the corners and the length and walls were of wood, and he said to me, this is the table that is before the Lord" (Eze. 41:22).*
- E. *The verse commences with the altar and ends up with the table!*

- F. *Both R. Yohanan and R. Eleazar said, “When the house of the sanctuary stood, the altar atoned for a person, but now that the house of the sanctuary no longer is standing, a person’s table atones for him.”*

**III.1 A. Four golden props were there [at the corners of the table], with their heads shaped into branches [like a Y], with which they would support them [the loaves of bread], two [props] for this row [of bread], and two for that row:**

- B. *What is the source in Scripture for this rule?*  
C. Said R. Qattina, “Said Scripture, ‘And you shall make its plates and dishes for incense, and its flagons and bowls with which to pour libations’ (Exo. 25:29).  
D. “plates: the moulds;  
E. “and dishes for incense:’ the dishes;  
F. “and its flagons: the props;  
G. “and bowls:’ the rods.  
H. “to pour:’ with which the bread was covered. [Cashdan: the rods lay over the cakes like a cover.]

**III.2. A. [To the proposition that the rule in fact derives from the Torah,] objected Raba, “We have learned in the Mishnah: **Neither the work of ordering of the reeds nor the work of their removal overrides the Sabbath.** Now if the requirement that there be rods derives from the Torah, why should they not override the restrictions of the Sabbath?”**

- B. *Then Raba retracted, saying, “What I said is nothing. For we have learned in the Mishnah: A general principle did R. Aqiba state, ‘Any sort of work which it is possible to do on the eve of the Sabbath does not override the Sabbath, and [any sort of work] which it is not possible to do on the eve of the Sabbath does override the Sabbath.’ Placing the rods did not override the Sabbath, for, after all, why have the rods? It was so that the bread not become moldy. But in such a short space of time [in which the cakes stood without the rods, between removing the rods on the eve of the Sabbath and removing the bread at noon on the Sabbath], the bread would not be moldy anyhow. And so it has been taught on Tannaite authority: On the eve of the Sabbath one would go in, draw out the rods, place them on the ground parallel to the length of the table. At the end of the Sabbath he would go back in, lift up the ends of one cake and insert the rods underneath it, then lift up the ends of another and do the same. The four middle cakes required three rods underneath them, each, the uppermost cake needed only two underneath, for there was no weight on it, and the bottom one required no rods at all, for it stood on the surface of the table [T. Men. 11:16, with variations].”*

**Topical Appendix on the Size of the Cubit Measured in Handbreadths**

- III.3. A. [With reference to the dispute on the size of the handbreadth, “...the amah is five handbreadths,” the words of R. Judah. R. Meir says, “...The amah is six handbreadths”], we have learned in the Mishnah: R. Meir says, “All the cubit [measures] were middle-sized, except for the golden altar and the horns and the circuit and the base [of the altar].” R. Judah says, “The cubit of building was six handbreadths and of utensils five” [M. Kel. 17:10].**

- B. Said R. Yohanan, Both of them interpret the same verse of Scripture: ‘And these are the measures of the altar by cubits — the cubit is a cubit and a handbreadth [Cashdan: the ordinary cubit, which measured six handbreadths, was one cubit and one handbreadth by the standard of the cubit spoken of in this verse, for the latter cubit measured only five handbreadths, and all parts of the altar mentioned in this verse were measured by a cubit of five handbreadths]. [97B] The bottom shall be a cubit, and a cubit the breadth, and the border thereof by the edge thereof round about a span, and this shall be the base of the altar’ (Eze. 43:13).
- C. “‘The bottom shall be a cubit’ — this refers to the base of the altar.
- D. “‘and a cubit the breadth’ — this refers to the rim.
- E. “‘the border thereof by the edge thereof round about a span’ — this refers to the horns.
- F. “‘and this shall be the base of the altar’ — this refers to the golden altar.
- G. “R. Meir took the view that only this [the golden altar] was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths, and all other utensils in the Temple were measured by one of six handbreadths, while R. Judah took the position that ‘like this cubit’ shall be all the cubits for the utensils.”

- III.4.** A. *In the assumption that the height from the base to the rim was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths, and the verse, “the bottom shall be a cubit and a cubit the breadth” mean that the height from the base that rose up one cubit to the rim which one one cubit wide was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths, let us consider the following:*
- B. *The height of the altar in all was ten cubits, six of five handbreadths each, for of six handbreadths each. So the height of the altar was fifty-four handbreadths, and half, twenty-seven. The distance from the top of the horns to the rim was twenty four handbreadths, three handbreadths less than half the height of the altar. And in the Mishnah we have learned: **And a red line goes around it at the middle, to effect a separation between the drops of blood which are tossed on the top and the drops of blood which are tossed on the bottom. And the foundation extended all the length of the north side and all the length of the west side, and projects one cubit to the south and one cubit to the east [M. Mid. 3:1Q-S].** Then how, in connection with the burnt offering of a bird, can it have been taught on Tannaite authority: And how did he do so? He would go up on the ramp and turn to the terrace and go on to the southeast horn. He would pinch off the head close by the neck, sever it, drain the blood onto the wall of the altar. If he did it below his feet [Freedman: stooping down], even a cubit, it is fit [Freedman, *Zebahim*: because the red line, which demarcated the upper part of the altar from the lower, was a cubit below the terrace]. [If he bent low and drained out the blood of the offering against the wall of the rim upon which he stood, it was valid]. But he has applied below the red line, by two handbreadths, blood that is supposed to be applied above it! [Cashdan: the blood of the burnt offering must be applied above the red line, but by draining out the blood against the wall beneath his feet a cubit’s distance down, he has reached two handbreadths below the red line.]*

- C. [Therefore this is how the passage has to be interpreted:] “‘The bottom shall be a cubit, and a cubit the breadth, and the border thereof by the edge thereof round about a span, and this shall be the base of the altar’” (Eze. 43:13) —
- D. “‘The bottom shall be a cubit’ — this refers to the rebatement of the base [Cashdan: the cubit of five handbreadths was used only for measuring the depth of width of each ledge or platform around the altar].
- E. “‘and a cubit the breadth’ — this refers to the rebatement of the rim.
- F. “‘the border thereof by the edge thereof round about a span’ — this refers to rebatement of the horns.
- G. *So the height of the altar was sixty handbreadths, and the half of that measure was thirty.*
- H. *The distance from the top of the horns to the rim was twenty four handbreadths, six less than half the height of the altar. And therefore we have learned: If he did it below his feet [Freedman: stooping down], even a cubit, it is fit.*
- I. *So now you have established the passage as referring to the rebatements. But can you actually invoke the rebatements in explanation of the passage? Lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: **The altar was thirty-two by thirty-two [cubits] [at the base]. It rose by one cubit and drew in by one cubit [on every side]. This is the foundation. Thus was left [an area] thirty cubits by thirty [M. Mid. 3:1A-G]. But it should be thirty two cubits by thirty two cubits** [Cashdan: since the rebatement of each ledge was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths]. Furthermore: **It rose by five cubits and drew in by one cubit. This is the circuit. Thus was left [an area] twenty-eight by twenty-eight [M. Mid. 3:1A-G]. But in your view, it should be twenty eight cubits and four handbreadths by twenty eight cubits and four handbreadths. And should you say that since the four additional handbreadths were less than a cubit, they were just omitted, we have learned in addition: **The area of the horns is a cubit on this side and a cubit on that side. Thus was left [an area] twenty-six by twenty-six [M. Mid. 3:1H-I]. But according to you there should be twenty seven by twenty seven**** [Cashdan: for the handbreadths not reckoned now add up to a cubit].*
- J. *Well, the framer of the passage did not set matters out with precision.*
- K. [But note further:] **The place for the passage of the priests is a cubit on this side and a cubit on that side. Thus was left [an area] twenty-four by twenty-four [as] the place for the [altar] fire [M. Mid. 3:1J-K]. But from your view, they should be twenty five by twenty five. And here too should you say, Well, the framer of the passage did not set matters out with precision, note that it is written, “And the altar hearth shall be twelve cubits long by twelve broad, square” (Eze. 43:16). Now you might claim that it was only twelve cubits by twelve, but when the passage adds, “in the four quarters thereof” (Eze. 43:16), it teaches that one measures from the middle twelve cubits in all directions [Cashdan: each quarter of the top surface of the altar must measure twelve by twelve cubits, so the whole top surface must be twenty four by twenty four, and this measurement must be exact]. And should you say that originally six of the thirty two cubits were cubits of five handbreadths** [Cashdan: the last three cubits of each side of the base were of five handbreadths each, so that six of these cubits equalled five cubits of



six handbreadths each, accordingly the length of each side was in reality thirty one cubits], *then the Temple court must have had more space, and yet we have learned: The courtyard [of the Temple, from the Israelite courtyard onward] in all was one hundred eighty-seven cubits in length by one hundred thirty-five in breadth. From east to west [the length] was one hundred eighty-seven: the area trodden by Israelites, eleven cubits, the area trodden by priests, eleven cubits, the altar, thirty-two, the area between the porch and the altar, twenty two cubits, the sanctuary, a hundred cubits, and eleven cubits behind the place of the Mercy Seat [M. Mid. 5:1].* So you must conclude as follows:

- L. [Therefore this is how the passage has to be interpreted:] “The bottom shall be a cubit, and a cubit the breadth, and the border thereof by the edge thereof round about a span, and this shall be the base of the altar” (Eze. 43:13) —
- M. “‘The bottom shall be a cubit’ — this refers to the height of the base.
- N. “‘and a cubit the breadth’ — this refers to the rebatement of the rim.
- O. “‘the border thereof by the edge thereof round about a span’ — this refers to height of the horns.”
- P. *But as to the space taken up by the horns, [98A] it is of no consequence whether one or the other cubit was used.*
- Q. *So how high was the altar? It was fifty eight, and half was twenty nine handbreadths. The distance from the top of the horns down to the rim was twenty three handbreadths, that is, six handbreadths less than half the height of the altar. And accordingly we have learned: If he did it below his feet [Freedman: stooping down], even a cubit, it is fit [Freedman, Zebahim: because the red line, which demarcated the upper part of the altar from the lower, was a cubit below the terrace]. [If he bent low and drained out the blood of the offering against the wall of the rim upon which he stood, it was valid]. This same point derives from a close reading of the verse, “The bottom shall be a cubit, and a cubit the breadth” Eze. 43:13).*
- R. *That proves it.*

### **III.5.** A. And how big was a medium size cubit?

- B. Said R. Yohanan, “Six handbreadths.”
- C. *Said R. Yosé bar Abin, “So we too have learned in the Mishnah: R. Meir says, ‘The table: its length is twelve [handbreadths, and its breadth, six]. [The amah is six handbreadths.]’”*
- D. *Then it must follow that there was a cubit that was larger than this one.*
- E. *Quite true, and lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: The cubit of which they have spoken-with a middle-sized cubit. And two cubits were in the Palace of Shushan, one at the northeastern corner, and one at the southeastern corner. [That one] which was on the northeastern corner was longer than that of Moses by a half-fingerbreadth, and that one which was at the southeastern corner was longer than it by a half-fingerbreadth. It comes out that it was longer than that of Moses by a fingerbreadth. And why have they said one larger and one smaller? So that the workers [would] take according to the smaller [measure]*

and return according to the larger, so that they should not happen to commit sacrilege [M. Kel. 17:9].

- F. *What need was there for two?*
- G. *One for gold and silver, the other for building* [Cashdan: for building work the standard cubit was increased by one whole fingerbreadth].

**III.6.** A. *There we have learned in the Mishnah: As to the Eastern Gate, on it is a picture of the Walled City of Shushan, through which the high priest who burns the red cow, and the cow, and all who assist in its rite, go forth to the Mount of Olives* [M. Mid. 1:3E-G].

- B. *How come?*
- C. R. Hisda and R. Isaac bar Abdimi:
- D. *one said*, “So that they might know whence they came.”
- E. *The other said*, “So that they might stand in awe of the monarchy.”

**III.7.** A. Said R. Yannai, “You should always show respect for the government, for it is written, ‘And all these your servants shall come down to me’ (Exo. 11: 8), but he did not make that statement with reference to Pharaoh.”

- B. *R. Yohanan said*, “The same proposition derives from the following: ‘And the hand of the Lord was on Elijah, and he girded up his loins and ran before Ahab’ (1Ki. 18:46).”

**III.8.** A. “And the leaf thereof for healing” (Eze. 47:12):

- B. R. Hisda and R. Isaac bar Abdimi:
- C. *one said*, “To loosen the mouth on top” [so the dumb may speak].
- D. *The other said*, “To loosen the mouth below” [to allow for a pregnancy].

**III.9.** A. *It has been stated*:

- B. R. Isaac bar. Abodimi and R. Hisda:
- C. *one said*, “It is to open up the upper mouth [and help the dumb to speak].”
- D. *One said*, “It is to open the lower mouth [and heal the barrenness of a barren woman].”
- E. *It has been stated*:
- F. Hezekiah said, “It is to open the mouth of the dumb.”
- G. Bar Qappara said, “It is to open the ‘mouth’ of the barren women.”

### **Reversion to the Exposition of the Mishnah’s Proposition**

**III.10.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority*:

- B. Had Scripture stated, “And you shall take fine flour and bake it into twelve loaves of it; two tenths of an ephah shall be in each loaf. And you shall set them in two rows” (Lev. 24: 5), but not added, “six in a row,” I might have supposed that one row would be made of up four cakes, the other of eight. Scripture therefore had to say, “six in a row.”

- C. And had Scripture stated, “in two rows, six in a row,” but not added, “twelve,” I might have supposed that there were to be three rows, each of six cakes, so Scripture had to say, “twelve.”
- D. And had Scripture said both “Twelve” and also “in rows,” but not “in two rows” or “six in a row,” I might have supposed there were to be three rows, each of four cakes. So Scripture had to tell us, “in two rows” and “six in a row.”
- E. Without all three expressions we should not have known the rule [Sifra CCXLI:I.7].
- F. How was it done?
- G. He puts two rows of six loaves each, but if he put out one of four and one of eight, he has not carried out his obligation.
- H. If he put out two rows of seven cakes each —
- I. Rabbi says, “They treat the one on top as though it were not there” [T. [Men. 11:14](#)].
- J. *But lo, we require fulfillment of the verse, “And you shall put upon each row pure frankincense” (Lev. 24: 7)?*
- K. *Said R. Hisda to R. Hamnuna, and some say, R. Hamnuna to R. Hisda, “Rabbi is consistent with views expressed elsewhere, in which he holds that ‘upon’ means ‘near to,’ in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- L. *““And you shall put pure frankincense on each row” —*
- M. *“Rabbi says, “upon” here means “near to.”*
- N. *““You say it means “near to,” but perhaps it means literally, “upon”? Since Scripture says, “And you shall put a veil on the ark” (Exo. 40: 3) [and that was not actually upon but only near the ark, in front of it,] you must conclude that “on” means “near to.”””*

- IV.1 A. All utensils in the sanctuary [are laid out] lengthwise parallel to the length of the Temple [= east to west]:**
- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
  - C. All utensils in the sanctuary were placed with the length parallel to the length of the house, except for the ark, the length of which was parallel to the breadth of the house [north to south]. So it was placed, and so its staves were placed.
  - D. *What is the sense of that statement?*
  - E. *This is the sense of that statement: So it was placed, because so its staves were placed.*
  - F. *And how on the basis of Scripture do we know that that is the rule for the staves?*
  - G. *It is on the basis of that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
  - H. **“And the staves were so long” (1Ki. 8: 8):**
  - I. **Might I suppose that they did not reach the curtain [that hung over the entrance to the Holy of Holies at the east side (Cashdan)]?**
  - J. **Scripture states, “that the ends of the staves were seen from the holy place” (1Ki. 8: 8).**

**K.** If I had in hand only the verse, “that the ends of the staves were seen,” I might suppose that they tore through the curtain and protrudes. So Scripture says, “But they could not be seen without” (1Ki. 8: 8). How so? **[98B]** They pressed against the curtain and bulged out like the two breasts of a woman: “My beloved is unto me as a bundle of myrrh, that lies between my breasts” (Son. 1:13) **[T. Yoma 2:15C-K]**.

**L.** *How do we know that the staves lay along the breadth of the ark? Maybe they lay along its length?*

**M.** *Said R. Judah, “Two men could not stand in the space of one and a half cubits.” [Cashdan: as the ark was one cubit and a half wide, if, as suggested, the staves lay along the length of the ark, there would then have been only the space of one cubit and a half between the staves, and within this space two men could not have walked side by side carrying the ark].*

**N.** *And how do we know that four people carried it?*

**O.** “And the Kohathites” [a plural, hence] two, “the bearers of the sanctuary” [a plural, so] two more “set forward” (Num. 10:21).

**IV.2.** *A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

**B.** Ten tables did King Solomon make, as it is written, ““He made ten tables as well, and placed them in the Temple, five on the right side and five on the left” (2Ch. 4: 8).

**C.** Now if you take the view that five were at the right of the entry, five on the left of the entry, then it would turn out that tables were placed on the south side of the place, while the Torah says, “And you shall put the table on the north side” (Exo. 26:35).

**D.** But the table that Moses made stood in the middle, with five tables to the right, five to the left [all on the north (Cashdan)].

**IV.3.** *A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

**B.** Ten candlesticks did King Solomon make, as it is written, “And he made the ten candlesticks of gold according to the ordinance concerning them, and he set them in the Temple, five on the right, five on the left” (2Ch. 4: 7).

**C.** Now if you take the view that five were at the right of the entry, five on the left of the entry, then it would turn out that candlestick was placed on the north side of the place, while the Torah says, “And the candlestick over against the table on the side of the tabernacle towards the south” (Exo. 26:15).

**D.** But the one that Moses made stood in the middle, with five candlesticks to the right, five to the left.

**IV.4.** *A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

**B.** *One Tannaite statement formulates this rule: the tables stood in the inner half of the sanctuary, while another Tannaite statement formulates that rule: the tables stood in the inner third of the sanctuary.*

**C.** *There is no contradiction between these two statements. The one authority [the latter] reckons the house of the Holy of Holies within the term sanctuary, and the other [the former] does not reckon the house of the Holy of Holies within the term sanctuary.*

**IV.5.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “The tables were set lengthwise from east to west, [=All the utensils which were in the sanctuary are laid out lengthwise parallel to the length of the Temple, thus east to west]” the words of Rabbi.
- C. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, “From north to south.”
- D. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of Rabbi?*
- E. *He draws an analogy from the case of the candlestick. Just as the candlesticks are set out with the branches running from east to west, so these stood from east to west.*
- F. *And how on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact for the candlesticks themselves?*
- G. *Since in connection with the candlestick at the west, Scripture states, “Aaron shall order it...before the Lord” (Exo. 27:21), it must follow that the rest of them were not “before the Lord.” If, then, we were to take for granted that the candlestick stood with the branches set out from north to south, all the lamps would then be before the Lord” [Cashdan: so that no one lamp could be said to be looking westwards any more than the others, so the candlestick stood with its branches extended towards east and west].*
- H. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon?*
- I. *He draws an analogy from the case of the ark. Just as the ark stood lengthwise from north to south, these too stood lengthwise from north to south.*
- J. *And how come Rabbi does not invoke the analogy of the ark for his ruling?*
- K. We draw an analogy from an object that stood outside the Holy of Holies from another object that stood outside, but one may not draw an analogy for one that stood outside from one that stood inside [Cashdan: the ark was within the Holy of Holies, the candlestick and tables outside].
- L. *And how come R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon does not invoke the analogy of the candlestick for his ruling?*
- M. *He will say to you that the candlestick itself stood with the branches extending north and south.*
- N. But is it not written, “Aaron and his sons shall order it...before the Lord” (Exo. 27:21) ([Cashdan: which shows that only one lamp, “it,” was before the Lord; but if it is maintained that the candlestick stood with its branches extending to the north and south, all lamps alike would be before the Lord].
- O. [Cashdan:] *they were all made to face the middle lamp [but the middle lamp alone faced the Holy of Holies].*
- P. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- Q. “The seven lamps shall give light in front of the candlestick” (Num. 8: 2) — this teaches that they were to the sides, facing the middle lamp.
- R. Said R. Nathan, “On this basis we may conclude that the middle one was the best.”

**IV.6.** A. *Now from the perspective of him who said that the tables stood lengthwise, east to west, there is no problem in explaining how the ten*

*tables were placed in the twenty cubits [each one being two cubits long, one wide; the twenty cubits furthest from the entrance to the sanctuary can contain them, if they were placed head to head in a long line, so there is one table twenty cubits long by one cubit wide (Cashdan)]. But from the perspective of him who maintains that they stood lengthwise north to south, how could the ten tables fit into the twenty cubits [Cashdan: for the sanctuary was twenty cubits wide, and the tables were placed parallel with the width of the sanctuary]! Furthermore, how in the world did the priests get into the Holy of Holies [with the tables as a barrier the entire width of the area]? And furthermore, five tables would then be on the south side [vs. Exo. 26:35]! And furthermore, where was there room for the table of Moses [which is supposedly between the other tables, so where would there be space for eleven]?*

- B. *Well, according to your own reasoning, from the perspective of him who has said that they were set out from east to west, where would there be room for the table of Moses? But do you assume that they stood in one row? In fact, they stood in two rows.*
- C. **[99A]** *Now from the perspective of him who said they stood from north to south, there are no problems. But from the perspective of him who said that they stood from east to west, there is this problem: how far away was the row of tables nearest the northern wall from the wall? Two and a half cubits [for two people to walk side by side, e.g., the priests who took care of the show bread, who walked around the tables two by two (Cashdan)]. Then there was one cubit, the width of the table, two and a half cubits, the space between the tables, one cubit, the width of the table, again two cubits and a half the space between the tables [that of Moses the southern row of tables], and one cubit, the width of the table itself, so in all, ten cubits and a half; the tables then will have encroached to the extent of half a cubit on the south side of the sanctuary.*
- D. *But do you suppose that the table of Moses stood between the two rows of tables? That is not the case, it stood at the head of the two rows of tables [nearest the Holy of Holies, at a higher elevation than the other tables], while the latter stood below, like a disciple before his master.*

#### **IV.7. A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:**

- B. While ten tables did Solomon make, they laid out the show bread only on the table made by Moses: “And the table on which the show bread was” (1Ki. 7:48).
- C. While ten candlesticks did Solomon make, they lit only the candlestick made by Moses: “And the candlestick of gold with the lamps thereof, to burn every evening” (2Ch. 13:11).
- D. R. Eleazar b. Shammua says, “On all of them did they set out the bread: ‘And the tables on which was the show bread’ (2Ch. 4:19). And all of them did they light: ‘And the candlesticks with their lamps, that they should burn according to the ordinance before the sanctuary, of pure gold’ (2Ch. 4:20).”
- E. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “They laid out the show bread only on the table made by Moses. How then do I interpret the verse, ‘And the tables on which was the show bread’ (2Ch. 4:19)? This refers to the three tables that were in the Temple [**Two**



tables were inside the porch...and one of gold is inside], the one of silver [Mishnah: marble], the other, gold. On the table of silver they laid out the shew bread that were brought in fresh, on the one of gold they laid out the show bread when it was brought out stale, since as to Holy Things, we raise something to a higher level of sanctification, but we do not bring something down to a lower level of sanctification. And inside the sanctuary was the table of gold, on which the show bread was set perpetually.”

- IV.8.** A. *And how on the basis of Scripture do we know that, as to Holy Things, we raise something to a higher level of sanctification, but we do not bring something down to a lower level of sanctification?*
- B. Said Rabbi, “Said Scripture, ‘And Moses raised the tabernacle and laid its sockets and set up its boards and put in its bars and raised up its pillars’ (Exo. 40:18) [he did it all himself].”
- C. *And how do we know that one may raise in level of sanctification what is at a lower level?*
- D. Said R. Aha bar Jacob, “Said Scripture, ‘Even the fire pans of these men who have sinned at the cost of their lives, and let them be made beaten plates for a covering of the altar, for they are become holy, because they were offered before the Lord, that they may be a sign unto the children of Israel’ (Num. 17: 3).
- E. “To begin with they were mere appurtenances of the altar, but in the end they were made part of the altar itself.”

### **A Disciple of a Sage as a Sanctified Utensil**

- IV.9.** A. “Which you broke and you shall put them into the ark” (Deu. 10: 2):
- B. *It was taught as a Tannaite statement by R. Joseph:* “This teaches that both the tablets and the broken pieces of the tablets were placed into the ark.
- C. “On this basis we learn that a disciple of a sage who for no fault of his own forgot his learning is not to be humiliated.”
- IV.10.** A. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “On occasions [99B] the nullification of the Torah may serve as a foundation for the Torah [by ceasing to study in order to perform a religious deed]: ‘which you did break,’ for the Holy One, blessed be he, said to Moses, ‘You did well to break them.’”
- IV.11.** A. And said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “A disciple of a sage who turned sour is not to be humiliated in public: ‘Therefore you shall stumble in the day, and the prophet also shall stumble with you in the night’ (Hos. 4: 5).
- B. “Cover it up in darkness.”
- IV.12.** A. And said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “However forgets a single thing that he has learned transgresses a negative commandment: ‘Only take heed for yourself and keep your soul diligently, lest you forget the things’ (Deu. 4: 9).”
- B. *That accords with what R. Abin said R. Ilai said.* For said R. Abin said R. Ilai, “In any passage in which the words occur, ‘observe lest,’ or ‘do not,’ the sense is a negative commandment.”
- C. Rabina said, “‘observe lest,’ and ‘do not,’ form two negative commandments.”

- D. R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "He violates three negative commandments: 'Only take heed to yourself and keep your soul diligently lest you forget the things.'"
- E. Might one suppose that that is only when it is not through the person's own fault?
- F. Scripture says, "...and lest they depart from your heart," meaning, him who deliberately puts them out of his heart.
- G. R. Dosetai b. R. Yannai said, "Might one suppose that that is the case even when his repetition is too difficult for him? Scripture says, by way of limitation, 'only.'"

**IV.13.** A. *Both R. Yohanan and R. Eleazar said*, "The Torah was given in forty days, and the soul was formed in forty days. Whoever guards his Torah-learning has his soul guarded, and whoever does not guard his Torah learning does not have his soul guarded."

- B. *A Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael*: "The matter may be compared to the case of a man who handed a swallow over to his servant and said to him, 'Do you think that if you let it perish, I will take from you for its value only an issar? I will take your soul from you! [I'll kill you.]'"

### 11:7

- A. Two tables were inside the porch, at the inside of the door of the house,
- B. one of marble, and one of gold.
- C. On the one of marble do they set the show bread when it is brought in, and on the one of gold when it is taken out.
- D. For in matters of holiness, they place something on a higher level of sanctification, but they do not lower something to a lower level of sanctification.
- E. And one of gold is inside, on which [is arrayed] the show bread continually.
- F. Four priests enter in,
- G. two in [whose] hands are two rows [of show bread], and two in [whose] hands are two dishes [of frankincense].
- H. And four go in before them, two to take out the two rows [of bread], and two to take out the two dishes [of frankincense].
- I. Those who bring them in stand at the north [side of the table], with their faces to the south.
- J. Those that bring them out stand at the south with their faces to the north.
- K. These draw out [the old loaves] and these lay down [the new ones].
- L. And a handbreadth of one [new row] [lies] up against a handbreadth of another,
- M. as it is said, "Before me perpetually" (Exo. 25:30).
- N. R. Yosé says, "Even though these take away [the old loaves] and [then] the others put down [the new loaves], this too was [deemed to carry out the requirement that the bread be set forth] perpetually."
- O. They went forth and put them down on the golden table which was on the porch.
- P. And they burned the dishes [of frankincense that had been removed].
- Q. And the loaves are divided among the priests.

- R. [If] the Day of Atonement coincides with the Sabbath, the loaves are divided in the evening.
- S. [If] it coincided with the eve of the Sabbath, the goat of the Day of Atonement is eaten in the evening.
- T The Babylonians would eat it raw,
- U. because they are not squeamish.
- I.1** A. [R. Yosé says, “Even though these take away [the old loaves] and [then] the others put down [the new loaves], this too was [deemed to carry out the requirement that the bread be set forth] perpetually:”] *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. R. Yosé says, “Even though these take away [the old loaves] and [then] the others put down [the new loaves], that means nothing.
- C. “How then do I interpret ‘before me continually’? It means that the table should never be left overnight without bread.”
- I.2.** A. Said R. Ammi, “On the basis of what R. Yosé has said [that ‘continually’ means that some old show bread was on the table for a while in the morning, the new in the evening], we may draw the conclusion that even if a person has repeated only a single lesson in the morning and only a single lesson in the evening, he has carried out the religious duty, ‘This book of the Torah shall not depart out of your mouth’ (Jos. 1: 8).”
- I.3.** A. Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, “Even if a person only recited the Shema morning and evening, he has carried out the religious duty, ‘This book of the Torah shall not depart out of your mouth’ (Jos. 1: 8).
- B. “But it is prohibited to make this statement before common folk.”
- C. And Raba said, “It is an absolute religious duty to say it before common folk.”
- I.4.** A. Ben Damah, son of R. Ishmael’s sister, “As to someone like myself, who has studied the entire Torah, what is the law about my studying the wisdom of Greece?”
- B. In his regard he recited this verse, “‘This book of the Torah shall not depart out of your mouth, but you shall meditate on it day and night’ (Joshua 1: 8). So go, find a time that is neither day nor night, and that is when you may study the wisdom of Greece.”
- C. *But this view differs from that of R. Samuel bar Nahmani, for* said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, “This verse of Scripture contains neither an obligation nor a commandment but only a blessing. For when the Holy One, blessed be he, realized that to Joshua, were of Torah were most precious, as it is said, ‘His minister, Joshua son of Nun, a young man, did not depart out of the tent’ (Exo. 33:11), said to him the Holy One, blessed be he, ‘Joshua, are the words of Torah so precious to you? ‘This book of the Torah shall not depart out of your mouth, but you shall meditate on it day and night’!”
- I.5.** A. *A Tannaite authority of of the household of R. Ishmael:* “Words of Torah should not be a mere obligation to you, but you also are not permitted to exempt yourself from studying them.”

**I.6.** A. Said Hezekiah, “*What is the meaning of the verse, ‘Yes, he has allured you out of the mouth of straits into a broad place, where there is no straitness’ (Job. 36:16)? Come and take note of how the Holy One blessed be he is really not like mortal. A mortal may well entice someone out of the ways of life into the ways of death, but the Holy One, blessed be he, entires someone out of the ways of death into the ways of life, as it is written, Yes, he has allured you out of the mouth of straits into a broad place, where there is no straitness’ (Job. 36:16). ‘...out of the mouth of straits’ refers to Gehenna, which has a narrow mouth, so that its smoke is piled up [100A] in its midst. And lest you maintain that just as its mouth is narrow, so the whole of it is narrow, the verse states, ‘deep and large’ (Isa. 30:33). And lest you say that it is not made ready for a king, the verse states, ‘Yes, for the king is it prepared’ (Isa. 30:33). And lest you say there is no word in it: ‘The pile thereof is fire and much word’ (Isa. 30:33), and lest you say this being saved from Gehenna is all that Torah-study gets you, ‘and that which is set on your table if full of fatness’ (Job. 36:16).”*

- II.1.** A. **[If] the Day of Atonement coincides with the Sabbath, the loaves are divided in the evening. [If] it coincided with the eve of the Sabbath, the goat of the Day of Atonement is eaten in the evening:**
- B. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “They were not Babylonians, but Alexandrians, but since [the Palestinian sages] loathe the Babylonians, they call them Babylonians.”
- C. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. R. Yosé says, “They were not Babylonians, but Alexandrians, but since [the Palestinian sages] loathe the Babylonians, they call them Babylonians.”
- E. Said to him R. Judah, “May your mind be set at rest as you have set my mind at rest.”

## 11:8

- A. **[If] one set out the bread on the Sabbath but [set out] the dishes [of frankincense] after the Sabbath and burned the dishes [of frankincense] on the [next] Sabbath, it is invalid. [It was only on the table six days.]**
- B. **And they are not liable on their account [the loaves of bread] because of violation of the rules of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness. [The bread is not sanctified.]**
- C. **[If] one set out the bread and the dishes [of frankincense] on the Sabbath and burned the dishes [of frankincense] after the Sabbath, it is invalid.**
- D. **And they are not liable on their account because of violation of the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness.**
- E. **[If] one set out the bread and the dishes [of frankincense] after the Sabbath and burned the dishes on [the next] Sabbath, it is invalid. [They have not been left from Sabbath to Sabbath.]**
- F. **How should one do it?**
- G. **Let him leave it for the coming Sabbath [thirteen days in all], for even if it is on the table for many days, that is of no account.**

**The following serves the cited Mishnah-passage and is inserted here only because our Mishnah-paragraph contributes a fact to the analytical proof-process**

**I.1** A. *There we have learned in the Mishnah:* The supervisor said to them, “Go and see whether the time for slaughtering the sacrifice has come.” If it has come, he who sees it says, “It is daylight!” Mattithiah b. Samuel says, “[He says], ‘Has the whole east gotten light?’ ‘To Hebron?’ And he says, ‘Yes.’” And why were they required to do this? For once the moonlight came up, and they supposed that the eastern horizon was bright, and so they slaughtered the daily whole offering and had to bring it out to the place of burning. They brought the high priest down to the immersion hut. This governing principle applied in the Temple: Whoever covers his feet [and defecates] requires immersion, and whoever urinates requires sanctification [the washing] of hands and feet [M. **Yoma 3:1-2**].

B. Now why was this required [that people make sure the first light of day had dawned]? Because once the penumbra of the moon came up, and people imagined that the east was lit up. They slaughtered the daily whole offering but had then to bring it out to the place of slaughter and make the high priest go down into the immersion-pool.

C. *The father of R. Abin repeated as a Tannaite statement:* “Not only this alone [that is, that the daily whole offering slaughtered at night has to be burned], but even a bird that was presented as a burnt offering, the neck of which was pinched by night, or the meal offering from which a handful was taken at night have to be thrown out at the place of burning. Now with regard to the bird presented as a burnt offering, that is no problem, for it was not possible to bring it back. But as to the meal offering, why can’t he put the handful back and take it out again by day?”

D. *He is the one who repeated the Tannaite statement and associated observation, and he is the one who explained it:* “The use of the utensil of service sanctifies the contents thereof even outside the proper time” [Cashdan: and once the handful has been taken out and put into a utensil of ministry, it cannot be put back and mixed with the remainder of the meal offering].

E. *An objection was raised:* Whatever is offered up by day can be consecrated only by day, and whatever is offered by night can be consecrated only by night, and whatever can be offered day or night may be consecrated day or night. “Whatever is offered up by day can be consecrated only by day” — but not by night!

F. Well, while it does not become consecrated by night *so that it may be offered*, it does become consecrated by night *so that it may be invalidated*.

G. *An objection was raised by R. Zira, “ [If] one set out the bread and the dishes [of frankincense] after the Sabbath and burned the dishes on [the next] Sabbath, it is invalid. [They have not been left from Sabbath to Sabbath.] How should one do it? Let him leave it for*

**the coming Sabbath [thirteen days in all], for even if it is on the table for many days, that is of no account.** *Now if you take the view that utensils of service have the power to sanctify offerings presented in them not at their proper time, then the offering should be both sanctified and therefore invalidated!"*

- H. *Said Rabbah, "That's a perfectly good question, but the father of R. Abin is citing a formulation on Tannaite authority. [Harmonizing these rules is possible along the following lines:] the framer of the Tannaite statement before us takes the view that the night is not classified as 'at the wrong time' [Cashdan: for with regard to holy things the night following the day is included in it, so utensils of ministry can hallow by night as well as by day, though the offering may not be presented by night]. But days may be classified as 'at the wrong time.'"*
- I. *Still, in the end [101B] when the eve of the Sabbath comes, let the bread and dishes of frankincense be both consecrated and also invalidated!*
- J. *Said Raba, "We must take as our premise that the priest had removed it before then [Friday just prior to the Sabbath, then replaced them at the proper time on the Sabbath]."*
- K. *Mar Zutra, and some say, R Ashi, said, "You may even say that the priest had not removed it before then [Friday just prior to the Sabbath, then replaced them at the proper time on the Sabbath]. But since the priest had laid matters out not in accord with the religious duty that pertains to the rite, it is treated as though a mere ape had laid out the offerings" [Cashdan: and the table will not sanctify the offering when the Sabbath eve draws near, nor will the Sabbath day sanctify it, but the priest will have to enter on the next day, remove it and replace it, and only then will the table sanctify it. But when the handful was taken from the meal offering at night and put into a utensil of service, the night is not considered 'the wrong time,' so the utensil will sanctify it.]*

## 11:9

- A. **The two loaves are eaten, neither earlier than two [days] nor later than three [days after being baked].**
- B. **How so?**
- C. **[If] they are baked on the eve of the festival and eaten on the festival, [that would be an example of eating them] two days [after being baked].**
- D. **[If] the festival fell after the Sabbath, they are eaten three days [after being baked].**
- E. **The show bread is eaten neither less than nine nor more than eleven days [after being baked].**
- F. **How so?**
- G. **[If] it is baked on the eve of the Sabbath and eaten on the Sabbath [in the following week], [that would be an example of eating them] nine days [after they are baked].**
- H. **[If] the festival coincided with the eve of the Sabbath, it is eaten ten [days after being baked].**



- I. [In the case of] two festival days of the New Year [that is, if the New Year began on Thursday and the Day of Atonement fell on the following Sabbath], it is eaten eleven [days after being baked].
- J. And [baking it] does not override either the Sabbath or the festival [M. 11:2C].
- K. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says in the name of R. Simeon, son of the Prefect, “It overrides the festival, but it does not override the fast day.”

**The following serves the cited Mishnah-passage and is inserted here only because our Mishnah-paragraph contributes a fact to the analytical proof-process**

**I.1** A. [And [baking it] does not override either the Sabbath or the festival:] Said Rabina, “In the opinion of him who says, ‘Votive offerings and free will offerings are not offered on the Festival Day,’ *you may not say that by the law of the Torah they may be offered, while rabbis issued a precautionary decree to prevent deferring those offerings until the festival [since that would represent accumulating work to be done on the Festival]; even by the law of the Torah they may not be offered, for the two loaves are obligatory for that day [Pentecost], so there is no reason to take into account the possibility of one’s deferring the offering until the Festival [for they cannot be presented before the appropriate day]. And yet our Mishnah states: And [baking it] does not override either the Sabbath or the festival.*”