

I

BAVLI TRACTATE YOMA CHAPTER ONE

FOLIOS 2A-21B

1:1

- A. Seven days before the Day of Atonement they set apart the high priest from his house to the councillors' chamber.
- B. And they [also] appoint another priest as his substitute,
- C. lest some cause of invalidation should overtake him.
- D. R. Judah says, "Also: they appoint another woman as a substitute for his wife,
- E. "lest his wife die, since it says, 'And he shall make atonement for himself and for his house' (Lev. 16: 6). 'His house' — this refers to his wife."
- F. They said to him, "If so, the matter is without limit."

I.1 A. *We have learned there in the Mishnah: Seven days before the burning of the cow, they separate the priest who burns the cow from his house, [bringing him] to the chamber that faces the northeast corner of the Temple building, and it was called the stone house [M. Par. 3:1A-C].*

- B. Why was it called the stone house? Because all of the rites that were performed there were carried out with utensils made of dung or utensils made of stone or utensils made of clay.

I.2. A. *Why was that the case?*

- B. *Since a person who had immersed and was awaiting sunset for the completion of his rites of purification may validly carry out the rite of burning the read cow, as we have learned in the Mishnah, And they would render the priest who burns the cow unclean and immerse him, because of the Sadducees, so that they should not say, "It is done by one on whom the sun has set" [M. Par. 3:7G-H], our rabbis made the ordinance that for the rite are to be used utensils made of dung or utensils made of stone or utensils made of clay, so as not to transmit uncleanness, so that people will not treat the rite in a slovenly manner.*

I.3. A. *And what was the particular consideration that required the rite to be performed in the northeast corner?*

- B. *It is because it is in the status of a sin [or: purification] offering, and the purification offering must be presented at the north, as it is written in its regard, “‘Towards the front of the tent of meeting” (Num. 19: 4), therefore our rabbis made the ordinance that it be performed in the chamber that faces the northeast corner of the Temple building, so that the rite should be clearly distinguished.*

I.4. A. *What is the meaning of the word rendered as “chamber”?*

- B. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “There was a place on the Temple mount that was called by that name.”
- C. And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “The whole of the sanctuary was called by that name, as it is said, ‘And to build the chamber for which I have made provision’ (1Ch. 29:19).”

I.5. A. *How do we know [that for the rite of burning the red cow and for the rites of atonement on the Day of Atonement, it is required to set apart the officiating priest for a period of time]?*

- B. Said R. Minyumi bar Hilqiah said R. Mehasaya bar Idi said R. Yohanan, “Said Scripture, ‘As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do, to make atonement for you’ (Lev. 8:34) —
- C. “the word, ‘to do’ refers to the red cow, and the words ‘to make atonement for you’ speak of the rites of the Day of Atonement.”
- D. *Now it is obvious that the entirety of the passage of Scripture cannot be assigned to the matter of the red cow, since the language, “to atone,” is used, and the rite of the red cow does not involve atonement. But might one say that the entirety of the passage may speak solely of the Day of Atonement?*
- E. *Say: we draw an analogy between passages in which the word “has commanded” is written, that is, here, we find the language, “the Lord has commanded to do” (Lev. 8:34), and there, we find the same language, namely, “This is the statue of the law that the Lord has commanded” (Num. 19: 2). Just as in the latter passage, the context concerns the red cow, so here, reference is made in addition to the red cow, and just as in the present case, there must be separation of the priest for purposes of purification, so in the other case, the priest must be separated for the same purpose.*
- F. **[2B]** *Then might one say, we establish the link between the usages of “has commanded” in connection with the Day of Atonement with the result that the passage speaks only of that matter, since we find the language, “and he did as the Lord has commanded Moses” (Lev. 16:34)?*
- G. We draw an analogy between a usage of the word “has commanded” that speaks of the situation prior to actually doing the action [Lev. 8:34: “he commanded to do”] from a similar such usage [as at Num. 19: 4, where the same formulation occurs], but we do not draw an analogy between the usage of “has commanded” that appears after the actual doing of the rite from the rule governing the case where the language, “has commanded” occurs prior to the doing of the rite [as in the present instance].

- H. *Might one say that “has commanded” speaks of sacrifices, where we find the language, “On the day of the Lord’s commanding of the children of Israel” (Lev. 7:38)?*
- I. *We draw analogies between two usages of the language “has commanded,” but not between “has commanded” and “his commanding....”*
- J. *But what difference does the formal variation make anyhow, since a Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael [maintains], “‘The priest shall return’ and ‘the priest shall come in’ (Lev. 14:39) — ‘returning’ and ‘coming in’ mean the same thing anyhow”?*
- K. *The ruling of the household of R. Ishmael pertains to a case in which there is no comparably identical usage, but here, where we find a similar word used in the same way, we do draw an analogy only when the utilization is formally identical.*

How do we know that the requirement to separate the priest from his household applies only to the Day of Atonement and to no other cultic occasion?

The whole of what follows is a secondary inquiry into the problem of comparison of rites of consecration and atonement. The composite contains vast amplifications of its own. The whole gives a somewhat run-on impression, but in fact the single problem predominates as indicated above. What we have therefore is an enormous reflection on the basic problem of the comparison and contrast of rites of a single classification, a handsome beginning to our tractate, because the tractate’s particular topic is now broaden and deepened into an account of what is encompassing and general.

- I.6.** A. *“...and the words ‘to make atonement for you’ speak of the rites of the Day of Atonement.”*
- B. *But might one say that reference is made here to the atonement that derives from a sacrifice [in general, in behalf of individuals, so that all priests must be set apart for an equivalent period prior to performing the everyday rites]?*
- C. *Well, then, do we know which priest is going to be assigned a given rite, that he in particular should be separated for the requisite span of time?*
- D. *Say: well, therefore, should we not in fact set apart for the specified span of time the entire priestly division that serves in a given period?*
- E. *We draw an analogy between the rule governing a matter for which a specific time is designated and another matter for which a specific time is designated, and that would then eliminate from consideration ordinary offerings, which take place every day.*
- F. *Then might one say that priests who are assigned the offerings for the Pilgrim Festivals should be separated for the specified span of time?*
- G. *We draw an analogy between the rule governing a matter that takes place once a year and the one governing another such matter that takes place just once a year, and that would then eliminate from consideration the Pilgrim Festivals, which do not take place only one time a year.*

- H. *Well, then, might one say that the rule would apply to the priests assigned the offerings for one particular festival [analogous to the Day of Atonement]? And should you say, but we don't know which one of them might be the specified festival, whether it is the Festival of Unleavened bread, because it is with that Festival that Scripture commenced its exposition of the festivals, or whether it is the Festival of Tabernacles, since the religious duties that apply to that Festival are many —*
- I. *we draw an analogy for the rule governing the separation of the priest for seven days before the rite is to be carried out on a single day from another case in which the priest is separated from his household for seven days for the service of a single day; but we do not draw an analogy from the case of a priest that must be removed for seven days for the rite to be carried out for seven days from the law that governs the case of a priest's being separated from his household for seven days for the service that is performed on only a single day.*
- J. *But might one then say that the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly would come under consideration, for there we should have separation from the household of the officiating priest for seven days for the purpose of carrying out the rite for a single day [and the analogy then would be a valid one].*
- K. *We draw an analogy concerning a matter before which there is no span of sanctification to another matter before which there is no span of sanctification, but we do not draw an analogy for a matter before which there is a spell of sanctification from a matter prior to which there is no spell of sanctification.*
- L. *Well, then, would that very argument not yield a probative argument a fortiori to the contrary? Namely: If a matter prior to which there is no spell of sanctification still requires that the priest be separated for a week before the right, then should not the same rule all the more so apply to a matter prior to which there is a spell of sanctification?*
- M. *Said R. Mesharshayya, "Not at all, for Scripture says in so many words, 'this day' (Lev. 8:34), which means, 'a day like this.'"*
- N. *[Offering a better answer,] R. Ashi said, "But is it conceivable that there should be a case in which the principal portion of the festival's rites are performed by priests who have not been separated, while the subsidiary portion of the same festival's rites should have to be performed by priests who have been separated from their households? And even from the perspective of him who has said, 'The Eighth day of Solemn Assembly is a festival entirely distinct unto itself,' that is the case so far as the rites of [3A] dividing the offerings by lot, the recitation of the blessing, 'who has kept us in life...', the fact that the holiday has its own distinct name, the fact that the festival has its own number of sacrifices, the fact that the festival has its own Psalm, the fact that the festival has its own blessing. But so far as its relationship to the prior days, that festival day serves quite nicely to make up a festival sacrifice that one did not offer on the first day, as much as all the other successive days may serve to make up that offering, inclusive of the last day, the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly. For we have learned in the Mishnah: **He who did not make a festal offering on the first festival day of a festival makes festal offerings throughout the entire festival, including the last festival day of the Festival [of Tabernacles] [M. Hag. 1:6A].**"*

- I.7.** A. *Well, perhaps reference is made to Pentecost [Shabuot], since it would qualify, being a case in which the priest would have to separate from his household for seven days in preparation for a rite that is carried out for one day only?*
- B. Said R. Abba, “We draw an analogy between a holy day that is observed through offering one bullock and one ram from a holy day that is observed by offering one bullock and one lamb, *but that then excludes the matter of Pentecost, which involves an offering of two rams.*”
- C. *That response poses no problems to him who has said that the offering for the Day of Atonement is a single ram. But from the perspective of him who says that it involves two rams, what is to be said? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. Rabbi Says, “The ram to which reference is made here in Leviticus is the one to which reference is made in the book of Numbers.”
- E. R. Eliezer b. R. Simeon says, “They are two distinct rams, one that is stated here and the other in the book of Numbers.” [Eliezer then would reject Abba’s solution to the problem.]
- F. *You may even say that R. Eliezer b. R. Simeon would concur here. In that case, one of the rams serves to meet the requirement of the holy day, the other, the requirement of the additional offerings, which then excludes Pentecost, on which occasion both of the rams meet the requirement of the holy day itself.*
- I.8.** A. *Well, perhaps reference is made to the New Year, which would then require separation of the priest for seven days prior to a one-day rite?*
- B. Said R. Abbahu, “We draw an analogy between a case in which a bullock is offered along with a ram deriving from his own resources from another case in which the priest presents a bullock and a ram from his own resources, *which then excludes both Pentecost and the New Year, on which occasions both offerings derive from public funds.*”
- C. *Well, now, that reply poses no problems for him who interprets the language, “Take for yourself” (Lev. 9: 2) to mean, “from your own resources, [3B] and “make for yourself” (Num. 10: 2) means, “from your own property.” But from the perspective of him who says that these derive from public funds, what is to be said? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. ““Take for yourself” (Lev. 9: 2) to mean, ‘from your own resources,’ and ‘make for yourself’ (Num. 10: 2) means, ‘from your own property.’ ‘And they shall take for you’ (Exo. 27:20) means, from the funds of the community,” the words of R. Josiah.
- E. R. Jonathan says, “Whether the usage is ‘take for yourself’ or ‘they shall take for you,’ the source is communal funds. And how come Scripture says, ‘Take for yourself’? It is as if to say, ‘What belongs to you I desire more than what belongs to them.’”
- F. Abba Hanan said in the name of R. Eleazar, “One verse of Scripture says, ‘Make yourself an ark of wood’ (Deu. 10: 1), and another verse, ‘And they shall make an ark of acacia wood’ (Exo. 25:10). How so? The one speaks of an age in which the Israelites carry out the will of the Omnipresent, the other of an age in which they do not carry out the will of the Omnipresent.”

G. *Now at issue in the dispute is the generic sense of the word “for you” in the usage, “take” or “do,” “take for you” in the generic sense: as in “take for you also the chief spices” (Exo. 30:34), or “Make for yourself” in the generic sense: as in “Make for yourself two trumpets of silver” (Num. 10: 2). But in the matters of the offerings of the high priest on the Day of Atonement and on the eighth day of consecration, by contrast, there is an explicit statement that these derive from the resources of the priest himself. In the case of the consecration of the priests: “And to the children of Israel you shall speak, saying, Take for yourself a he-goat for a sin offering” (Lev. 9: 3). Now why state, “And he said to Aaron, take for yourself a bull calf for a sin offering” (Lev. 9: 2)? That surely yields the inference, “Take for yourself,” that which derives from your own resources. And with reference to the Day of Atonement, we have, “Herewith shall Aaron come into the holy place, with a young bullock for a sin offering” (Lev. 16: 3). Then why proceed, “And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel” (Lev. 16: 5), and “And Aaron shall present the bullock of the sin offering which is for himself” (Lev. 16: 6)? Surely that bears the inference, “for himself,” from his own resources.”*

I.9. A. R. Ashi said, “We draw an analogy from a rite that requires a bullock for a sin offering and a ram for a burnt offering to another in which the bullock is for a sin offering and the ram for a burnt offering, *which then excludes both the New Year and Pentecost, in which case both beasts serve as burnt offerings.*”

I.10. A. Rabina said, “We draw an analogy from a rite that is performed by the high priest to another rite that is performed by the high priest, *then excluding all of the other rites subject to the questions that have been raised, since the rites on those other occasions are not necessarily performed by the high priest.*”

B. *There are those who say,* said Rabina, “We drawn an analogy from a rite that is held for the first time to a rite that is held for the first time, *excluding the cases raised earlier, since none of them is classified as a rite that took place for the first time.*”

C. *What is the meaning of “a rite that took place for the first time”? Should I say, a rite that was performed for the first time ever by the high priest? Then that would go over Rabina’s argument in the first version!*

D. *No, the phrase means,* we draw an inference from a rite that was the first service of its classification held in its place for a rite that is the first service held in its place. [The first rite for the Day of Atonement took place in the Holy of Holies, which prior to that time had never been entered, and this was on the first Day of Atonement; the Consecration service involved the first sacrifice on the outer altar, in priestly garments (Jung)].

I.11. A. *When R. Dimi came, he said, “R. Yohanan repeated as a Tannaite statement one thing, R. Joshua b. Levi repeated as a Tannaite statement two things.*

B. *“R. Yohanan repeated as a Tannaite statement one thing: ‘the words, to do, to atone for,’ speak of the rite of the Day of atonement.*

C. *“R. Joshua b. Levi repeated as a Tannaite statement two things: to do refers to the rites involving the bullock, to atone for refers to the rites of the day of atonement.”*

- D. *R. Yohanan repeated as a Tannaite statement one thing? And lo, we have learned in the Mishnah in two distinct passages: **Seven days before the Day of Atonement they set apart the high priest from his house to the councillors' chamber...Seven days before the burning of the cow, they separate the priest who burns the cow from his house!***
- E. *In the latter case, it is merely a general distinction accorded to the latter rite [as an ad hoc regulation (Jung)].*
- F. *But lo, said R. Minyumi bar Hilqiah said R. Mehasaya bar Idi said R. Yohanan, "Said Scripture, 'As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do, to make atonement for you' (Lev. 8:34) — the word, 'to do' refers to the red cow, and the words 'to make atonement for you' speak of the rites of the Day of Atonement." [Here he clearly differentiates, like Joshua b. Levi above.]*
- G. *That statement belongs to his master [whom he cites here]. For when Rabin came, he said R. Yohanan [said] in the name of R. Ishmael, "...the word, 'to do' refers to the red cow, and the words*

- I.12.** A. [Reverting to the basic proof, just now cited, in the context of 5.B, we take up the proof in its own terms, thus:] *said R. Simeon b. Laqish to R. Yohanan, "From what analogy have you drawn your interpretation? It is from the consecration service. But then, by the same analogy, just as in the case of the consecration service, leaving out any of the required rites would invalidate the service, so too here, would omission of any of the details invalidate the service? And should you say that it really would, have we not learned in the Mishnah: **And they [also] appoint another priest as his substitute, lest some cause of invalidation should overtake him?** But the Tannaite statement does not use the language also, **Seven days before the Day of Atonement they set apart the high priest from his house to the councillors' chamber.** And should you claim, what is the meaning of **appoint?** It is, **they set apart** — then the framer of the passage surely should be expected to make use in both passage of either the word appoint or set apart!"*
- B. *He said to him, "Then how does the master draw an appropriate analogy?"*
 - C. *He said to him, "From the case of Sinai, in which case Scripture states, 'And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered him [Moses] for six days, and he called to Moses on the seventh day' (Exo. 24:16). Since Scripture says, and he called to Moses on the seventh day, what is the point of referring also to for six days? That serves as the generative metaphor to indicate that whoever enters the camp of the Presence of God has to be set apart for six days."*
 - D. *Well and good, but in our Mishnah-passage we repeat the formulation, **Seven days before the Day of Atonement they set apart!***
 - E. *Our Mishnah-paragraph represents the view of R. Judah b. Betera, who takes account of [4A] the high priest's becoming unclean through sexual relations with his wife [should her period begin during sexual relations, which case he is unclean for seven days and so cannot officiate].*

I.13. A. *Said R. Yohanan to R. Simeon b. Laqish, "Now, from my perspective, there are no problems, for I invoke the analogy of the rite of consecration. That is in line with what has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. *"On both of the priests [the one for the Day of Atonement, the other for the burning of the red cow], they sprinkle purification water all seven days, the water deriving from the remains of all of the sin offerings that they had there.*

C. *"That then indicates that there was a rite of sprinkling purification water in connection the the consecration of the priests. But from your perspective, deriving the relevant analogy from the encounter at Sinai itself, was there any rite of sprinkling in connection with Moses's sojourn on Sinai? [Obviously not.]"*

D. *He said to him, "Well, now, from your perspective, are matters so flawless? In the rite of consecration, the sprinkling was done with blood, and here it was done with water!"*

E. *He said to him, "But that's no problem! For R. Hiyya stated as a Tannaite teaching, Water takes the place of blood. But from your perspective, was there any sprinkling at all at Sinai!?"*

F. *He said to him, "It was merely a generic distinction [marking off the rite of the red cow and of the Day of Atonement]."*

I.14. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Yohanan, it has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Simeon b. Laqish.*

B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Yohanan:*

C. *"With this shall Aaron come into the holy place" (Lev. 16: 3) — with that which has been specified in context. What might that be? In the context of the consecration. Just as what is stated in the context of the consecration, specifying that Aaron is to separate himself from his household for seven days and serve in the priesthood for one day, and Moses gave him all seven days in order to inform himself for the act of service, so in generations to come, the high priest is set apart for seven days and performs the act of service in the priesthood for one day.*

D. *And two disciples of sages from among the disciples of sages of Moses [are assigned to his case]. That is done to show rejection of the opinion of the Sadducees. They give him all seven days in order to inform himself for the act of service. On this basis they have said, **Seven days before the Day of Atonement they set apart the high priest from his house to the councillors' chamber.***

E. *And just as they separate the high priest, so **[seven days before the burning of the cow,] they separate the priest who burns the cow from his house, [bringing him] to the chamber that faces the northeast corner of the Temple building, [and it was called the stone house] [M. Par. 3:1A-C].***

F. *All the same is the rule applying to the one and to the other: they sprinkle upon him purification water every day of the seven days from the remains of all sin purification rite ash and water that were there.*

- G. And should you say, in connection with the consecration blood was used for the rite of purification, while here it was water, you may say: water comes instead of blood.
- H. And Scripture further says, “As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do to make atonement for you” (Lev. 8:34) — “to do” speaks of the rite of burning the red cow, “to atone” speaks of the rite of the Day of Atonement.
 - I. *But the phrase “with this” is required to make reference to that to which it obviously speaks in any event, namely, “with a young bullock for a sin offering and a ram for a burnt offering”!*
 - J. *Say: if that word made reference solely to the offering, Scripture could as well has said “with this” [in the masculine form, not in the feminine form, as is used], or, it could as well has said, “with these....” Why the specific utilization of “with this” in the feminine singular? It bears two meanings.*
 - K. *And what is the point of adding as well, And Scripture further says, “As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do to make atonement for you” (Lev. 8:34) — “to do” speaks of the rite of burning the red cow, “to atone” speaks of the rite of the Day of Atonement?*
 - L. *Should you say that it was only the first and original Day of Atonement on which the high priest has to be removed, as we find on the occasion of the consecration [the first and only such occasion], but for the Day of Atonement in general thereafter, that is not required, or if you should say that it was only the first high priest who had to be set apart for seven days, but future high priests do not have to be set apart, come and pay attention to the verse: “As has been done this day, so the Lord has commanded to do to make atonement for you” (Lev. 8:34) — “to do” speaks of the rite of burning the red cow, “to atone” speaks of the rite of the Day of Atonement.*

I.15. A. *...it has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Simeon b. Laqish:*

- B. “Moses ascended in a cloud, was covered by a cloud, was sanctified by a cloud, so as to receive the Torah for Israel in sanctity, as it is written, ‘And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai’ (Exo. 24:16). This event took place after the pronouncement of the Ten Commandments, which came first in the forty days of revelation,” the words of R. Yosé the Galilean.
- C. R. Aqiba says, “‘And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai’ (Exo. 24:16) — this began at the beginning of the third month. ‘And the cloud covered it’ — namely, the mountain, [4B] Then ‘he called to Moses on the seventh day’ — Moses and all Israel standing there. But the purpose of the Scripture is solely to pay special respect to Moses.”
- D. R. Nathan says, “The purpose of Scripture was only to clean Moses of all the food and drink in his bowels, to put him at the same level as the ministering angels.”
- E. R. Matia b. Heresh says, “It was only the purpose of Scripture only to arouse in him awe, so that the Torah would be given only in awe and in dread and trembling, as is said, ‘Serve the Lord with awe and rejoice with trembling’ (Psa. 2:11).”

- F. *What is the meaning of “...rejoice with trembling” (Psa. 2:11)?*
- G. Said R. Ada bar Matenah said Rab, “Where there is rejoicing, there should also be trembling.”
- H. *What is at issue in the cited passage?*
- I. *R. Yosé the Galilean and R. Aqiba engaged in precisely what is at issue in the following Tannaite conflict, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- J. On the sixth of the month [of Sivan] the Ten Commandments were given to Israel.
- K. R. Yosé says, “On the seventh of that month.”
- L. *The one who says that it was on the sixth of the month holds that on the sixth it was given, and on the seventh he ascended. The one who says that it was given on the seventh holds that on the seventh the Torah was given and Moses ascended, as it is written, “And he called to Moses on the seventh day” (Exo. 24:16).*
- M. *R. Yosé the Galilean then sees matters as does the first of the two Tannaite authorities, who has said, On the sixth of the month [of Sivan] the Ten Commandments were given to Israel. Therefore this event took place after the Ten Commandments, thus: “And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai. And the cloud covered it’ — namely, Moses. “And he called to Moses on the seventh day” — so as to receive the rest of the Torah. For if it should enter your mind to suppose that the sense is, “And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai” (Exo. 24:16) — this began at the beginning of the third month. “And the cloud covered it” — namely, the mountain, Then “he called to Moses on the seventh day” — so as to receive the Ten Commandments, well, as a matter of fact, Moses had already received them on the sixth day, and the cloud had departed on the sixth day!*
- N. *And R. Aqiba sees matters as does R. Yosé, who has said, “On the seventh of that month the Torah was given to Israel.”*
- O. *Well, now, from the perspective of R. Aqiba, we have no problem in understanding the fact that **on the seventeenth of Tammuz the Tablets were broken [M. Ta. 4:6B]**. Then the twenty-four days of Sivan and the sixteenth of Tammuz make up the forty days on which he was on the mountain, and on the seventeenth of Tammuz he went down and broke the Tablets. But from the perspective of R. Yosé the Galilean, who maintains that there were six days of separation from his household in addition to the forty days Moses spent on the mountain, the Tablets would not have been broken prior to the twenty-third of Tammuz!*
- P. *R. Yosé the Galilean may say to you, “The forty days on the mountain include the six days of separation from his household.”*
- I.16.** A. The master has said, “Then ‘he called to Moses on the seventh day’ — Moses and all Israel standing there.”
- B. *That supports the position of R. Eleazar, for said R. Eleazar said, “Then ‘he called to Moses on the seventh day’ — Moses and all*

Israel standing there. But the purpose of the Scripture is solely to pay special respect to Moses.”

- C. *An objection was raised:* [He heard the voice speaking] “toward him” but not “to him,” so we know that Moses heard the voice, but the rest of Israel did not hear the voice [and that interpretation would contradict the claim that all Israel was standing there but Scripture wished to pay special respect to Moses].
- D. *No problem! The one refers to the situation at Sinai, the other, to the situation in the Tent of Meeting [where only Moses heard the voice].*
- E. *And if you prefer, I shall say, no problem! The one speaks of the call, the other, of the act of speech [the former having been heard solely by Moses, the latter, by all Israel].*

I.17. A. *In the presence of R. Eleazar R. Zeriqa juxtaposed and contrasted verses of Scripture, and some say, said R. Zeria, R. Eleazar juxtaposed and contrasted verses of Scripture, as follows:* “‘And Moses was not able to enter into the tent of meeting because the cloud abode thereon’ (Exo. 40:35) versus ‘And Moses entered into the midst of the cloud’ (Exo. 24:18). This contrast teaches that the Holy One, blessed be he, grabbed Moses and poked him into the cloud.”

B. *A member of the household of R. Ishmael repeated as a Tannaite statement, “Here is said, ‘in the midst,’ and the same word appears elsewhere, ‘and the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea’ (Exo. 40:35, Exo. 14:22, respectively). Just as in the latter case there was a demarcated path, so in the case of the cloud there was a demarcated path.”*

I.18. A. “And the Lord called to Moses and spoke to him [saying]” (Lev. 1: 1):

- B. Why does the call take precedence over the act of speech?
- C. The Torah thereby gives instruction on dignified conduct, that someone should not say something to another person without first calling to him.
 - D. *That supports the view of R. Hanina, for said R. Hanina, “Someone should not say something to another person without first calling to him.”*
- E. “...saying,” (Lev. 1: 1):
- F. Said Rabbah, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that if someone tells something to his fellow, the latter may not repeat it unless the former says to him, ‘Go, say it’? As it is said, ‘And the Lord called to Moses and spoke to him saying...’”

- I.19.** A. [Reverting to 12.A, said R. Simeon b. Laqish to R. Yohanan, “From what analogy have you drawn your interpretation? It is from the consecration service. But then, by the same analogy, just as in the case of the consecration service, leaving out any of the required rites would invalidate the service, so too here, would omission of any of the details invalidate the service?”] *it must follow that both authorities take the view that in the case of the rites of consecration, every detail that Scripture introduces in their regard is essential to the rite [and if omitted, invalidates it].*
- B. *For it has been stated on Amoraic authority:*
- C. As to the rite of consecration —
- D. R. Yohanan and R. Hanina —
- E. One said, “In the case of the rites of consecration, every detail that Scripture introduces in their regard is essential to the rite [and if omitted, invalidates it].”
- F. And the other said, “Whatever matter would invalidate the rite in generations to come if it is omitted invalidates in that connection too, and any matter that would not invalidate the rite if omitted in generations to come would not invalidate in that case either.”
- G. *Now, on the basis of what has been said here, may you draw the conclusion that it is R. Yohanan who takes the view, “In the case of the rites of consecration, every detail that Scripture introduces in their regard is essential to the rite [and if omitted, invalidates it],” in light of the fact that R. Simeon b. Laqish said to R. Yohanan, “From what analogy have you drawn your interpretation? It is from the consecration service. But then, by the same analogy, just as in the case of the consecration service, leaving out any of the required rites would invalidate the service, so too here, would omission of any of the details invalidate the service?” and the other said nothing by way of retort or denial?*
- H. *You may indeed draw that conclusion.*

I.20. A. *Now what is the practical issue about which the dispute rages?*

- B. **[5A]** *Said R. Joseph, “At issue between them is the rite of laying on of hands on the head of the sacrifice. In the view of him who has said, ‘In the case of the rites of consecration, every detail that Scripture introduces in their regard is essential to the rite [and if omitted, invalidates it],’ omitting the laying of hands on the head of the sacrifice would invalidate the rite. In the view of him who has said, ‘Whatever matter would invalidate the rite in generations to come if it is omitted invalidates in that connection too, and any matter that would not invalidate the rite if omitted in generations to come would not invalidate in that case either,’ omitting the laying of hands on the head of the sacrifice would not invalidate the rite.”*
- C. *And as to the generations to come, how do we know that the omission of the laying on of hands would not invalidate the rite?*
- D. *As has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. **“And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him” (Lev. 1: 4): does the atonement come about in consequence of the laying on of hands? And is it not the fact that the atonement comes about only because of the blood rite, as it is said, “For it is the blood that makes**

atonement by reason of the life” (Lev. 17:11)? So what purpose is served when Scripture states, “And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him” (Lev. 1: 4)? It is to show that if the owner regarded the laying on of hands as the mere afterthought of the religious duty of making the offering, Scripture regards him as though he did not make atonement, even though he did make atonement [Sifra VI.V.4].

- I.21.** A. R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “Waving the offering is at issue between them. In the view of him who has said, ‘In the case of the rites of consecration, every detail that Scripture introduces in their regard is essential to the rite [and if omitted, invalidates it],’ omitting the waving of the sacrifice would invalidate the rite. In the view of him who has said, ‘Whatever matter would invalidate the rite in generations to come if it is omitted invalidates in that connection too, and any matter that would not invalidate the rite if omitted in generations to come would not invalidate in that case either,’ omitting the waving of the sacrifice would not invalidate the rite.”
- B. *And as to the generations to come, how do we know that the omission of the waving of the offering would not invalidate the rite?*
- C. *As has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. “To be waved, to make atonement for him” (Lev. 14:21):
- E. Is it the fact that the waving effects atonement? And is it not the fact that atonement is only through the blood, as it is said, “For the blood is what makes atonement by reason of the life” (Lev. 17:11)?
- F. It is to teach the rule that if one has treated the waving as a mere minor detail of the religious duty, Scripture regards it as though he has not achieved atonement.
- G. But in point of fact, he has made atonement.
- I.22.** A. R. Pappa said, “At issue between them is separating the officiating priest for seven days prior to the rite. In the view of him who has said, ‘In the case of the rites of consecration, every detail that Scripture introduces in their regard is essential to the rite [and if omitted, invalidates it],’ not doing so would invalidate the rite. In the view of him who has said, ‘Whatever matter would invalidate the rite in generations to come if it is omitted invalidates in that connection too, and any matter that would not invalidate the rite if omitted in generations to come would not invalidate in that case either,’ not doing so would not invalidate the rite.”
- B. *And as to the generations to come, how do we know that the omission of the separation of the officiating priest would not invalidate the rite?*
- C. *Since the Tannaite formulation uses the language of appoint, and not the language of set apart, [that point follows] [thus: **And they [also] appoint another priest as his substitute, lest some cause of invalidation should overtake him?** But the Tannaite statement does not use the language also, **Seven days before the Day of Atonement they set apart the high priest from his house to the councillors’ chamber**].*

- I.23.** A. *Rabina said, "At issue between them are use of the larger number of garments that are used in the rite [eight for the high priest, rather than the four of the ordinary priest] and also the application of the larger number of anointments of oil that are required during the seven days. In the view of him who has said, 'In the case of the rites of consecration, every detail that Scripture introduces in their regard is essential to the rite [and if omitted, invalidates it],' not doing so would invalidate the rite. In the view of him who has said, 'Whatever matter would invalidate the rite in generations to come if it is omitted invalidates in that connection too, and any matter that would not invalidate the rite if omitted in generations to come would not invalidate in that case either,' not doing so would not invalidate the rite."*
- B. *And as to the generations to come, how do we know that the omission of these details would not invalidate the rite?*
- C. *As has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. *"And the priest who shall be anointed and who shall be consecrated to be priest in his father's stead shall make atonement" (Lev. 16:32) —*
- E. *What is the point of this verse of Scripture?*
- F. *Since Scripture states, "Seven days shall the son who is priest in his stead put them on" (Lev. 16:32), I know only that the priest who has put on the greater number of priestly vestments and who has been anointed on each of the seven days might then "minister in the holy place" [on the Day of Atonement]. If the priest put on the larger number of garments for seven days but was anointed for only one, put on the larger number of vestments on one day but was anointed for seven, how do I know that he too could conduct the rite?*
- G. *Scripture says, "And the priest who shall be anointed and who shall be consecrated to be priest in his father's stead shall make atonement" (Lev. 16:32) — meaning, under all circumstances.*
- H. *Now we have found the basis for the rule that, to begin with, the priest must be distinguished by the larger number of vestments for seven days, but whence do we know the rule that, to begin with, the priest must be anointed for seven days?*
- I. *If you wish, I shall say that that is the case since a verse of Scripture was required to exclude that case [I know that to begin with, it was required], or, if you wish, I shall say that it is because Scripture stated, "'And the holy garments of Aaron shall belong to his sons after him, to be anointed in them, and to be consecrated in them" (Exo. 29:29). That verse then establishes an analogy between anointing and the provision of the larger number of garments. Just as the larger number of vestments is to be worn for seven days, so the anointing is to take place for seven days.]*
- J. *And what is the foundation in Scripture for the view of him who has said, "Whatever is written with regard to those forms is indispensable [so that the omission of a given detail invalidates the rite]"?*

- K. Said R. Isaac bar Bisna, “Said Scripture, ‘And thus you shall do to Aaron and his sons’ (Exo. 29:29). The use of ‘thus’ indicates an indispensable detail of the rite.”
- L. *Well, now that solves the problem with respect to any [5B] detail that is discussed by Scripture in particular. How do we know that the details [specified at Exo. 29: 4] but not articulated there [at Lev. 8:33] also are indispensable to the conduct of the rite?*
- M. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “An analogy is drawn between the two passages on the basis of the occurrence of the word *petah* in both of them [at Exo. 29: 4 and Lev. 8:33].”
- N. R. Mesharshayya said, “‘And keep the charge of the Lord’ (Lev. 8:35) indicates the indispensability [of the details covered by that clause].”
- O. R. Ashi said, “‘For so am I commanded’ (Lev. 8:35) indicates the indispensability [of the details covered by that clause].”

I.24. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “For so I am commanded [in connection with the meal offering],” “as I commanded [in connection with the sin offering],” “as the Lord commanded [in connection with the peace offering]” (Lev. 10:13, 18, 15) — [These were presented in connection with the consecration of the priesthood by Moses, and Moses instructed the priests to eat them, even though they were unclean, “for so I am commanded” (Freedman)].
- C. “For so I am commanded [in connection with the meal offering]” — in all instances, the commandment was that the priests eat the sacrificial meat assigned to them even though they had just been bereaved [after the death of the sons of Aaron].
- D. “as I commanded [in connection with the sin offering]” — just at the time that the death took place.
- E. “as the Lord commanded [in connection with the peace offering]” (Lev. 10:13, 18, 15) — “It is not on my own authority that I say it.”

I.25. A. Said R. Yosé bar Hanina, “There is no reference in the passage to the priest’s trousers [in Lev. 8-9, on the consecration of the priests].”

- B. When Scripture states, “And this is the thing that you shall do to them to consecrate them to minister” (Exo. 29: 1), that statement encompasses the matters of both the trousers and the tenth of an ephah.
- C. *Well, now, there is no problem with respect to the trousers, since they are covered by the generic, “garments.” But how do we know that the tenth ephah of fine flour offering also is involved?*
- D. It derives from the analogy effected by the occurrence of the word “this” both here and in the verse, “this is the offering of Aaron and his sons that they shall offer to the Lord...the tenth of an ephah” (Lev. 6:13).

I.26. A. Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that even the public declamation of the Scriptural

passage on the Consecration is essential to the rite [so that if it is omitted, the rite is invalidated]?

- B. “Scripture states, ‘This is the matter that the Lord has commanded to be done’ (Lev. 8: 5) — even an act of speech [the word for ‘matter’ and ‘speech’ utilizing the same consonants] is indispensable to the rite.

I.27. A. “How did he put the garments on them?”

- B. “How did he put the garments on them?”!! *What was was!*

- C. Rather, “How did he put the garments on them in time to come?”

- D. “How did he put the garments on them in time to come?”!! In time to come too, when Aaron and his sons will come back, so Moses will come right along with them!

- E. Rather, “How in line with the verses of Scripture before us did he put the garments on them?” [Jung: There are apparent contradictions between the command as given in Exo. 29 and the account of the ceremony in Lev. 8. In Exo. 29: 9: “And you shall gird them with a girdle, Aaron and his sons” intimates that this girding of father and sons took place in close succession to one another, while Lev. 8: 7, “And girded him with the girdle and clothed him with the robe” shows that the girding of Aaron took place before the clothing of the sons had even begun.]

- F. *There was a dispute on that matter involving the sons of R. Hiyya and R. Yohanan.*

- G. One said, “Aaron and afterward his sons.”

- H. The other said, “Aaron and his sons simultaneously.”

- I. *Said Abbaye, “All parties concur that the order was Aaron and then his sons, for whether it involved the commandment of the actual deed, Aaron is mentioned first of all. What is subject to dispute is the order of putting on the girdle. He who says, ‘Aaron and afterward his sons’ cites the verse of Scripture, ‘And he girded him with the girdle’ (Lev. 8: 7), only after which it is written, ‘And he girded them with a girdle’ (Lev. 8:13). He who says, ‘Aaron and his sons simultaneously’ cites the verse of Scripture, ‘And you shall gird them with girdles, Aaron and his sons’ (Exo. 29: 9).”*

- J. *But in the view of him who says, “Aaron and his sons simultaneously,” does not Scripture say, “Aaron and afterward his sons’ cites the verse of Scripture, ‘And he girded him with the girdle’ (Lev. 8: 7), only after which it is written, “And he girded them with a girdle” (Lev. 8:13)?*

- K. **[6A]** He will say to you, “That speaks of the girdle of the high priest, indicating that it is not the same as the girdle of the common priest.”

- L. *But in the view of him who says, "Aaron and afterward his sons," does not Scripture say, "And you shall gird them with girdles, Aaron and his sons" (Exo. 29: 9)?*
- M. *He will say to you, "That verse serves to teach you that the girdle of the high priest was the same as that of the common priest."*
- N. *In that case, what need do I have for the statement, "And he girded him with a girdle" and then "and he girded them"?*
- O. *That yields the conclusion, Aaron and afterward his sons.*
- P. *And anyhow, can you find a way in which this can have been done simultaneously?*
- Q. *It means to indicate that Aaron came first [in a procedure the steps of which were uninterrupted; Aaron enjoyed priority].*

II.1 A. ...they set apart the high priest from his house to the councillors' chamber:

- B. *Why do they separate him?*
- C. *Why do they separate him? It is as has already been stated, whether in accord with the opinion of R. Yohanan or in accord with the opinion of R. Simeon b. Laqish!*
- D. *This is the sense of the question: how come he is separated from his house [wife]?*
- E. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. *R. Judah b. Beterah says, "Lest his wife turn out possibly to have been in her menstrual period and he have sexual relations with her."*
- G. *So are we dealing with genuinely wicked people?*
- H. *Rather: lest he have sexual relations with his wife and she turn out possibly to have been in her menstrual period.*

II.2. A. *Rabbis stated this matter before R. Hisda: "According to which authority has this statement been made? It is in accord with R. Aqiba, who said, 'A menstruating woman retroactively imparts uncleanness to him with whom she has sexual relations.' But it cannot be in accord with rabbis, for lo, they has said, 'A menstruating woman does not retroactively impart uncleanness to him with whom she has sexual relations.'"*

- B. *Said to them R. Hisda, "You may even maintain that it represents the position of rabbis. Rabbis contest the position of R. Aqiba only if the blood stains turned out a good bit later, after the act of sexual relations, but if they turned up only a bit later, they would concede the same point."*

II.3. A. *Said R. Zira, "That bears the inference that one who has sexual relations with a menstruating woman is not in the same status, as to uncleanness, as the menstruating woman, and may immerse on that very day. For if you take the view that one who has sexual relations with a menstruating woman is in the same status, as to uncleanness, as the menstruating woman, when is he supposed to immerse? Only at night. But then how is he supposed to conduct the rite on the next day, having to wait for sunset before entering the status of cultic cleanness? So does that not bear the inference that one who has sexual relations with a menstruating*

woman is not in the same status, as to uncleanness, as the menstruating woman, and may immerse on that very day?"

- B. *R. Shimi of Nehardea said, "You may even take the view that one who has sexual relations with a menstruating woman is in the same status, as to uncleanness, as the menstruating woman. For they set him apart [for the purpose of the present law] one hour prior to sunset."* [Jung: on the eve before the eighth day before the Day of Atonement. One hour is a very short period and unimportant, hence the separation would still be called "one of seven days." He could bathe on the evening before the eve of the Day of Atonement, the seventh day after having become ritually impure, and be fit to officiate on the Day of Atonement, having awaited the sunset on the day before his bath.]
- C. *An objection was raised: All who are obligated to immerse — their immersion takes place by day. [B. Shab. 121A: A man afflicted by flux, a woman afflicted by flux, a man with the skin ailment [of Lev. 13-14] and a woman with the same, a man who has sexual relations with a menstruating woman, and someone unclean with corpse uncleanness — they are to be immersed by day.] A woman who has completed her menstrual period and a woman after child birth may take their immersion bath at night. So that pertains to a menstruating woman — but not to her lover.*
- D. *No, the sense is, the menstruating woman and all who are classified in her category.*
- E. *An objection was raised: **One who has had a seminal emission is like one who has touched a dead creeping thing** He who has sexual relations with a menstruating woman is like one who is unclean by reason of corpse uncleanness [M. Zab. 5:11]. Does this not mean, so far as immersion is concerned?*
- F. *No, it means, with respect to the uncleanness pertaining to them.*
- G. *But the matter of uncleanness pertaining to them is spelled out in so many words in Scripture. In the former, it is written that it lasts for seven days [Lev. 15:24], and in the latter, seven days' spell of uncleanness is made explicit [Num. 19:11]. [6B] Rather, does this not refer to the immersion-rules that pertain to them [so the lover may immerse by day].*
- H. *Not at all, in point of fact, reference is made to the uncleanness pertaining to them, and the latter clause of the Mishnah-paragraph is what necessitated making these statements, namely, **But more strict is the rule concerning the one who has sexual relations with a menstruating woman: for he imparts uncleanness to bed and chair with a minor sort of uncleanness, [rendering the bed and chair capable of] imparting uncleanness to food and drink [M. Zab. 5:11C-D].***
- I. *Come and take note of that which R. Hiyya stated as a Tannaite rule: A man afflicted by flux, a woman afflicted by flux, a man with the skin ailment [of Lev. 13-14] and a woman with the same, a man who has sexual relations with a menstruating woman, and someone unclean with corpse uncleanness — they are to be immersed by day. A woman who has completed her menstrual period and a woman after child birth may take their immersion bath at night.*
- J. *That is a valid refutation .*

II.4. A. Now instead of merely separating the high priest from the uncleanness that may attach to his household, surely you should separate himself from the possibility of corpse-uncleanness!

B. R. Tahalipa, the father of R. Huna in the name of Raba: "That is to say, for affairs of community, the considerations of corpse uncleanness do not operate at all."

C. *Rabina said, "You may even maintain that for affairs of community, the considerations of corpse uncleanness are simply suspended [and still answer the question at hand]. But corpse uncleanness is uncommon, while uncleanness deriving from one's wife is commonplace."*

II.5. A. *It has been stated as an Amoraic dispute:*

B. R. Nahman said, "For affairs of community, the considerations of corpse uncleanness do not operate at all."

C. R. Sheshet said, "For affairs of community, the considerations of corpse uncleanness are simply suspended."

D. *Where there is corpse uncleanness affecting a number of participants in the same priestly watch, all parties concur that those priests that are unaffected by the corpse uncleanness and so still cultically clean carry out the rites, and those that are unclean do not. Where there is a dispute, it concerns the question of whether the administration has to make the effort to find clean priests in another family-watch. In such a case, R. Nahman said, "For affairs of community, the considerations of corpse uncleanness do not operate at all," so the administration does not have to make the effort to find clean priests in another family-watch, and R. Sheshet said, "For affairs of community, the considerations of corpse uncleanness are simply suspended," so the administration does have to make the effort to find clean priests in another family-watch.*

E. *There are those who say, even in a case in which there are both clean and unclean priests in the same family-watch of priests, R., Nahman contests the matter and says that the unclean priests also may participate in the cultic rites, for so far as the All-Merciful is concerned, any consideration of corpse uncleanness is suspended when it comes to the community's affairs.*

F. *Said R. Sheshet, "On what basis do I take the position that I do? It is because of that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: If the priest was standing at the altar and offering the meal offering of the sheaf of first barley and it became unclean, if there is another at hand, he should be told, 'present the other instead.' If not, he should be instructed, 'Get smart and shut up,'" these are the words of Rabbi. [R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, "One way or the other, he should be instructed, 'Get smart and shut up,' for the grain for the first sheaf of barley that was reaped not in accord with its religious requirement is not valid."]* *Now the Tannaite formulation uses the language, in any event, if there is another at hand, he should be told, 'present the other instead.'* [The law of corpse uncleanness in the case of the community offering is suspended, not annulled.]

G. Said R. Nahman, "I concede that where there is remnant to be eaten, [a substitute sacrifice should be found if possible, so that the remnant may be eaten in the state of cultic cleanness]."

- H. *An objection was raised:* If the priest was offering the meal offering that goes along with bullocks or rams or sheep and it became unclean in his hand, he should say so in so many words and get another instead; if there is none at hand but the first, someone says to him, “Get smart and shut up.” *Now does this not refer to the bullocks, rams, and lambs of the Festival of Sukkot [which belong to the community, and yet here too, considerations of uncleanness are suspended, not nullified altogether].*
- I. R. Nahman may say to you, “Not at all, ‘bullock’ refers to the bullock offered up by reason of inadvertent acts of idolatry, *and although it is a sacrifice in behalf of the community, there is no fixed time that pertains, so one goes and makes the effort to find a substitute*; ‘rams’ refer to the ram of Aaron, *and although a fixed time pertains to it, it is an offering of an individual, so one tries to get a substitute*; ‘lambs’ refers to the lamb presented together with the sheaf of first barley, *which yields remnant for the priests to eat.*”
- J. *An objection was raised:* If the blood of an offering was made unclean and inadvertently was sprinkled, it is acceptable; if this was done deliberately, it is not accepted. [That rule pertains only to an individual’s offering, but in the case of an offering in behalf of the entire community, the offering is acceptable whether made inadvertently or deliberately. In the case of an offering presented by a gentile, whether inadvertently or deliberately, accidentally or intentionally, the offering is not acceptable.]
- K. *When that Tannaite formulation was set forth, it referred to an offering presented by an individual.*
- L. *Come and take note:* For what does the high priest’s head plate atone? For blood, meat, and forbidden fat, that had become unclean whether inadvertently or deliberately, accidentally or intentionally, whether in the case of an offering in behalf of an individual or an offering in behalf of the community. *Now, if you take the view that considerations of uncleanness have been utterly nullified, then why make reference to expiation for an offering involving the community?*
- M. R. Nahman may say to you, “*When the language is used, what does the high priest’s head plate atone, it makes reference to an offering deriving from an individual. And if you prefer, I shall say, you may even say that it makes reference to community offerings, specifically, to those that are not subject to a fixed time frame.*”
- N. *An objection was raised:* “And Aaron shall bear the iniquity of the holy things” (Exo. 28:38) [the high priest’s head plate atones for faults in connection with the offering] — and what is the iniquity for which the head plate atones? If you should say that it is for the sin of making the offering refuse, lo, it is stated to the contrary, “It shall not be accepted” Lev. 19: 7). If you say, it is the sin of leaving the meat over beyond the proper time, lo, it is stated, “Neither shall it be imputed to him” (Lev. 7:18).**[7B]** Lo, it can bear the iniquity only for the sin of uncleanness, for that is remitted from the prevailing prohibition when it comes to the offering of the community. *Now that presents a contradiction to the position of R. Sheshet [for he*

says the law is suspended, but not nullified, for the community's sacrifice]!

- O. *In point of fact we deal with a conflict of Tannaite formulations of the law. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- P. “Whether or not the front-plate is actually on the high priest’s forehead, it propitiates,” the words of R. Simeon.
- Q. R. Judah says, “While it is till on his forehead, it propitiates. If it is no longer on his forehead, it does not propitiate.”
- R. Said R. Simeon to [Judah], “The condition of the high priest on the Day of Atonement will prove the matter. For on that day the front-plate is not on his forehead, and yet it serves to propitiate [and render acceptable sacrifices offered in a state of uncleanness, in line with Exo. 28:36-38].”
- S. Said R. Judah to [Simeon], “Omit reference to the Day of Atonement, on which uncleanness affecting the community is permitted [and abrogated. So the case at hand proves nothing.]” [Thus uncleanness affecting the community is treated as null].
- T. *So it follows that R. Simeon maintains that uncleanness is merely set aside when the community’s offering is involved.*

II.6. A. *Said Abbaye, “In a case in which the front plate was broken, there is no dispute; all parties concur that it does not propitiate. Where there is a dispute, it is in a case in which the front plate was simply hung up on a peg [and not on the priest’s forehead]. R. Judah takes the view that the verse is determinative, ‘And it shall be upon the forehead of Aaron and he shall bear’ (Exo. 27:38), and R. Simeon maintains that the determinative verse is, ‘And it shall be continually upon his forehead that they may be accepted before the Lord’ (Exo. 27:38). Now in that context [Simeon argues], what is the meaning of ‘continually’? Should we say that it means literally, continually upon his forehead? But is such a thing possible at all? Doesn’t the priest have to go to the toilet, and doesn’t he ever want to sleep? So what it means is, ‘it continually expiates.’”*

- B. *But doesn’t R. Judah take account of the reference in the verse to continually upon his forehead?*
- C. *That bears the meaning, “continually, he will not cease to think about it.”*
- D. *And that is in accord with Rabbah bar R. Huna, for said Rabbah bar R. Huna, “A man is liable to touch his phylacteries occasionally, a view based on an argument a fortiori from the head-plate of the high priest: [8A] if the head-plate, which contains only one reference to the Divine Name, is subject to the statement of the Torah, ‘And it shall always be on his forehead’ (Exo. 28:38), so that he will not neglect it, phylacteries, which contain numerous mentions of the Divine Name, all the more so.”*

- E. *And from the perspective of R. Simeon, who has said, "It continually expiates", lo, it is written, "And it shall be continually upon his forehead"!*
- F. *That serves the purpose of indicating the place at which the frontlet is to be located.*
- G. *Then how does R. Judah know where the frontlet is to be located?*
- H. *He derives that information from the language, "on his forehead."*
- I.
- J. *Then should not R. Simeon also derive that information from the phrase, "on his forehead"?*
- K. *Certainly he does, but how does he deal with the language, "And it shall be continually upon his forehead that they may be accepted"?*
- L.
- M. He will say to you, "Whatever is suitable to set upon his forehead expiates, and whatever is not suitable to set upon his forehead does not expiate." *That reading of matters then serves to exclude the case in which the frontlet is broken, in which instance it does not expiate.*
- N. *And from R. Judah's perspective, how does he know that, in the case in which the frontlet is broken, it does not expiate?*
- O. *He derives that fact from the use of not the word "forehead," which would have sufficed to convey the information at hand, but "his forehead," which bears in its wake a double meaning.*
- P. *And R. Simeon?*
- Q. *He derives no lessons from the use of not the word "his forehead," instead of merely forehead.*

II.7. A. *May we then say that the conflict between the following Tannaite authorities runs along the lines of that of the foregoing Tannaite authorities? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **"All the same is the rule applying to the one and to the other: they sprinkle upon him purification water every day of the seven days from the remains of all sin offerings that were there," the words of R. Meir.**
- C. **R. Yosé says, "They sprinkled on him only on the third and seventh [days] alone."**
- D. **R. Hananiah Prefect of the Priests says, "On the priest who burns the cow they sprinkle each of the seven days. And on the one of the Day of Atonement, they sprinkled only on the third and seventh [days] alone" [M. Par. 3:1, with variations].**
- E. *Is it not on the following that the dispute turns: R. Meir maintains that, when it comes to a public offering, considerations of uncleanness are postponed; R. Yosé*

maintains that, when it comes to public offerings, considerations of uncleanness are wholly remitted?

- F. *But does that seem so reasonable to you? For if R. Yosé maintains that those considerations are wholly remitted when it comes to community offerings, then why is sprinkling required at all?*
- G. *Rather, all parties among these Tannaite authorities maintain that when it comes to public offerings, uncleanness is set aside but not remitted entirely when it comes to public offerings. But here, this is what is subject to dispute: R. Meir takes the view that we maintain, when an act of immersion takes place at the proper time, it is a religious duty, and R. Yosé holds the view that we do not maintain, when an act of immersion takes place at the proper time, it is a religious duty.*
- H. *But is it the fact that R. Yosé holds the view that we do not maintain, when an act of immersion takes place at the proper time, it is a religious duty? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: Lo, if the Divine Name is written on one's skin, he must not bathe or anoint himself or stand in any unclean place. If he should turn out, however, to be required as a matter of religious duty to immerse in an immersion-pool, he wraps a piece of reed around the spot and goes down into the immersion pool and immerses. R. Yosé says, "In point of fact he may go down and immerse in an ordinary way, on condition that he not rub off the divine name." And we have it as an established fact that what is subject to debate here is whether or not when an act of immersion takes place at the proper time, it is a religious duty. For the first of the two Tannaite authorities maintains that we do not affirm the rule, when an act of immersion takes place at the proper time, it is a religious duty, while R. Yosé takes the position that we do affirm the rule, when an act of immersion takes place at the proper time, it is a religious duty.*
- I. *But all parties among these Tannaite authorities maintain that when an act of immersion takes place at the proper time, it is a religious duty, and here this is what is subject to debate: R. Meir maintains that we draw an analogy between sprinkling purification water and the act of immersion, and R. Yosé maintains that we do not drawn an analogy between sprinkling and the act of immersion.*
- J. *Well, then what about R. Hanina Prefect of the Priests? If he holds the view that we do draw an analogy between sprinkling the purification water and the act of immersion, then even the priest on the Day of Atonement also should*

be subject to the rule, but if he does not draw an analogy between sprinkling purification water and immersion, then even the priest who burns the red cow also should not be subject to the rule!

- K. In point of fact, he does not draw that analogy, but the imposition of the rule upon the priest who burns the red cow represents a mere ad hoc embellishment of the law.
- L. *Then in accord with which authority is that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The sole difference between the priest who burns the red cow and the High Priest on the Day of Atonement is [8B] that when this one is set apart for a period of sanctification, his brethren, the other priests, may nonetheless touch him, while when that one is set apart for purposes of purification, his brothers, the other priests, may not touch him? In accord with which authority is that rule?*
- M. *It may accord with either R. Meir or R. Yosé, but it cannot accord with R. Hanina the Prefect of the Priests, for there would then have to be yet another point of difference.*
- N. *Objected R. Yosé b. R. Hanina to this proposition [of Meir's and Hanina's that the priest who is to burn the red cow is sprinkled every day], "Well, it is quite proper that the priest be sprinkled on the first day [when he is set apart, Num. 19:19] because that may be the third day after he has contracted uncleanness, and so too, on the third day, because it also may be the third day after he has contracted uncleanness; it is quite reasonable to sprinkle him on the fifth day, because that may be the seventh day after he has contracted uncleanness, so too the sixth day may be the seventh after contracting uncleanness, and likewise the seventh may be the seventh after contracting uncleanness — but why on the fourth day should he be sprinkled, since there is no doubt at all on whether or not it is either the third day or the seventh day after he has contracted uncleanness [so there is no purpose served by sprinkling him on that day]?"*
- O. *But, by your own reasoning, is there any possibility of sprinkling him all seven days anyhow? For it is an established fact for us that sprinkling violates the general principle of resting on the holy day, and it does not, therefore, override the prohibitions of the Sabbath [so, as it is, sprinkling can take place only six days]! So what have you to say, but only, it is for seven days except for the Sabbath, and here too, it is seven days except for the fourth*

day [thus omitting the days on which the sprinkling either is not permitted or is not necessary].

- P. *Said Rabbah, "Therefore, since the rule governing the high priest on the Day of Atonement depends not on us but on the fixing of the calendar, he should be set apart on the third of Tishré, and whatever day of the week coincides with the third of that month, we remove him; but when it comes to the priest who burns the red cow, since we can determine the date of the rite ourselves, he should be removed on the fourth day of the week [Wednesday], so that the fourth day of his period of separation will coincide with the Sabbath."*

III.1 A. to the councillors' chamber:

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *Said R. Judah, "But was it the chamber of the counsellors? Wasn't it the chamber of the senators? But to begin with they called it the chamber of the senators, but since they had the habit of paying for the position of the high priest, so the high priests changed every twelve month, just like counsellors, who are changed every twelve month, they came to call it, the councillor's chamber."*

III.2. A. We have learned in the Mishnah: Bakers — sages required them to separate [from their produce] only [an amount] sufficient for heave offering of the tithe and dough offering [M. Dem. 2:4A-B].

- D. *Now, as to their not being required to separate the great heave offering, there is no problem, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: [Also: he decreed concerning the confession [concerning tithes] and annulled [the rules of] doubtfully tithed produce (M. Sotah 9:10A, D). For he sent to all the towns of Israel and found that they were separating only the great heave-offering alone. [As to first tithe and second tithe, some of them separated these tithes, and some of them did not. He said to them, "Just as the great heave-offering, if neglected, is a transgression punishable by death, so tithing the heave-offering, if neglected, is a transgression analogous [in regard to heave-offering] to certainly untithed produce [and punishable by death]. So let people designate heave-offering and heave-offering of the tithe and give it to the priest; as to second tithe, let them render it unconsecrated in exchange for coins. And as to the rest of the tithes, e.g., poorman's tithe, let him who wants to collect from his fellow produce evidence in behalf of his claim" so now people do not have to ask] [T. Sot. 13:10].*
- E. *So too with respect to first tithe and poor person's tithe, it was not required, on the principle, "He who lays claim on his fellow bears the burden of proof." But as to second tithe, should it not be separated, taken to Jerusalem, and eaten there by the baker?*
- F. *Said Ulla, "It is because the [members of the] councillor's chamber beat up the people for twelve months and instruct them, "Sell cheap, sell cheap," sages did not impose the burden on the bakers to set apart second tithe and take it to Jerusalem."*

- G. What is the meaning of the word for “councillor’s chamber”? It means, “managers’ chamber.”

The Corruption of the High Priesthood and the Consequent Fall of the Temple

The reference to the high priests buying and selling the high priesthood explains the introduction of the following topical appendix, a sizable composite devoted to the history of the Temple.

- III.3.** A. Said Rabbah bar bar Hanah said R. Yohanan, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘The fear of the Lord prolongs days, but the years of the wicked shall be shortened’ (Pro. 10:27)? ‘The fear of the Lord prolongs days’ — this refers to the first sanctuary, which stood for four hundred and ten years, and yet in which served only eighteen high priests. ‘...but the years of the wicked shall be shortened’ refers to the second sanctuary, which stood for four hundred and twenty years, and in which more than three hundred high priests served. Subtract from the total the forty years during which Simeon the Righteous served, as well as the eighty years in which Yohanan the High Priest served, the ten in which Ishmael b. Phabi served — and some say, eleven that R. Eleazar b. Harsom served. Then go and calculate: each one scarcely lived out his year!”
- III.4.** A. Said R. Yohanan b. Toreta, “How come Shiloh was destroyed? Because in it were practiced two matters, fornication and slovenly disposition of Holy Things.
- B. “Fornication: ‘Now Eli was very old and he heard all that his sons did to Israel, and how they lay with the women that did service at the door of the tent of meeting’ (1Sa. 2:15).”
- C. And that is so, even though said R. Samuel bar. Nahmani said R. Yohanan, “Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan. “Whoever says that the sins of Eli sinned only errs: ‘And the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phineas, priests to the Lord, were there’ (1Sa. 1: 3). Since **[9B]** they delayed offering up fowl that were to be sacrificed, Scripture treats them as though they had had sexual relations with the women who brought the birds.”
- D. ...slovenly disposition of Holy Things: as it is written, “Yes, before the fat was made to smoke, the priest’s servant came and said to the man who sacrificed, Give meat to roast for the priest, for he will not have boiled flesh from you but raw meat. And if the man said to him, Let the fat be made to smoke first of all and then take as much as you want, then he would say, No, but you shall give it to me now, and if not, I will take it from you by force. And the sin of the young men was very great before the Lord, for the men dealt contemptuously with the offering of the Lord” (1Sa. 2:15-17).
- III.5.** A. Why was the first sanctuary destroyed? Because in it were practiced three vices: idolatry, fornication, and murder.
- B. Idolatry: ““For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it” (Isa. 28:20).
- C. *What is the sense of*, “For the bed is shorter than that one can stretch himself on it”?

- D. Said R. Jonathan, “This bed is too short for two neighbors to stretch out in at one time.”
- E. *What is the sense of* “And the covering is narrower”?
- F. Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani, “*When R. Jonathan would reach this verse of Scripture, he would cry. ‘He of whom it is written,’* ‘He gathers the waters of the sea together as a heap’ (Psa. 33: 7) — *should a molten statue rival him!*”
- G. Fornication: “Moreover the Lord said, Because the daughters of Zion are haughty and walk with stretched-forth necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go, and make a tinkling with their feet’ (Isa. 3:16).
- H. “because the daughters of Zion are haughty” (Isa. 3:16)? They would go along with a tall girl beside a short one. [It means that the walked along with haughty bearing].
- I. “and walk with outstretched necks”(Isa. 3:16)? They walked heel by toe mincingly (Freedman)].
- J. “and wanton eyes” (Isa. 3:16)? *They filled their eyes with eye paint and gestured to men.*
- K. “walking and mincing”? “They would walk with heel touching toe.
- L. “and making a tinkling with their feet.”
- M. Said R. Isaac [of the household of R. Ammi], “This teaches that they would put myrrh and balsam in their shoes and would walk through the market places of Jerusalem. When they came near Jewish boys, they would stomp on the ground and the perfume spurted out on them, so that lust filled them like a snake’s venom.”
- N. Murder: “Moreover Manasseh shed innocent blood in great volume until he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another” (2Ki. 21:16).
- O. [Following the re-arrangement of the text by Jung:] They were wicked, but they placed their faith in the Holy One blessed be he.
- P. For it is written, “The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money, yet will they lean upon the Lord and say, ‘Is not the Lord in the midst of us? No evil shall come upon us”’ (Mic. 3:11).
- Q. Therefore the Holy One, blessed be he, brought down upon them three evil decrees as against the three vices that were theirs: “Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field and Jerusalem shall become heaps and the mountain of the house as the high places of a forest” (Mic. 3:12).
- R. But as to the second sanctuary, in which the people were engaged in Torah and practice of the commandments and acts of loving kindness, on what account was it destroyed? It was because of gratuitous hatred.
- S. That fact serves to teach you: gratuitous hatred weighs in the balance against the three cardinal sins of idolatry, fornication, and murder.

III.6. A. *During the time of the first sanctuary, was there no gratuitous hatred? It is written, “They are thrust down to the sword with my people, therefore smite upon my thigh” (Eze. 21:17),*

- B. And said R. Eleazar, "This refers to the people who eat and drink together and then pierce one another through with the daggers of their tongue."
- C. *That took place with Israel's princes:* "Cry and wail son of man, for it is upon my people" (Eze. 21:17).
- D. *Since the text states as a Tannaite statement,* "Cry and wail," one might have supposed that reference is made to all Israel, but the same verse proceeds, "upon all the princes of Israel."

III.7. A. *R. Yohanan and R. Eleazar both say,* "The ancients, whose sin was made known, also had their destiny made known. But the moderns, whose sin was not made known, also did not have their destiny made known."

III.8. A. Said R. Yohanan, "The little finger nail of the ancients is better than the big belly of the moderns."

B. *Said to him R. Simeon b. Laqish, "To the contrary! The moderns are better off, for even though they are subjugated to the kingdoms, they nonetheless engage in Torah-study."*

C. He said to him, "The sanctuary proves I am right, for it was restored to the ancients but not to the moderns."

III.9. A. They asked R. Eleazar, "Were the ancients greater, or the moderns?"

B. He said to them, "All you have to do is set your eyes upon the sanctuary!"

C. There are those who say, he said to them, "Your witness in this matter is the sanctuary itself."

III.10. A. *R. Simeon b. Laqish was swimming in the Jordan. Rabbah bar bar Hannah came along. He gave him his hand [to help him out of the water]. He said to him, "By God, how I hate you! For it is written, 'If she be a wall, we will build upon her a turret of silver, if she be a door, we will enclose her with boards of cedar' (Son. 8: 9). If you had made yourselves like a wall and come up, all of you, in the time of Ezra, you would have been comparable to silver — which rot does not rule. Now that you have immigrated, it is like doors [in several pieces, not all at once], you are comparable to cedar, which rot does rule."*

III.11. A. *What is the meaning of "cedar"?*

B. Said Ulla, "It is 'a sawing worm'" [Jung].

C. *What is the meaning of "a sawing worm"?*

D. Said R. Abba, "It means, 'an echo.' *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* When the last prophets died, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, the Holy Spirit took leave of Israel. But still they made use of the echo."

III.12. A. *But did R. Simeon b. Laqish ever engage in conversation with Rabbah bar bar Hana? If even with R. Eleazar, who was the master of the Land of Israel, he did not engage in conversation — for anyone with whom R. Simeon b. Laqish engaged in conversation in the market could get merchandise on credit without witnesses — would he engaged in conversation with Rabbah bar bar Hannah?*

B. *Said R. Pappa, "Toss into the story another person between them [instead of those to whom the original tale refers]. It was either R. Simeon b. Laqish and Zeiri, or Rabbah bar bar Hana and R. Eleazar."*

III.13. A. [Continuing the story above:] *Now, when R. Simeon b. Laqish came before R. Yohanan, he said to him, 'This is not the reason [that the second sanctuary proved less than the first]. For even if all of them had come up to the Land of Israel in the time of Ezra, still the Presence of God would not have come to rest in the second sanctuary, for it is written, 'And God shall enlarge Japheth and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem' (Gen. 9:27) [10A] — even though God has enlarged Japheth [Persia, in context], still the Presence of God comes to rest only in the tents of Shem.'*

III.14. A. *Now how on the basis of Scripture do we know that the Persians derive from Japheth?*

- B. It is written, "The sons of Japheth, Gomer and Magog and Madai and Javan and Tubal and Meshek and Tiras" (Gen. 10: 2):
- C. Gomer: Germania;
- D. and Magog: Kandia [Crete];
- E. and Madai: Macedonia;
- F. and Javan: literally;
- G. and Tubal: Beth Unyaqi;
- H. and Meshek: Mysia;
- I. and Tiras:
- J. *Concerning this item there is a dispute between R. Simai and rabbis, and some say, R. Simon and rabbis.*
- K. One said, "This refers to Thrace."
- L. The other said, "This refers to Persia."

III.15. A. *R. Joseph taught as a Tannaite statement, "Tiras is Persia, Sabtah, Raamah, and Sabteca."*

III.16. A. *R. Joseph taught as a Tannaite statement, "It is Inner and Outer Sakistan. Between the two is a distance of a hundred parasangs, and the circumference is a thousand."*

III.17. A. "And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel and Erech and Accad and Calneh in the land of Shinar" (Gen. 10:10):

- B. Babel: this means what it says.
- C. and Erech: this is Urikot.
- D. and Accad: this is Baskar.
- E. and Calneh in the land of Shinar: this is Nupar-Ninpi.

III.18. A. "Out of that land went Ashur:"

- B. *R. Joseph taught as a Tannaite statement, "Ashur is Siloq."*

III.19. A. "And built Nineveh and Rehoboth-ir and Calah" (Gen. 10:11):

- B. Nineveh: this means what it says.
- C. "and Rehoboth-ir: Perat of Mesene.
- D. and Calah: Perat de Borsif.
- E. "And Resen between Nineveh and Calah — the same is the great city" (Gen. 10:12):

- F. "Resen:" this is Ctesiphon.
- G. "the same is the great city:" on the basis of what is stated, I do not know whether by "the great city" reference is made to Nineveh or Resen. But when Scripture proceeds, "Now Nineveh as an exceeding great city to God, of three days' journey," you must conclude that "by the great city" is meant Nineveh.

III.20. A. "And Ahiman, Sheshai and Talmai the children of Anak were there" (Num. 13:22):

- B. *A Tannaite statement:*
- C. Ahiman: the most skilled among the brothers.
- D. Sheshai: for he made the ground on which he walked into pits.
- E. Talmai: he made the ground full of ridges.
- F. Another explanation: Ahiman built Anath, Sheshai built Alush, Talmai built Talbush.
- G. "the children of Anak:" because by their great height they even overtowered the sun."

III.21. A. Said R. Joshua b. Levi said Rabbi, "Rome [which destroyed the second Temple] is destined to fall by the hand of Persia [which permitted the building of the second Temple]: 'Therefore hear you the counsel of the Lord, that he has taken against Edom; and his purpose, that he has planned against the inhabitants of Teman; surely the least of the flock shall drag them away, surely their habitation shall be appalled by them' (Jer. 49:20)."

- B. *Objected Rabbah bar Ulla, "On what basis is it inferred that the reference to 'the least of the flock' means Persia? That it is written, 'The ram that you saw having two horns, they are the kings of Media and Persia' (Dan. 8:20)? But why not say it refers to Greece, for it is written, 'And the rough he goat is the king of Greece' (Dan. 8:21)!"*
- C. *When R. Habiba b. Surmaqi came up, he reported this interpretation before a certain one of the rabbis. He said to him, "Should someone who doesn't know how to explain the meaning of a passage raise an objection against Rabbi? What does the language, 'the least of the flock' mean? It means, the youngest among his brethren, for R. Joseph stated as a Tannaite teaching, 'Tiras is Persia.'"*

III.22. A. Said Rabbah bar Hannah said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Judah b. R. Ilai, "Rome [which destroyed the second Temple] is destined to fall by the hand of Persia [which permitted the building of the second Temple]. That proposition is yielded by an argument a fortiori. If in the case of the first sanctuary, which the children of Shem built and the Chaldeans destroyed — the Chaldeans fell at the hands of the Persians, in the case of the second sanctuary, which the Persians built and the Romans destroyed — isn't it logical to suppose that the Romans will fall at the hands of the Persians?"

III.23. A. Said Rab, "Persia is destined to fall at the hand of Rome."

- B. *Said R. Kahana and R. Assi to Rab, "Are those who build to be given over into the hands of those who destroy?"*
- C. *He said to them, "Yes, indeed, because it is a decree of the King."*
- D. *There are those who say, he said to them, "They too destroyed synagogues."*

- E. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. Persia is destined to fall at the hand of Rome, *first of all because they destroyed synagogues*, and second, because it is the King's decree that builders should fall by the hands of destroyers.
- G. For said R. Judah said Rab, "The son of David will come only when the evil kingdom of Rome will overspread the entire world for nine months: 'Therefore will he give them up until the time that she who travails has brought forth, then the residue of his brethren shall return with the children of Israel' (Mic. 5: 2)."

IV.1 A. [The Counsellor's Chamber:] *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. All the chambers that were located in the sanctuary had no mezuzah except for the counsellor's chamber, for in that chamber was the dwelling place of the high priest.
- C. Said R. Judah, "Now is it not the fact that there were any number of chambers in the sanctuary in which there were residences, and they had no mezuzah.
- D. "Rather, the operative consideration for the counsellor's chamber's not having a mezuzah was a decree."
- E. *What is the operative consideration behind the opinion of R. Judah?*
- F. *Said Rabbah, "R. Judah takes the view that any dwelling that is not made for use both in the dry season and in the rainy season is not classified as a house [that would require a mezuzah]." [Here we are talking about a temporary residence.]*
- G. *Objected Abbaye, "But is it not written, 'And I will smite the winter house with the summer house' (Amo. 3:15)?"*
- H. *He said to him, "Both the winter house and the summer house are classified as houses by name, but that is not so with the generic, 'house.'"*
- I. *Objected Abbaye, "A festival hut during [the week of] the Festival [of Tabernacles] — R. Judah declares it subject [to the law during that week], but Sages declare it exempt [for that week] [M. Ma. 3:7I-K]. And in that connection there is a following Tannaite statement: R. Judah requires such a house to be included in an erub [for purposes of carrying on the Sabbath] and for the purposes of a mezuzah and for the definition of a house in connection with the imposition of the requirement to tithe upon otherwise untithed produce. [These are traits that pertain only to a house.] And should you say, that is only by authority of rabbis, to be sure, in regard to the requirement of providing an erub and a mezuzah, one may indeed claim that that would be only on the authority of rabbis? But could you possibly maintain that as to the requirement for tithing what is brought there in, that is only on the authority of rabbis? [That would not be a plausible decree, for this consideration:] [10B] Perhaps one may turn out to set aside tithe from a portion of the crop that is obligated to tithe for a portion of the crop that is exempt, and from a portion of the crop that is exempt for a portion of the crop that is liable?"*
- J. *Rather, said Abbaye, "As to the seven days on which the high priest is separated and assigned to live in the house, all parties concur that the room has to have a mezuzah. What is subject to dispute? It is the rule that applies on all the other days of the year. Rabbis take the view that we decree that there must be a mezuzah on the other days of the year on account of the seven days on which it is*

obligatory to put a mezuzah on the door of the room, while R. Judah takes the view that we do not make such a decree.”

- K. *Said to him Raba, “And lo, the case of the tabernacle that is built for the Festival of Tabernacles on that Festival itself is what the Tannaite ruling discusses.”*
- L. *Rather, said Raba, “As to the rest of the days of the year, there is no dispute among any party that the room is exempt from the requirement of having a mezuzah. Where there is a dispute, it concerns the seven days in which the priest must take up residence there. And as to the sukkah there is a special consideration in play, and as to the chamber, there is a special consideration in play.*
- M. *“And as to the sukkah there is a special consideration in play: R. Judah is consistent with his principles, for he has said, ‘For the t=sukkah, we require a duly constituted permanent dwelling, in which case, it is indeed liable to the requirement of a mezuzah. And rabbis are consisted with their view, since they maintain that the sukkah is merely a random, transitory dwelling and must be so, and therefore is not obligated for a mezuzah.*
- N. *“and as to the chamber, there is a special consideration in play: rabbis maintain that a house in which one lives willy nilly is classified as a house, while R. Judah holds the view that a house in which one must live willy nilly is not classified as a house. But it is by the authority merely of rabbis that they ordained that it must have a mezuzah, so that people should never say, ‘The high priest is imprisoned in jail.’”*

IV.2. A. *Who is the Tannaite authority behind that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **[11A]** *All the gates that were there in the eastern part of the Temple court had no mezuzah except for Nicanor’s gate, within which was located the chamber of the counsellors.*
- C. *May one say that this represents the position of rabbis and not R. Judah, for in the opinion of R. Judah, the room itself was subject to the requirement of a mezuzah only by reason of an ad hoc decree, so should we go and proclaim a decree subsidiary to an already-existing decree?*
- D. *You may even say that this represents the position of R. Judah, on grounds that the whole of the area was subject to one and the same decree.*

The Requirement of the Mezuzah: A Topical Appendix

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

- B. *“And upon the doorposts of your house and upon your gates” (Deu. 6: 9):*
- C. *All the same is the rule that governs the gates of houses, courts, provinces, cities — all are subject to the commandment of fixing a mezuzah for the Omnipresent, since it is said, “And you shall write them upon the doorposts of your house and upon your gates” (Deu. 6: 9).*

IV.4. A. *Said Abbayye to R. Safra, “As to the city gates of Mahoza, what is the reason that our rabbis have not provided for them a mezuzah?”*

- B. *He said to him, “These serve only to support the Fort of Turrets of the city.”*

- C. *"But the Fort of Turrets itself requires a mezuzah, for it encompasses a residence for the guard of the prison, and lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: A synagogue that encompasses a residence for the attendant is obligated to have a mezuzah."*
- D. Rather, said Abbayye, "It is by reason of danger, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: A mezuzah belonging to a private house is inspected twice a week, and that serving a house belonging to the community twice a Jubilee, and said R. Judah, 'There was the case concerning a certain man named Artabin, who was examining the mezuzot in the Upper Market of Sepphoris, and a certain Roman agent found him and seized from him a thousand zuz.'"
- E. But did R. Eleazar not say, "Persons engaged as agents in accomplishing a religious duty are not subject to danger"?
- F. *A situation in which danger is to be expected is different, in line with the verse, 'And Samuel said, How can I go? If Saul hears it, he will kill me, and the Lord said, Take a heifer with you, and say, I have come to sacrifice to the Lord' (1Sa. 16: 2).*

IV.5. A. In the presence of R. Judah R. Kahana repeated as a Tannaite rule, "A storage house for straw, the stable, the wood shed, and the storehouse are exempt from the obligation of a mezuzah, because women derive benefit from them."

- B. *What is the meaning of, women derive benefit from them?*
- C. They wash therein.
- D. *Said to him R. Judah, "The operative consideration is that women wash there, so it must follow that those that are not designated for such a purpose are liable to the mezuzah. But it has been taught on Tannaite authority: An ox stable is exempt from a mezuzah! Rather, What is the meaning of, women derive benefit from them? They adorn themselves, and this is the sense of the Tannaite statement: Even though women adorn themselves in them, they are exempt from the requirement of a mezuzah."*
- E. Said R. Kahana to him, "But is it the fact that those in which women adorn themselves are exempt? *And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: An ox stable is exempt from a mezuzahs, but one in which women adorn themselves is liable to a mezuzah. So what can you say? The matter of one in which women adorn themselves is subject to a conflict of Tannaite rules. In my opinion too, as to places that are used without specification, there is a conflict of Tannaite rules, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: '...your house' (Deu. 6: 9) means, the house that is singularly yours, excluding therefore a storage house for straw, an ox shed, a wood shed, or a storage shed, which are exempt from the requirement of having a mezuzah. And there are those who impose liability for that purpose. However, they say, 'The toilet, the tannery, bathhouse, and house containing an immersion pool, of which women make use, are exempt from a mezuzah.'*"
- F. *R. Kahana, then, explains matters in accord with his theory, and R. Judah explains matters in accord with his theory.*
- G. *R. Kahana, then, explains matters in accord with his theory: '...your house' (Deu. 6: 9) means, the house that is singularly yours, excluding therefore a storage house for straw, an ox shed, a wood shed, or a storage shed, which are exempt*

from the requirement of having a mezuzah. And there are those who impose liability for that purpose. However, they say, ‘The toilet, the tannery, bathhouse, and house containing an immersion pool, of which women make use, are exempt from a mezuzah. *What is the meaning of*, women derive benefit from them? They wash therein. And so they are exempt from having a mezuzah.

- H. *If so, then all we have is a bathhouse [which is already covered]!*
- I. *We are thereby informed of the rule covering a public bath house and the rule covering a private bath house. It might have entered your mind to suppose that a public bath house, which is full of filth, is exempt, but private ones, which have less filth, might be liable to a mezuzah, and so we are informed that that is not the case.*
- J. *and R. Judah explains matters in accord with his theory. here is the sense of the Tannaite statement, “...your house” (Deu. 6: 9) means, the house that is singularly yours, excluding therefore a storage house for straw, an ox shed, a wood shed, or a storage shed, which are exempt from the requirement of having a mezuzah, even if women use them for adorning themselves. And there are those who impose liability when those places are used for that purpose. But if they are otherwise not specified for a particular purpose, all parties concur that they are exempt. However, they say, “The toilet, the tannery, bathhouse, and house containing an immersion pool, even those of which women make use, are exempt from a mezuzah, because there is much filth in those places.”*
- K. *So R. Judah takes the view that if the sheds are otherwise unspecified as to use, all parties concur that they are exempt from the requirement of having a mezuzah? But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- L. *“And upon the doorposts of your house and upon your gates” (Deu. 6: 9):*
- M. *All the same is the rule that governs the gates of houses, courts, provinces, cities as well as hen houses, straw sheds, wine stores, oil stores — all are subject to the commandment of fixing a mezuzah for the Omnipresent, since it is said, “And you shall write them upon the doorposts of your house and upon your gates” (Deu. 6: 9).*
- N. *Might one suppose that subject to the also are **[11B]** the porter’s lodge, a veranda or a balcony?*
- O. *The Torah states, “house...,” just as “house” refers to a building used for a residence, so are excluded all other buildings that do not serve as residence.*
- P. *Is it possible, then, that I should encompass under the law also a toilet, tannery, bathhouse, and house containing an immersion pool?*
- Q. *The Torah states, “house...,” just as “house” refers to a building used for a dignified purpose, [so are excluded these spaces, which are not used for dignified activities].*
- R. *Is it possible that I should encompass under the law also building on the Temple mount, its cells and courts?*
- S. *The Torah states, “house...,” just as “house” refers to a building used for an everyday purpose, so covered under the law are only building used for an everyday purpose, excluding these spaces, which are used only for sacred purposes.*
- T. *That forms a valid refutation of Judah’s position!*

- IV.6.** A. *R. Samuel bar Judah repeated as a Tannaite tradition in the presence of Raba:*
“Six gates are exempt from the requirement of having a mezuzah: a straw shed, stable, wood shed, storehouse, Median gate, a gate without beams, and a gate that is lower than ten handbreadths in height.”
- B. *He said to him, “So you start promising six, but you end up with seven!”*
- C. *He said to him, “The status of the Median gate is subject to a conflict of Tannaite statements, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: as to an arched doorway, R. Meir declares it liable to a mezuzah, but sages declare it exempt; and they concur that if the lower section [between the arch and the ground] is ten handbreadths high, the doorway has to have a mezuzah.”*
- D. *Said Abbaye, “All concur that if it is ten handbreadths high but the lower section is less than three handbreadths off the ground, or even if it was three handbreadths high but the total height was less than ten handbreadths, it is absolutely null. Where they differ, it is a case in which the height of the lower section is three handbreadths, and the total height ten cubits, and the width of the arch was less than four handbreadths, but the sides are sufficiently wide for the arch to be cut to a width of four handbreadths. R. Meir maintains that we do regard the sides as though they were cut to complete the prescribed width, and rabbis take the view that we do not regard them as though they were cut to complete the prescribed width.”*
- E. *He said to him, “So if you happen to come across them, don’t tell the members of the staff of the household of the exilarch anything about this Tannaite rule of the arched doorway.”*

- IV.7.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. *A synagogue, a harem, and a house owned by partners are liable to a mezuzah.*
- C. *That’s obvious!*
- D. *What might you otherwise have said? We interpret the language, “your house...,” to mean, not her house, “your house,” not their houses,” and so we are informed that that is not the case.*
- E. *But might I say that that is indeed the case?*
- F. *Said Scripture, “That your days may be multiplied, and the days of your sons” (Deu. 11:21) — so do the sons require life and the daughters not? Rather, what need do I have for the language, “your house”?*
- G. *It is in accord with Raba, for said Raba, “‘As you enter’ bears the sense of the right side, for when someone walks into a house, it is with the right foot first.”*

- IV.8.** A. *It has further been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. *A synagogue, a harem, and a house owned by partners are liable to contract uncleanness through plagues.*
- C. *That’s obvious!*
- D. *What might you otherwise have said? “Then he who owns the house shall come to him” (Lev. 14:35) — to him and not to her, to him and not to parties? So we are informed that that is not the case.*
- E. *But might I say that that is indeed the case?*
- F. *Said Scripture, “In a house of the land of your possession” (Lev. 14:34).*

- G. Then what am I to make of “to him”?
- H. Affected by the uncleanness that is under discussion is him who treats his house as singularly his own, not being willing to lend his utensils but saying he has none. The Holy One, blessed be he, reveals his true character when he has to empty out the contents of his house. Thus the language before us then excludes him who lends his utensils to others.

IV.9. A. But is a synagogue subject to uncleanness through plagues? *And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Might one suppose that synagogues and school houses contract uncleanness through plagues?
- C. Scripture states, “Then he who owns the house shall come to him” (Lev. 14:35) — him who enjoys complete possession of the property, excluding these, who do not enjoy complete possession of the property.
- D. *There is no conflict beyond resolution, since the one position represents that of R. Meir, the other, of our rabbis, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. A synagogue that encompasses a residence for the attendant is obligated to have a mezuzah, and one that does not encompass such a residence — R. Meir obligates nonetheless, but sages exempt.
- F. *But if you prefer, I shall say, both represent positions of rabbis, but there is no conflict, for the one speaks of a synagogue that encompasses a residence, and the other, one that does not.*
- G. *And if you prefer, I shall say, both of the statements pertain to one that does not encompass a residence. [12A] But one speaks of big cities, the other, towns.*
- H. *But is it the fact that those that are in big cities are not subject to uncleanness by reason of plagues? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. “And I put the plague of leprosy in the house of the land of your possession” (Lev. 14:34) — and Jerusalem is not [divided among the tribes or therefore] subject to uncleanness by reason of plagues.
- J. Said R. Judah, “I heard the rule only in reference to the place of the sanctuary alone.”
- K. Lo, it therefore follows that synagogues and school houses do contract uncleanness by reason of plagues — *and that is so, even though they are located in big cites.*
- L. Say: Said R. Judah, “I heard the rule only in reference to a place that is sanctified — that alone.”
- M. *What is subject to dispute in this argument?*
- N. *The initial authority takes the view that Jerusalem is not divided among the tribes, while R. Judah maintains that Jerusalem is divided among the tribes. And they are engaged with the matter subject to dispute between the following Tannaite authorities, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- O. **What part fell into the territory of Judah? The Temple mount, the treasuries, and the courts.**

- P. What part fell into the territory of Benjamin? The sanctuary, porch, and house of the Holy of Holies.
- Q. A triangular strip of land protruded, entering and leaving [Benjamin's portion, but connected to Judah's], and on that strip of land the altar was built [The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan XXXV:III.1].
- R. Now every single day that righteous man, Benjamin, was troubled, wanting to swallow up that land, as it is said, "He covers him all day long" (Deu. 33:12). **Because Benjamin acquired sufficient merit, so he was made into the landlord of the All-mighty, as it is said, "And he dwells between his shoulders" (Deu. 33:12).**
- S. *Now this Tannaite authority maintains that* Jerusalem is not divided among the tribes.
- T. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: They do not rent houses in Jerusalem [to those bringing offerings] because they [i.e., the houses] are [the property] of [all the] tribes [cf. T. Neg. 6:2]. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, "Also [they do] not rent beds."* The hides of sanctified animals [which are themselves unconsecrated; cf. M. M.S. 1:3A-C] do innkeepers therefore come and take by force [if the guests do not leave them behind as gifts] [T. M.S. 1:12-13].
- U. *Said Abbaye, "It follows that it is proper conduct to leave the host the empty wine pitcher and hide."*

IV.10. A. *And are synagogues in the villages liable to contract uncleanness through plagues? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. "As a possession" (Lev. 14:34) — when they have conquered it.
- C. If they conquered it but have not yet divided it among the tribes, if they have divided it among the tribes but not divided it among the father's houses, divided it among the father's houses but each individual family does not yet pick out its own property, how do we know that that is the case?
- D. Scripture says, "Then he who has the house to him" — he to whom the house uniquely belongs, excluding those that do not belong to the owner alone.
- E. *The better answer is as given to begin with.*

V.1 A. **And they [also] appoint another priest as his substitute, lest some cause of invalidation should overtake him:**

- B. *It is obvious that* if a cause of invalidation overtook him prior to the daily whole offering of the dawn that they initiate the other priest through the daily whole offering of the dawn. [He presides at the daily whole offering of the dawn, wearing the eight garments of the high priest on that occasion.] If the cause of invalidation takes place after the daily whole offering of the dawn, however, how is the initiate to take place?
- C. Said R. Adda bar Ahbah, "It is through putting on the priestly girdle [of fine linen that the high priest wears on the Day of Atonement]."
- D. *Well, that answer poses no problem for him who maintains that the girdle of the high priest is the same as that of the ordinary priest, but from the perspective of the*

one who maintains that he girdle of the high priest is not the same as that of the ordinary priest, what is to be said?

- E. Said Abbaye, "He puts on the eight garments and with a hook [turns one of the limbs of the daily burnt offering that is on the outer altar; in that way the limb burns more rapidly, and he has done the work of initiation for the office of high priest that he is going to take over presently]."
- F. *And that ruling accords with the view of R. Huna, for* said R. Huna, "A non-priest who turned a piece of meat on the altar fire with a prong is subject to the death penalty [since only a priest may do this]."
- G. And R. Pappa said, **[12B]** "His act of service itself serves as his initiatory rite. *For has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: As to all the utensils that Moses made, the act of anointing them served to sanctify them, while, in the future, the act of making use of them served to dedicate them. Here too, the same may be said, namely: His act of service itself serves as his initiatory rite.*"

- V.2.** A. When R. Dimi came, he said, "As to the girdle of the high priest is the same as that of the ordinary priest —
- B. "Rabbi and R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon —
 - C. "One said, 'It is made of mixed fabrics [wool and linen, otherwise forbidden].'
 - D. "The other said, 'It is made of fine linen.'"
 - E. *You may draw the conclusion that it is* Rabbi who said, "It is made of mixed fabrics [wool and linen, otherwise forbidden]," *for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - F. "The only difference between a high priest and an ordinary priest is the girdle," the words of Rabbi.
 - G. "R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, "Not even the girdle."
 - H. *Now to what occasion is reference made here? Should we say that it is on the other days of the year? But then there are more points of difference, since, after all, the high priest serves in eight garments, an ordinary priest in four. So is this not with reference to the Day of Atonement?* [Then the high priest has only four garments, like a common priest, but the character of the girdle then is the point of difference, since on that day the high priest's girdle was of linen, the common priests, of wool and linen, as during the rest of the year (Jung)].
 - I. *Say:* Not at all. In point of fact reference is made to the ordinary days of the year, and it speaks of the garments that both classes of priest wear equally [the girdle then being the sole difference; the others wear tunic, breeches, and miter as does the high priest].

- V.3.** A. When Rabin came, he said, "As to the girdle of the high priest on the Day of Atonement — all parties concur that it is made of fine linen. And as to the same on the ordinary days of the year, all parties concur that it was of mixed fibres, wool and linen. They differed only with respect to the to the girdle of the ordinary priests, whether on the ordinary days of the year or on the Day of Atonement. For:
- B. "Rabbi says, 'It is made of mixed fabrics [wool and linen, otherwise forbidden].'
 - C. "And R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, 'It is made of fine linen.'"

- D. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “So too we have learned as a Tannaite statement:
- E. ““And the priest shall put on his linen garment, and his linen breeches shall he put upon his flesh” (Lev. 6: 3) — What does Scripture say, “he shall put on”? It is to encompass use of the miter and girdle for removing the ashes,’ the words of R. Judah.
- F. “R. Dosa says, ‘It is to encompass the rule that the four garments of the high priest on the Day of Atonement may be used by an ordinary priest through the rest of the year.’
- G. “Rabbi says, ‘There are two objections to this matter. First, the girdle of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement is different from that of the ordinary priest; second, should the garments that are worn for the most weighty sanctification be used for an occasion of lesser sanctification? Rather, “he shall put on” means to include worn out garments [which may be worn when the altar ashes are removed].”
- H. *And R. Dosa is consistent with views expressed elsewhere, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. “And shall leave them there” (Lev. 16:23) — this teaches that they have to be hidden away [to protect them from reuse or use for a rite of lesser sanctification].
- J. R. Dosa says, “It is so that they should not be used for another Day of Atonement.”

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

- B. **“If the high priest became disqualified, and a substitute should serve in his place, the high priest returns to the priesthood, and this one who served in his place is subject to all of the religious requirements of the high priesthood,” the words of R. Meir.**
- C. **R. Yosé says, “The first returns to the high priest’s liturgy, and as to the second, he is valid to serve neither as high priest nor ordinary priest. [Tosefta’s version: Even though they have said, ‘All the religious requirements of the high priesthood apply to him,’ he is valid neither as a high priest nor as an ordinary priest.]”**
- D. **[In Tosefta’s version:] Said R. Yosé, “There was the case involving Joseph b. Elim of Sepphoris served in the place of the high priest for one hour.**
- E. **“And sages said, ‘The first returns to the high priest’s liturgy, and as to the second, he is valid to serve neither as high priest nor ordinary priest.**
- F. **““As to high priest: on account of envy; as to ordinary priest, because one rises in the hierarchy of sanctification but does not decline.”**
- G. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, **[13A]** “The decided law accords with R. Yosé. And R. Yosé concurs that if the substitute high priest violated the law and did officiate, his act of service is valid.”
- H. Said R. Judah said Rab, “The decided law accords with R. Yosé. And R. Yosé concurs that if the first priest should die, the second returns to his act of service.”
- I. *But that’s self-evident! [What choice is left?]*

- J. *What would you otherwise have imagined? That he would be classified as a jealous rival even during the lifetime of the other [and so excluded from further participation]? So we are informed that that is not the case.*

VI.1 A. R. Judah says, “Also: they appoint another woman as a substitute for his wife, lest his wife die, since it says, ‘And he shall make atonement for himself and for his house’ (Lev. 16: 6). ‘His house’ — this refers to his wife:”

- B. *But don’t rabbis also consider the same possibility [of the need for another priest]?*

- C. *Rabbis will tell you, uncleanness is commonplace, death isn’t.*

VII.1 A. They said to him, “If so, the matter is without limit:”

- B. *They certainly gave a good answer to R. Judah!*

- C. *Then what about R. Judah? [What does he have to say for himself?]*

- D. *He will say to you, “We take into account the possibility of one sudden death, but we do not have to take into account the possibility of the deaths of two successive wives.”*

- E. *And rabbis?*

- F. *Well, if we are supposed to take account various possibilities, then we might as well take into account the possibility of the sudden deaths of even two wives!*

- G. *But then the rabbis should take account of that possibility even when it comes to their own position [not only in response to Judah’s]!*

- H. *Rabbis will say to you, “The high priest is on the alert [not to contract uncleanness].”*

- I. *Well, then, if the high priest is on the alert, then why do we have to appoint a substitute priest for him anyhow?*

- J. *If we single out a rival priest for him, all the more so is he going to remain on the alert [not to contract uncleanness]!*

VI.2. A. *And is such an arrangement [involving a substitute wife] really adequate to the purpose? “His house” (Lev. 16: 6) is what the All-Merciful has said, and this one is not “his house” [if she is not yet married to him at the moment that the first wife dies]!*

- B. *It would be a case in which he had betrothed her.*

- C. *But note, so long as he has not actually consummated the marriage, she would hardly qualify as “His house” (Lev. 16: 6)! For if that were done, he would have two houses, and the All-Merciful has said, “He shall atone for himself and for his house,” — but not for two houses!*

- D. *Well, if it comes to that, he can go and divorce her.*

- E. *If he divorces her, then our problem reverts to its original place.*

- F. *Not at all, such a detail would be required, if he issues a divorce that rests on a stipulation, saying to her, “Lo, this is your writ of divorce, in the event of your death” [on the Day of Atonement; if she dies that day, the writ is valid retroactively, in which case there is only one house; and if she does not die, but the other wife does, then she remains “the house,” the letter of divorce being valid (Jung)].*

- G. *But maybe she won't die, in which case he still has two houses. Rather, he says to her, "Lo, this is your writ of divorce, in the stipulation that you not die." If she doesn't die, she is divorced, and if she dies, so the other wife is still left.*
- H. *But maybe she won't die, in which case, the writ of divorce is valid, and the other wife may die, so he will be left with no "house" at all!*
- I. *Rather, he says to her, "...on condition that one or the other of the two of them should die." The upshot is, if one dies, the other is still life, and if the other dies, one of them will survive.*
- J. *Sure, and what if neither of them dies! He will be left with two "houses"! And, further, a writ of divorce bearing such a stipulation is not valid, for hasn't Raba said, "If he said, 'Behold, this is your writ of divorce if you drink no wine all the days of my life and your life,' it is not valid, but if he said, 'All the days of the life of so-and-so,' it is valid"?*
- K. *Rather, he says to her, "Lo, this is your writ of divorce on the stipulation that your co-wife not die," Then, if her co-wife does not die, she is divorced, and if she dies, lo, she is left as his house!*
- L. *Sure, sure, but what happens then if her co-wife dies right in the middle of the rite, and the matter turn out [13B] retroactively to show that the writ of divorce of the other had not been valid, in which case, it will turn out that he will have been officiating at the right covering not one but two houses!*
- M. *Rather, it would work if he said to her, "Lo, this is your writ of divorce on the stipulation that your co-wife die."*
- N. *Yeah, and what if her co-wife dies, and the writ of divorce of the first wife turns out to be valid, and he will be left without a house at all?*
- O. *Rather, what he does is divorce both of them. To one, he says, "Lo, this is your writ of divorce on the stipulation that your co-wife not die," and to the other, he says, "Lo, this is your writ of divorce on the stipulation that you not enter the synagogue [on the Day of Atonement]."*
- P. *But perhaps her co-wife won't die and she won't enter the synagogue, so the writs of divorce of both of them will prove valid, and he'll be left with no house!*
- Q. *Rather, to one he says, "Lo, this is your writ of divorce on the stipulation that your co-wife not die," and to the other, "Lo, this is your writ of divorce on the stipulation that I myself shall enter the synagogue [on the Day of Atonement]," in consequence of which if the one dies, the other one will be left, and if the other dies, then the one will be left.*
- R. *But what is there to say, if her co-wife dies while the rite is half done, and it will turn out retrospectively that he will have carried out the rite while possessing two houses?*
- S. *Well, if he say that she was about to die, he would immediately enter the synagogue and so validate the divorce retroactively.*
- T. *Objected R. Assi, and some say, R. Avira, "Well, what about the case of two levirate widows of one brother? Would it not be the rule that they should not be married by the same surviving brother-in-law?" [Deu. 25:9 states that the brother that survives has to build up his brother's house; house means wife, and therefore a single brother could not enter levirate marriage with two surviving widows.]*

- U. [Not at all,] because Scripture twice makes reference to “his sister-in-law,” meaning that levirate marriage applies even to two sisters-in-law who survive a childless husband.”
- V. Then a betrothed woman should not marry her levir! [If house means wife, why should the betrothed sister-in-law have to enter levirate marriage at all, since she is not yet the wife?]
- W. The reference of Scripture to “abroad” encompasses the betrothed women within the levirate rule.

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

- B. **A high priest makes an offering while he is in the status of one who has yet to bury his dead, though he may not eat the priestly portion while in that status [M. Hor 3:5B/T. Hor. 2:1].**
- C. R. Judah says, “All day.”
- D. *What is the meaning of “All day”?*
- E. Said Raba, “It is required to indicate that he is to be brought from his house” [to preoccupy him and distract him from his grief (Jung)].
- F. *Said to him Abbaye, “Now, from the perspective of R. Judah, we even remove him from the sanctuary, in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘If he was standing and making offerings on the altar and heard that he had suffered a bereavement, he leaves his labor and goes out of the sanctuary,’ the words of R. Judah. R. Yosé says, ‘He finishes,’ and you have said, they bring him from his family to the altar?!”*
- G. Rather, said Raba, “*What is the meaning of ‘All day’?* [14A] *It means that he does not perform an act of service that entire day, as a precautionary decree lest he eat [what in his present status he is forbidden from eating; after burial he may eat his share of the offerings].”*
- H. Said R. Ada bar Ahbah to Raba, “But does R. Judah invoke the precautionary decree on the basis of such a possibility of his eating? And have we not learned in the Mishnah: **R. Judah says, “Also: they appoint another woman as a substitute for his wife, lest his wife die, since it says, ‘And he shall make atonement for himself and for his house’ (Lev. 16: 6). ‘His house’ — this refers to his wife. But if his wife dies, he may perform the service on the same day, and R. Judah does not introduce the possibility of a precautionary decree lest he eat!”**
- I. *He said to him, “But how are the cases parallel? In that case, since it is the Day of Atonement, on which no one in the world is going to eat anyhow, he also is not likely to end up eating anything. But in the present case, in which everybody in the world is eating anyhow, he may very well end up eating!”*
- J. *But under such conditions, do the restrictions that pertain to one who has suffered a bereavement and not yet buried his dead apply to him anyhow, since, so far as the wife is concerned, she is divorced from him!*
- K. *While mourning rites would not be obligatory, in any event he would certainly be upset [and not in a proper mood of rejoicing to eat his share of sacrificial meat].*

The tractate commences with a rather majestic exercise in comparison and contrast, with special attention to the rites comparable to the one at hand, on which the high priest is separated from his household for a preparatory period. A sequence of comparisons, I:1-4, 5;, then I:6-27, execute the required work of detailed comparison. The aim is to prove that the present rite is unique and beyond comparison with any other. Only with II:1-7 do we turn to the specific allegations of the Mishnah and conduct an exegesis of the statements therein. III:1-2 proceed along these same exegetical lines. Then, III:3-23, a separate topical appendix intrudes, on the reason for the destruction of the Second Temple. The proximate reason for the insertion is at the opening unit, but the whole moves in its own direction. The same pattern — exegesis, then topical appendix — is repeated at IV:1-2 and IV:3-10. The remainder of the Talmud is exegetical in character.

1:2

- A. **All seven days he tosses the blood, offers up the incense, trims the lamp, and offers up the head and hind leg [of the daily whole offering].**
- B. **But on all other days, if he wanted to offer it up he offers it up. [And if not, not.]**
- C. **For a high priest offers up a portion at the head and takes a portion at the head [of the other priests].**

I.1 A. *Who is the Tannaite authority responsible for this rule?*

- B. *Said R. Hisda, “It is not in accord with R. Aqiba. For if it were in accord with R. Aqiba, lo, he has said, ‘A clean priest on whom fell some of the sprinkling of blood — it has made him unclean. In that case, how could he perform an act of priestly service?’*
- C. *“For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. *“““And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean” (Num. 19:19) — if the [purification water] was sprinkled “upon the unclean person” he shall be clean, and if it was sprinkled upon the clean person, he becomes unclean,” the words of R. Aqiba.*
- E. *“And sages say, ‘These statements are made only concerning matters that are susceptible to receive uncleanness.’” [Sprinkling affects what is susceptible to uncleanness; if the water is sprinkled upon what is not susceptible, it is misused; whatever is left of the water is invalid (Jung)].*
- F. *What is the point?*
- G. *It is as we have learned in the Mishnah: [If he intended to sprinkle] on the man, and he sprinkled on the cow, if there is [more purification water] on the hyssop, he should not repeat. [If he intended to sprinkle] on the cow, and he sprinkled on the man, if there is [more purification water] on the hyssop, he should repeat [M. Par. 12:3F-H].*
- H. *What is the Scriptural foundation for the position of R. Aqiba?*
- I. *The All-Merciful could as well have written, “And the clean person will sprinkle upon him,” so why say, “upon the unclean person”? That formulation of matters yields the proposition, if the [purification water] was sprinkled “upon the unclean*

person” he shall be clean, and if it was sprinkled upon the clean person, he becomes unclean.

J. *And rabbis?*

K. *This makes the point that sprinkling is to be done only upon what is susceptible to receive uncleanness.*

L. *But [the view that sprinkling could never impart uncleanness, which is the position of sages] derives from an argument a fortiori, namely: if the result of sprinkling upon an unclean person is that he becomes clean, if sprinkling is done upon a clean person, is it not an argument a fortiori that he should remain clean?*

M. *And R. Aqiba?*

N. *That is in line with what Solomon said, “I said, I will get wisdom, but it is far from me” (Qoh. 7:23). [No logic applies.]*

O. *And rabbis?*

P. *They deem the verse to speak of a different fact, namely, the man who sprinkles that water, and the man on whom it is sprinkled, are clean, but one who otherwise touches it is unclean.”*

Q. *But is the one who sprinkles purification water clean? And has it not been written, “And he who sprinkles the purification water shall wash his cloths” (Num. 19:21). [Therefore he is presumably unclean.]*

R. *What is the meaning of “who sprinkles...”? It is, “who touches.”*

S. *But is it not written explicitly, “He who sprinkles is required to wash his clothes” (Num. 19:21), but “he who touches” is not required to wash his clothes!*

T. *Rather, frame matters as follows: what is the meaning of “who sprinkles...”? It is, “he who carries.”*

U. *Then why not write, “he who carries”?*

V. *It is to imply that [one is made unclean only] if he carries the requisite volume of water that is required for sprinkling.*

W. *That reply forms no problem to one who maintains that the valid act of sprinkling requires a fixed amount of water, but from the viewpoint of him who says that it does not require a fixed volume of water, what is there to be said?*

X. *Even from the viewpoint of him who says that it does not require a fixed volume of water, that opinion pertains to the one who is sprinkled, but in regard to the utensil, a fixed volume of water is required. For so we have learned in the Mishnah: **How much must be in the water for it to be sufficient for sprinkling? Enough so that one may dip [14B] the tips of the buds and sprinkle. [R. Judah says, “They regard them [the buds] as though they were on a hyssop of brass which absorbs no water]” [M. Par. 12:5C-E].** That is in line with what Solomon said, “I said, I will get wisdom, but it was far from me” (Qoh. 7:23).*

Y. *Abbaye said, “You may even maintain that it is R. Aqiba. The high priest performs acts of service all day long, in the evening he is sprinkled, then he immerses and awaits sunset to complete the purification process [so he would be cultically clean at night and can officiate the next day, and he days the same in sequence].”*

II.1 A. ...offers up the incense, trims the lamp, and offers up the head and hind leg [of the daily whole offering]:

- B. *It follows that the offering of the incense comes first, and trimming the lamps afterward. And by contrast: Those who had won the right to remove the ashes of the inner altar and of the candlestick would go first [M. Tam. 3:6A]; He who won [the right to offer] the incense did take the spoon [M. Tam. 5:4A].*
- C. *Said R. Huna, “Who is the Tannaite authority responsible for tractate Tamid? It is R. Simeon of Mispeh.”*
- D. *But lo, we have heard the very opposite, for we have learned in the Mishnah: [He who effects the act of slaughter stands in the east with his face to the west. And that [daily whole offering] of the dawn was slaughtered at the northwestern corner, at the second ring. That [daily whole offering] of twilight was slaughtered at the northeastern corner [of the altar], at the second ring. The slaughterer slaughtered. The one who receives the blood received the blood. He came to the northeastern corner. He tosses [the blood] in a northeasterly direction. [Then he came to the southwestern corner. He tosses the blood in a southwesterly direction. The residue of the blood did he pour out on the southern base of the altar] [M. Tam. 4:1E-N]. And a Tannaite statement in that regard is as follows: R. Simeon of Mispeh repeats in connection with Tamid the following revision: As he came to the northeastern corner, he sprinkled it to the east and to the north; as he came to the southwestern corner, he sprinkled it to the west and then to the south.*
- E. *Rather, said R. Yohanan, “Who is the Tannaite authority behind the order of the rite that is set forth in tractate Yoma? It is R. Simeon of Mispeh.”*
- F. *But then contrast the order set forth in tractate Yoma with an account of the order set forth in that same tractate at another passage, for we have learned in the Mishnah: The second lot: (1) Who slaughters the animal, (2) who tosses the blood, (3) who clears the ashes off the inner altar, (4) who clears the ashes off the candelabrum...The third lot: “Those who are new to the burning of the incense, come and draw lots” [M. Yoma 2:3-4]. [The incense is offered after the lamps were trimmed, by contrast to our Mishnah’s rule.]*
- G. *Said Abbaye, “There really is no contradiction between the two passages, the one speaks of trimming the two lamps, the other, trimming the five lamps.” [First came a trimming, then incense, then another trimming.]*
- H. *Is that to imply that burning the incense interrupts the process? And lo, Abbaye himself was setting forth the order of the daily Temple service in the name of a tradition, and in that version, he has the trimming of the lamps interrupted by the blood of the daily whole offering!*
- I. *Say: no problem, the one represents the position of Abba Saul, the other, that of rabbis, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- J. *He should not trim the lamps and then burn the incense, but he should burn the incense first and then trim the lamps.*
- K. *Abba Saul says, “He trims and then burns.”*
- L. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of Abba Saul?*

- M. It is written, ““Every morning, when he trims the lamps” (Exo. 30: 7), followed by, “He shall burn it” (Exo. 30: 7).
- N. *And sages?*
- O. *What is the sense of the All-Merciful’s statement here? [15A] At the time the lamps are being trimmed, the incense should still be burning. For if you do not take that view, then as to twilight, concerning which it is written, “And when Aaron lights the lamps at dusk, he shall burn it” (Exo. 30: 8), here too, is it the fact that first he lights the lamps and then he offers the incense that is owing for dusk?*
- P. *And should you say, indeed so — has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- Q. “From evening to morning” (Exo. 27:21) — supply a sufficient volume of oil so it may burn all night, from evening to morning; or, reading matters otherwise, “From evening to morning” — there is no service that is rightly conducted from evening to morning except for this one [the lighting of the lamps]. [Jung/Rashi: no other service is proper from the time they have been lit in the evening until the following morning.]
- R. *Rather, what is the sense of the All-Merciful?* It is that, at the time of lighting the lamps, incense should still be burned, *and here too*, at the time of the trimming, there should still be incense burning.
- S. And Abba Saul?
- T. He will say to you, “That case is exceptional, since Scripture emphasizes, “it” [Exo. 37:32; only this may be done from evening to morning, not other aspect of the liturgy.]
- U. *Said R. Pappa, “There really is no contradiction between the two passages, the one represents rabbis, the other, the view of Abba Saul.”*
- V. *So how do you settle matters? It is that the passage of the Mishnah that is before us here represents the position of rabbis, and the passage of the Mishnah that deals with the lottery speaks for Abba Saul? Then note what follows: **They brought him the daily whole offering. He cut [the windpipe and gullet], and another priest completed the slaughtering on his behalf. He received the blood and tossed it. He went in to offer up the incense offering of the morning, to trim the lamps, and to offer up the head and limbs, Baked Cakes, and wine [M. Yoma 3:5]. So that accords with the position of rabbis! Then are we left with the anomaly that the beginning and the end of the passage accord with sages, but the middle with Abba Saul?***
- W. *R. Pappa may say to you, “Yes, indeed, the beginning and the end of the passage accord with sages, but the middle with Abba Saul.”*
- X. *Well, now, there is no problem understanding why Abbaye has not taken the position of R. Pappa, since, from his viewpoint, he does not care to emerge with the strange result that the beginning and the end of the passage accord with sages, but the middle with Abba Saul. But from R. Pappa’s perspective, how come he does not accord with the position of Abbaye?*

- Y. *He will say to you, "Would the Tannaite authority first of all repeat the rule governing the trimming of two lamps and only later on that for five lamps? [The five lamps were trimmed before the two.]"*
- Z. *And Abbaye?*
- AA. *He will say to you, "First he teaches the rule in a general context, covering the obligation of the high priest to be taken up with the rites for seven days; later on, he goes into detail to describe the actual order of the service."*

- II.2.** A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing: He came to the northeastern corner. He tosses [the blood] in a northeasterly direction. [Then he came to the southwestern corner. He tosses the blood in a southwesterly direction. The residue of the blood did he pour out on the southern base of the altar] [M. Tam. 4:1E-N]. And a Tannaite statement in that regard is as follows: R. Simeon of Mispheh repeats in connection with Tamid the following revision: As he came to the northeastern corner, he sprinkled it to the east and to the north; as he came to the southwestern corner, he sprinkled it to the west and then to the south.*
- B. *What is the Scriptural basis for the position of R. Simeon of Mispheh?*
 - C. *Said R. Yohanan in the name of one of the members of the household of R. Yannai, "Said Scripture, 'And one he goat for a sin offering unto the Lord, it shall be offered in addition to the continual burnt offering and the drink offering thereof' (Num. 28:15). So it is a burnt offering, and the All-Merciful [juxtaposing it to a sin offering] has said, 'Perform with it the rite of the sin offering.' How so? One flicks the blood with a single gesture that yields two drops of blood, just as is the case with the burnt offering, and he tosses two separate drops of blood, as is the case with the sin offering."*
 - D. *Well, why not have him sprinkle two drops that yield four, as in the rite of the burnt offering, and four that yield four, as in the rite of the sin offering?*
 - E. *But do we find any case in the sprinkling of blood in which half of the blood is sprinkled as is that of the sin offering and half as is that of the burnt offering? You must then concede that it is Scripture that has treated them as analogous.*
 - F. *Here too, then, must we concede that it is Scripture that has treated them as analogous?*
 - G. *There it is a case of just splitting the sprinkling [Jung: without any evidence that this is made after the manner of a sin offering, since both are made in one corner].*
 - H. *Well, then, why not place one that yields two drops below, in accord with the ritual of the burnt offering, and two that yield two above, in accord with the ritual of the sin offering?*
 - I. *We do not find any case of sprinkling the sacrificial blood upon the altar, in which half of the blood is tossed above the red line around the altar, and the other half below.*

- J. *Well, now, we don't, don't we? Well, then, how is it possible that we learn in the Mishnah: **Then he sprinkled some [of the blood], one time upwards and seven times downwards...But [he did it] like one who cracks a whip [M. Yoma 5:3C-E]**?*
- K. *What is the meaning of **like one who cracks a whip**?*
- L. *R. Judah showed it by imitating a whip-cracker. [The seven drops were all sprinkled downwards; this is not a relevant exception.]*
- M. *But do we not find any case of sprinkling the sacrificial blood upon the altar, in which half of the blood is tossed above the red line around the altar, and the other half below? And have we not learned in the Mishnah: **He tossed the blood on the top of the altar seven times [M. Yoma 5:6A]**? Doesn't this mean that this was on the middle of the altar [in front], as people say, "The noon light shines," meaning "the middle of the day"?*
- N. *Said Rabbah bar Shila, "No, **[15B]** it means, the top of the altar itself, in line with the usage of the same words in the verse, 'And the like of the very heaven for clearness' (Exo. 24:10)."*
- II.3.** A. *How come the first sprinkling is done as is done with the burnt offering and afterwards as done with the sin offering? Let him sprinkle first as done with the sin offering and then as is done with the burnt offering?*
- B. *Since it is a burnt offering, it comes first.*
- II.4.** A. *And how come he sprinkles from the northeast to the southwest corners of the altar? Let him sprinkle southeast and then northwest?*
- B. *Say: the burnt offering blood has to be sprinkled on a place on the altar below which there is a projecting base [Jung], and the southeastern corner of the altar has no such base.*
- II.5.** A. *And how come he sprinkles first of all at the northeastern corner and then at the southwestern corner? Let him sprinkle first at the southwestern corner and then at the northeastern corner?*
- B. *It is because a master has said, "Every turn that you make in the Temple must be to the right, the east," so he comes first to the northeast. [Cf. M. Zeb. 6:3A: **Whoever goes up to the altar goes up on the right [=east side] and makes a circuit and goes down on the left**].*
- II.6.** A. *How do we know that it is the burnt offering that the All-Merciful specifies is to be offered up in the manner of a sin offering? Maybe it is the sin offering that the Torah maintains is to be offered up in the manner of the burnt offering?*
- B. *Don't let the thought enter your mind! For it is written, "in addition to the continual burnt offering and the drink offering thereof" (Num. 28:15). Now what is it that the All-Merciful has said? Apply the rules of the sin offering to the burnt offering.*
- II.7.** A. *We have learned in the Mishnah there: **The superintendent said to them, "Go and bring a lamb from the lamb office."** Now lo, the lamb office was located at the northwestern corner. And there were four*

offices there: (1) one was the lamb office; (2) and one was the seal office; (3) and one was the hearth office; (4) and one was the office in which they would prepare the show bread [M. **Tam. 3:3**]. *And by contrast:* Four offices were in the room of the hearth, like cells opening into a hall, two in the sanctuary, two in unconsecrated ground, and flagstones' ends made a border between what was consecrated [in the area of the courtyard] and what was unconsecrated [north of the room of the hearth]. And what were their purposes? That on the southwestern side was the office for the lamb offerings. [16A] That on the southeastern side was the office for those who make the shew-bread. In that on the northeastern side did the Hasmoneans put away the stones of the altar which had been rendered abominations by the kings of Greece. Through that on the northwestern side do they go down to the room for immersion [M. **Mid. 1:6**].

- B. *Said R. Huna, "Who is the Tannaite authority who is responsible for tractate Middot? It is R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for we have learned in the Mishnah: The women's courtyard was one hundred thirty-five cubits in length by one hundred thirty-five cubits in breadth. And there were four offices at each of its four corners, each forty cubits square....And what was their purpose? That in the southeastern corner was the office of the Nazirites, in which the Nazirites cook their peace offerings, shave off their hair, which they throw under the pot [Num. 6:18, M. **Naz. 6:8**]. That in the northeastern corner was the office in charge of the wood supply, in which the priests who are blemished examine the wood [for worms]. And any piece of wood in which a worm is found is invalid for use on the altar. That on the northwestern corner was the office of the lepers. That in the southwestern corner — said R. Eliezer b. Jacob, "I forget what its purpose was." Abba Saul says, "There did they keep the wine and oil." It was called the office of the oil room [M. **Mid. 2:5A-O**]. And it certainly stands to reason that it is R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for we have learned in the Mishnah: All the walls which were there were high, except the eastern wall [of the Temple mount] [Eze. 40: 5]. For the priest who burns the red cow stands at the top of the Mount of Olives and takes his direction, looking directly at the door of the heikhal at the time of the tossing of blood [M. **Mid. 2:4**], and we have further learned in the Mishnah: All of the entrances and gates which were there were twenty cubits high and ten cubits wide, except for that of the porch [M. **Mid. 2:3**]. And we have learned in the Mishnah: Inside it [the Temple mount, surrounding the inner area which contained the women's court and the Temple court] is a latticed railing, ten handbreadths high [M. **Mid. 2:3A**]. And we have learned in the Mishnah: Inside it is the rampart, ten cubits [wide].. And there were twelve steps there [leading up from the rampart to the women's courtyard]. The height of each step is a half-cubit, and its tread, a half-cubit. All the steps which were there [within the Temple mount]*

were a half a cubit in height and a half-cubit in tread, except for those of the porch [which had a tread of a cubit] [M. Mid. 2:3Eff]. *[Further:]* And fifteen steps go up from it to the Israelite courtyard [M. 2:5Q]. These go down from the Israelites' courtyard to the women's courtyard, each step's height and depth being half a cubit, *and we have learned in the Mishnah, R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, "There was a step, a cubit high, and the platform [for the Levites] was set on it, and on it were three [more] steps, each a half cubit high" [M. Mid. 2:6F].* Now, *if you maintain that the anonymous statements represent throughout the opinion of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, then you can understand the statements we have cited, since, from his perspective, the door is concealed [Jung: by the height of the steps], but if you hold it is in accord with rabbis, there would be left a half-cubit through which the door would be visible. So does that not prove that R. Eliezer b. Jacob is the authority behind the anonymous statements of this tractate?*

- C. *Said R. Adda bar Ahba, "It is R. Judah. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, 'The altar stood at the very middle of the Temple court [half to the north, half to the south]. It was thirty two cubits square, ten cubits [16B] faced the door of the inner sanctum, eleven cubits on either side thereof, so that the altar was exactly opposite the inner sanctum.'"* [Jung: The inside of the Temple was twenty cubits, the walls were six cubits in depth, and the height of the altar was nine cubits, to which must be added the thirteen and a half cubits rise in the level of the court of the Israelites, where the altar stood, making a total of twenty-two and a half cubits, thus the altar would hide the Temple door, hence the lower eastern wall].
- D. *Now, if you should imagine that the authority for tractate Middot is in accord with R. Judah, how could the altar have stood in the center of the Temple? Have we not learned in the Mishnah: 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. From north to south was one hundred thirty-five: the ramp and the altar, sixty-two, from the altar to the rings, eight cubits, the area of the rings, twenty-four, from the rings to the tables, four, from the tables to the small pillars, four, from the small pillars to the wall of the courtyard, eight cubits, and the remainder [twenty-five cubits] was between the ramp and the wall and [in] the place of the pillars [M. Mid. 5:1-2]. But if you should imagine that tractate Middot is the work of R. Judah, how could the altar have stood in the center of the Temple? Lo, the larger part of the altar lies towards the south! [17A] Does it not follow that the authority behind the anonymous statements of tractate Middot is R. Eliezer b. Jacob?*

E. *It certainly does follow.*

II.8. A. R. Ada b. R. Isaac said, “That cell [the cell of the lambs] was removed from both corners [Jung: situated on the west side, it extended from north to south, though removed from both extremities], so that if someone came from the north, it appeared to him to lie at the south, and if someone came from the south, it appeared to him to lie at the north. But it stands to reason that it lay more to the southwest. How so? It is because we contrast two statements that are made with reference to the cell of the showbread and review the answer given by R. Huna b. R. Joshua, that one master regards it as lying to the right, the other to the left.

[17B] Now, if you maintain that it lay in the southwestern corner, it makes sense that he answers the objections that derive from the contrast in the two statements about the showbread; but if you say it lay in the northwestern corner, then what sense is there in the answer about the showbread? Should we not then infer that it lay in the southwestern corner? [Jung: At Tamid the cell of the lambs is in the northwest, and counting toward the right, the cell of the seals would be in the southwest, the cell of the fireplace in the southeast, and the cell of the showbread in the northeast. But in Middot, the cell of the showbread is in the southeast. Huna then says, the Tannaite authority of Middot counts from the right, and the one in Tamid counts from the left. If we say that the Tannaite authority of Tamid, who says the cell of the lambs lay in the northwestern corner, admits that it lay more to the southwest but appeared to lie to the northwest, and he started counting from the southwest, that will explain the contradictory statements in Tamid and Middot; but if you say that his statement, the cell of lambs lay in the northwestern corner, is to be taken literally, there is no sense in the answer, for even if one counted towards the left, that cell would be lying in the southwestern corner.]

B. *It certainly is the correct inference to be drawn.*

C. But the master has said, “Every turn that you make in the Temple must be to the right, the east”!

D. *That is the case when it comes to the rites of the Temple, but here the statement concerns only the measurements.*

III.1 A. For a high priest offers up a portion at the head and takes a portion at the head of the other priests:

B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. **How does the high priest take first place in offering a portion?**

D. He says, “This burnt offering I am going to offer,” “This meal offering I am going to offer.”

E. **How does the high priest take a portion at the head of the other priests [M. Yoma 1:2C]?**

- F. He says, “This sin-offering is mine for the eating,” “This guilt-offering is mine for the eating,” “One loaf of the two loaves, four or five loaves of the Show Bread [are mine].”
- G. Rabbi says, “Under all circumstances it is five, as it is said, “And what is left of the cereal-offering shall be for Aaron and for his sons’ (Lev. 2:10) — that Aaron should be equivalent to his sons [and get half].” [T. adds: [Under what circumstances? In the case of Holy Things of the Temple. But in the case of Holy Things of the provinces, all the same are the high priest and the ordinary priest: each gets an equal portion] [T. **Yoma 1:5**].

- III.2.** A. *Now there is an internal contradiction in the body of the foregoing. First you say, **One loaf of the two loaves**, so who is the authority behind the ruling? It must be Rabbi, who has said that he takes half. But then note what follows in the middle clause: **four or five loaves of the Show Bread [are mine]**. Now, that accords with the position of rabbis, who say that he does not take half. And then note what comes at the end: **Under all circumstances it is five**. So are we supposed to conclude that the opening and closing clauses belong to Rabbi, and the intervening one to rabbis?*
- B. *Said Abbaye, “No, it is that the opening and middle clauses belong to rabbis, and rabbis concede in the case of the broken bread that it is not really a proper thing to hand over to the high priest a piece of bread.”*
 - C. **[18A]** *And what is the meaning of **four or five loaves of the Show Bread [are mine]**?*
 - D. *From the viewpoint of rabbis, who say, [If a day intervened between a festival-day and a Sabbath, the priestly watch which was scheduled for that time took ten loaves, and the one that stayed back [in the Temple] took two. And on all other days of the year,] the entering priestly watch took six, and the one going off duty took six. [R. Judah says, “The one coming on duty takes seven, and the one going off duty takes five.”] [M. **Suk. 5:8A-B**], and for the locking of the gates there is no fee at all, the division covers the twelve loaves [not half of them, as Rabbi maintains]. Take off one from half, leaving five. But from the perspective of R. Judah, who says, **The one coming on duty takes seven, and the one going off duty takes five**, two are for the locking of the gates, and the outgoing division takes five, leaving a division for ten loaves; now if you take one off the half, he takes four.*
 - E. *Raba said, “The entire passage conforms to the view of Rabbi. He accepts the view of R. Judah.*
 - F. *But what is the sense of “four”? He should take five!*
 - G. *No problem. In the one case, there is a priestly watch that has delayed in the sanctuary [staying over for the Sabbath when the Festival requires doing so], the other speaks of a case in which no priestly watch has stayed over. If a priestly watched has stayed over, he would take four of them, since the division would cover eight loaves; if no priestly watch has stayed over, he ought to divide ten, and the division covers ten loaves, so he would take five.*
 - H. *Sure, sure, but Rabbi’s exact language is, **Under all circumstances it is five!***
 - I. *That in fact is an unsolved problem.*

I:1 conducts a routine inquiry into the authority behind an anonymous rule. II:1 proceeds to a more complex problem, bringing the present rule into alignment with the intersecting ones. III:1 then presents a Tannaite gloss. It is only in the second division that our talmud pursues an essentially independent exegetical problem, that is, an inquiry into facts and theories, not sources and authorities.

1:3-4

1:3

- A. They handed over to him elders belonging to the court, and they read for him the prescribed rite of the day [of atonement].
- B. And they say to him, “My lord, high priest, you read it with your own lips,
- C. “lest you have forgotten — or never [even] learned it to begin with.”
- D. On the eve of the Day of Atonement at dawn they set him up at the eastern gate and bring before him bullocks, rams, and sheep,
- E. so that he will be informed and familiar with the service.

1:4

- A. All seven days they did not hold back food or drink from him.
- B. [But] on the eve of the Day of Atonement at dusk they did not let him eat much,
- C. for food brings on sleep.

I.1 A. [“lest you have forgotten — or never [even] learned it to begin with:”] *There is no difficulty with the consideration, lest you have forgotten . But as to the consideration, or never [even] learned it to begin with — would such a person ever have been appointed to begin with? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “The anointed priest: ‘Now the priest who is greater than his brothers’ (Lev. 21:10) — greater in beauty, power, wisdom, and wealth [and so is ineligible for poverty.]”
- C. Others say, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that if he has nothing to begin with, they provide him with whatever belongs to his brothers? Scripture states, ‘Now the priest who is greater than his brothers, upon whose head the oil of anointing is poured’ (Lev. 21:10) — they build him up beyond his brothers” [cf. T. **Kip. 1:6**].
- D. *Said R. Joseph, “There is no contradiction here. The one speaks of the first sanctuary, the other, or the second. For said R Assi, ‘A big basket of denars did Martha daughter of Boethus give King Yannai .in exchange for appointing Joshua b. Gamla to the high priesthood.’”*

II.1. A. On the eve of the Day of Atonement at dawn they set him up at the eastern gate and bring before him bullocks, rams, and sheep, so that he will be informed and familiar with the service:

- B. *A Tannaite statement:*
- C. Also the he-goats.
- D. *Then how come our Tannaite authority did not formulate matters to include the he-goats?*

- E. *Since they are presented on account of sin, including them in the review might discourage the high priest.*
- F. *Sure, sure, but if so, then the bullock too is a problem, since it is presented on account of sin!*
- G. *As to the bullock, since it comes on his account and on account of his brothers, the other priests, if someone among his brothers, the other priests, has some fault, he would know it and call him back to repent.*
- H. *But wouldn't he know that with every Israelite?*
- I. *Said Rabina, "That's what the popular saying means, 'If your sister's son has been appointed sheriff, watch out not to walk in front of him in the marketplace.'"*

III.1 A. All seven days they did not hold back food or drink from him. [But] on the eve of the Day of Atonement at dusk they did not let him eat much, for food brings on sleep:

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *R. Judah b. Neqosa says, "They feed him cakes of fine flour and eggs, so as to induce defecation."*
- D. *They said to him, "All the more so will you make him hot."*

III.2. A. It has been taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. *Sumkhos said in the name of R. Meir, "They don't feed him citron, eggs, or wine."*
- C. *And some say, "Citron, eggs, or fat meat or vintage wine."*
- D. *And some say, "Also not white wine," because white wine provokes uncleanness [e.g., seminal emissions].*

III.3. A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. *To explain the seminal emission of someone who may or may not have become a zab [afflicted with the uncleanness described at Lev. 15], one may appeal to his having eaten food or too many kinds of food.*
- C. *Eleazar b. Pinhas says in the name of R. Judah b. Betera, "They do not feed him milk, cheese, eggs or wine, or soup of pounded beans or fat meat or muries or any other food that may provoke seminal emission."*
- D. *What does that latter phrase encompass?*
- E. *It is meant to encompass that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. *Five things provoke seminal emission in a man and these are they: garlic, [18B] pepperwort, purslane, eggs, and garden rocket.*

III.4. A. "And one went out into the field to gather herbs" (2Ki. 4:39) —

- B. *A Tannaite statement in the name of R. Meir: "This refers to garden-rocket."*
- C. *Said R. Yohanan, "Why are they called 'herbs' with a word built on the letters for 'light'? Because they enlighten the eyes."*

III.5. A. Said R. Huna, "He who comes across garden rocket — if he can eat it, he should eat it, and if not, he should at least rub it into his eyes."

- B. *Said R. Pappa, "That refers to rocket growing on the balk" [Jung].*

- III.6.** A. Said R. Giddal said Rab, “A guest should not eat eggs or sleep in the clothing of his host.”
- B. *When Rab would come to Darshish, he would make a public announcement, “Who wants to be my wife for today?”*
- C. *When R. Nahman would come to Shekunsib, he would make a public announcement, “Who wants to be my wife for today?”*
- D. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. **R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “A man should not marry a woman in one province and go and marry a woman in another, lest the two produce children who might marry one another, so that a brother might marry his sister, so the whole world will be filled up with mamzerim. In regard to such a case, it is stated in Scripture, ‘And the land became full of lewdness’ (Lev. 19:29)” [T. Qid. 1:4F-G].**
- F. *Well, rabbis are exceptional, since what they do is pretty well known.*
- G. But didn’t Raba say, “If one has proposed that a marriage to a woman be consummated and she consents, she has to wait for seven clean days [so that the first act of sexual relations will not take place during her period]”?
- H. But didn’t Raba say, “If a woman has been sought in marriage and agrees, she has to allow seven cultically clean days to go by” [so how can rabbis marry on the day they come to town]?
- I. *Rabbis would send out messengers and let people know that they were coming. If you prefer, I’ll say, “rabbis would only remain alone with the women [but would not have sexual relations with them], for a master has said, “He who has bread in the basket [even if he doesn’t eat it] is not the same as he who has no bread in his basket.”*
- I:1 asks an obvious question of Mishnah-exegesis. II:1 clarifies the formulation of the Mishnah’s rule. III:1, 2 gloss the Mishnah’s rule, and the rest is added as a topical appendix.

1:5-6

1:5

- A. **The elders of the court handed him over to the elders of the priesthood,**
- B. **who brought him up to the upper chamber of Abtinah.**
- C. **And they imposed an oath on him and took their leave and went along.**
- D. **[This is what] they said to him, “My lord, high priest: We are agents of the court, and you are our agent and agent of the court.**
- E. **“We abjure you by Him who caused his name to rest upon this house, that you will not vary in any way from all which we have instructed you.”**
- F. **He turns aside and weeps.**
- G. **And they turn aside and weep.**

1:6

- A. **If he was a sage, he expounds [the relevant Scriptures].**
- B. **And if not, disciples of sages expound for him.**

- C. If he was used to reading [Scriptures], he read.
- D. And if not, they read for him.
- E. And what do they read for him?
- F. In Job, Ezra, and Chronicles.
- G. Zekhariah b. Qebutal says, "Many times I read for him in the book of Daniel."

I.1 A. [19A] [who brought him up to the upper chamber of Abtinah:] *A Tannaite statement:*

- B. It was to teach him how to take the handful of incense.

I.2. A. Said R. Pappa, "The high priests had two rooms, one, the chamber of the counsellors, the other, the chamber of the household of Abtinah, one at the north, the other at the south."

- B. one at the north, *as we have learned in the Mishnah*: Six offices were in the courtyard, three in the north and three in the south. Those in the north: the office in charge of salt, the Parvah office, the office for rinsing. The office in charge of salt: there did they put salt on the offering. The Parvah office: there did they salt the hides of Holy Things, and on its roof was the room for immersion for the high priest on the Day of Atonement. The office for rinsing: for there did they rinse the innards of the Holy Things, and from there did a passageway go up to the roof of the Parvah office. Those in the south: the office made of wood, the office for the Exile, the office made of hewn stone. The office made of wood — said R. Eliezer b. Jacob, "I forgot what purpose it served" — Abba Saul says, "It is the office of the high priest, and it was behind the other two, and the roof of all three of them was on the same level." The office for the exile: there was a permanent cistern, and a wheel was placed on it, and from there did they draw water for the whole courtyard. The office made of hewn stone: there the great Sanhedrin of Israel was in session, And it judged the priesthood. And a priest in whom was found a cause of invalidation dresses himself in black clothing and cloaks himself in a black cloak and departs and goes his way. And he in whom no cause of invalidation was found dresses himself in white clothing and cloaks himself in a white cloak and goes in and serves with his brethren, the priests. And a festival day did they declare, for a cause of invalidation had not been found in the seed of Aaron the priest. And thus did they say, "Blessed is the Omnipresent, blessed be he, that a cause of invalidation has not been found in the seed of Aaron [M. [Mid. 5:3-4](#)].

- C. the other at the south, *as we have learned in the Mishnah*: Seven gates were in the courtyard: three at the north, three at the south, and one at the east. That on the south was the gate for kindling, next to it, the gate for the firstlings, next to that, the gate for water. And that on the east is the gate of Nicanor. And it had two offices, one at the right, one at the left. One was the office of Pinhas, the keeper of the vestments, and one was the office of those who make the baked cakes. And that on the north is the gate of the flame. And it was like a portico, with an upper room built on it, through which the priests keep watch from above, and the Levites from below. And it

had a door opening out to the rampart. Next to it was the gate of the offering, and next to that, the [gate of] the room of the hearth [M. **Tam. 1:4-5**].

- D. *And it has further been taught on Tannaite authority: Five acts of immersion, and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet, does the high priest carry out on that day. And all of them are in the sanctuary at the Parvah chamber, except for this one alone [M. **Yoma. 3:3B-C**].* which was on unconsecrated ground, on top of the gate that was beside his own cell.
- E. *[Pappa proceeds,] “But I don’t know whether the room of the counsellors was to the north and the room of the house of Abtinah to the south, or whether the room of the house of Abtinah was to the north and the room of the counsellors to the south. But it stands to reason that the room of the counsellors was to the south. How come? He would get up every morning during the seven days, defecate, immerse, and go to the north and study how to take the handful of incense. Then he would go to the sanctuary and perform his act of service all day long; towards evening he would be sprinkled and then immerse and take his rest. But if you say that the room of the counsellors was at the north, then he would get up in the morning defecate, go to the south, immerse, study incense-taking, come to the sanctuary and perform acts of service all day long, and then toward evening they would sprinkle on him, and then he would go to the south and immerse. So he would have to return and go to the north to rest. But would they impose such an additional burden of progress on him?”*
- F. *But why not impose such a burden on him?*
- G. *The reason is that, if he is a Sadducee, he will give up the rite [since the Sadducees believed the rite could not be performed by someone who was in the status of one who had immersed and waited for sunset for the completion of the rite of purification, while the Pharisees believed that it could. Sprinkling with the purification water made the high priest unclean; he then immersed, so as to be fit for the rite the next day. But this left him unclean in the status of one who has to await sunset for the completion of his rite of purification, which would take place only on the following evening.]*
- H. *Or, also, it would have been so as not to permit him to become too overbearing.*
- I. *For if you don’t take this position, then, why not put the two rooms side by side, or let him suffice with one room!*

II.1 A. **[And they imposed an oath on him and took their leave and went along. [This is what] they said to him,] “My lord, high priest: [We are agents of the court, and you are our agent and agent of the court. “We abjure you by Him who caused his name to rest upon this house, that you will not vary in any way from all which we have instructed you:”:**

- B. *May we say that this represents a refutation of the position of R. Huna b. R. Joshua, for R. Huna b. R. Joshua said, namely: “The priests serve as the agents the All-Merciful,” for if it should enter your mind that they are our slaves, [19B] is there something that we could not do, but they have the power to do in our behalf?” [He is called “our agent,” and we could not make gestures while reciting the Shema, but this is permitted here (Jung).]*

- C. *This is what they say to him, “We impose an oath upon you according to our intentionality and in accord with the intentionality of the court” [and he is “our agent” in respect to the oath, he takes the oath in the context defined by those who impose it].*

III.1 A. He turns aside and weeps. And they turn aside and weep:

- B. **He turns aside and weeps: because they suspected him of being a Sadducee [T. Kip. 1:7C-D].**
- C. **And they turn aside and weep:** *for* said R. Joshua b. Levi, “He who casts suspicion on genuinely good people in the end will be smitten in his own body on that account.”

III.2. A. And what was the point of all of this? It was so that he would not arrange the outside and bring it inside in the manner of the Sadducees.

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority [in Tosefta’s version]:*
- C. **Because there already was the case of that certain Boethusian [Bavli: Sadducean], who arranged the incense while he was still outside, and offered it up inside [Tosefta: so the cloud of incense went forth and frightened the entire house].**
- D. [Bavli omits:] **For the Boethusian maintained that he should burn the incense while he is still outside, as it says, “And put the incense on the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat which is upon the testimony” (Lev. 16:13).**
- E. [Bavli omits:] **Sages said to them, “Now has it not also been stated,” And put the incense on the fire before the Lord”?**
- F. [Bavli omits:] **“From this it follows that whoever offers up incense offers up incense only inside.**
- G. [Bavli omits:] **“If so, why is it said,” The cloud of the incense may cover”?**
- H. [Bavli omits:] **“This teaches that he puts into it something which causes smoke to rise.**
- I. [Bavli omits:] **“If therefore he did not put in something which makes smoke rise, he is liable to the death penalty.”**
- J. **Now when this Boethusian went forth, he said to his fathers, “In your entire lives you would [merely] expound the Scripture, but you never did the deed properly, until I arose and I went in and did it right.” [Bavli: “All my life I was troubled by this Scriptural verse, ‘For I appear in the cloud upon the ark cover.’ I would say, When shall the chance come to me that I can fulfil that verse. Now the chance has come to me, so should I not fulfil it?”]**
- K. **They said to him, “Even though we do expound matters as you say, we do not do things in the way in which we expound them. We obey the words of sages. [Bavli: Although we are Sadducees, we are afraid of the Pharisees.”]**
- L. **“I shall be very much surprised at you if you live for very long.”**
- M. **Not thirty days passed before they put him into his grave [T. Kip. 1:7F-O].**
- N. [Bavli:] **His corpse was thrown into the dung heap and worms came forth from his nose.**
- O. **Some say: When he came out of the Holy of Holies, he was smitten.**

- P. *For R. Hiyya taught as a Tannaite statement, “A kind of a voice was heard in the Temple court, for an angel came and struck him down on his face, and he brothers, the other priests, came in and found the mark of a calf’s foot on his shoulder: ‘And their feet were straight feet, and the sole of their feet was like the sole of a calf’s foot’ (Eze. 1: 7).”*

IV.1 A. R. Zekhariah b. Qebutal says, “Many times I read for him in the book of Daniel:”

- B. *R. Hanan b. Raba repeated as a Tannaite statement to Hiyya bar Rab in the presence of Rab, “Said R. Zekhariah b. Qeputal...,” and Rab gestured to him with his hand that ut is Qebutal.*
- C. *And why not say so in so many words?*
- D. *He was reciting the Shema [and could not interrupt].*
- E. *But in such a situation is it permitted to make gestures in such a fashion? And did not R. Isaac bar Samuel bar Marta say, “He who recites the Shema should not make gestures by blinking with his eyes nor gesticulating with his lips nor pointing with his fingers.”*
- F. *And it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- G. *R. Eleazar Hisma says, “He who in the midst of reciting the Shema makes gestures by blinking with his eyes or gesticulating with his lips or pointing with his fingers — concerning him, Scripture says, ‘You have not called upon me, O Jacob’ (Isa. 43:22).”*
- H. *No problem, the one rule pertains to reciting only the first part of the Shema, the other to the second.*

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

- B. “And you shall speak of them” (Deu. 6: 6) — but not during the Prayer.
- C. “And you shall speak of them” (Deu. 6: 6) — “of them” you may speak, but not of other things.
- D. R. Aha says, “‘And you shall speak of them’ (Deu. 6: 6) — make them a fixed commitment, not a random matter.”
- E. Said Raba, “He who engages in idle chatter violates an affirmative commandment, as it is said, ‘And you shall speak of them’ — of them but not of other things.”
- F. R. Aha bar Jacob said, “He violates a negative commandment, as it is said, ‘All things toil to weariness, man cannot utter it’ (Qoh. 1: 8).”

I:1 supplies a minor gloss to the Mishnah-rule, which bears in its wake the sizable compilation at I:2. This places the issue into a broader framework. II:1 introduces its own question into the Mishnah-rule, which now serves as data for a free-standing inquiry. III:1, 2 explain the historical background behind the Mishnah’s rule. IV:1-2 form a discussion of a problem independent of the Mishnah’s interest.

1:7

- A. [If] he tried to doze off, young priests snap their middle fingers before him and say to him, “My lord, high priest: Stand up and drive off [sleep] by walking on the cold stones.”

B. And they would keep him busy until the time for the slaughter had come.

I.1 A. [middle finger:] *what is the meaning of the word used for “middle finger”?*

B. *Said R. Judah, “The use of the letters that yield ‘co-wife’ means that it is the rival of this one. What is it? that is, the thumb.”*

C. *R. Huna snapped his finger and the sound could be heard in the whole household of the master.*

II.1 A. “My lord, high priest: Stand up and drive off [sleep] by walking on the cold stones:”

B. *Said R. Isaac, “[Show us] something new. And what was it? They said to him, ‘Show us the way in which the prostration is done.’”*

III.1 A. And they would keep him busy until the time for the slaughter had come:

B. *A Tannaite statement:*

C. *They kept him busy neither with a harp nor with a lyre, but by singing. And what did they sing? ‘Unless the Lord builds the house, they work in vain that build it’ (Psa. 127: 1).”*

D. *The most distinguished families of Jerusalem did not go to sleep all that night, so that the high priest would hear the sounds of celebrating, so that sleep should not seize him.*

III.2. A. It has been taught on Tannaite authority:

B. *Abba Saul said, “Even in the provinces they would do the same as a memorial to the Temple, but in doing so, they sinned.”*

C. *Said Abbaye, and some say, R. Nahman bar Isaac interpreted matters, “That refers to Nehardea. For said Elijah to R. Judah brother of R. Sila the Pious, ‘You say, why has the Messiah not come! But lo, today is the Day of Atonement, and how many virgins have been fucked in Nehardea!’*

D. *“He said to him, ‘What did the Holy One, blessed be he, say?’*

E. *“He said to him, [20A] ““Sin crouches at the door” (Gen. 4: 7).”*

F. *““And what did Satan say?”*

G. *“He said to him, ‘On the Day of Atonement, Satan has no power to serve as prosecutor.’”*

H. *And how do we know that fact?*

I. *Said Rammi bar Hama, “The word for Satan in numerical values assigned to the letters adds up to 365, meaning, for 364 days of the solar year, he has the power to act as prosecutor, but on the Day of Atonement, Satan has no power to serve as prosecutor.”*

The systematic glosses are routine.

1:8

A. Every day they take up the ashes from the altar at the cock’s crow or near

B. whether before or after it.

C. At the Day of Atonement from midnight, and on festivals at the end of the first watch [they do so].

D. And never did the cock crow before the courtyard was filled with masses of Israelites.

I.1 A. *There we have learned in the Mishnah:*

B. Limbs which burst from off the altar,

C. [if this was] before midnight —

D. one should put them back,

E. and the laws of sacrilege apply to them.

F. [If they burst] after midnight, one should not put them back, but the laws of sacrilege still do not apply to them [M. Zeb. 9:6D-H].

G. *What is the source in Scripture for this rule?*

H. Said Rab, “One verse of Scripture states, ‘This is the law of the burnt offering: it is that which goes up on its firewood upon the altar all night...and he shall burn thereon...’ (Lev. 6: 2-5), and another verse of Scripture states, ‘all night...and he shall take up the ashes’ (Lev. 6: 3). How are these two verses to be harmonized? [Freedman: the assumption is that ‘and he shall take up the ashes’ also means during the night, since the whole verse reads, ‘and the priest shall put on his linen garment...and he shall take up the ashes.’ As it does not say that he must don his linen garment ‘in the morning,’ it is assumed that he did it at night and immediately took up the ashes; thus this contradicts the implications of the former of the two verses.] Divide the night: half is for burning, the other half for taking the ashes.” [Freedman, Zebahim, *ad loc.*: the first half is for burning, and during this time the meat is not considered completely consumed unless it has actually been turned into ashes. The second half is for clearing, in the sense that even before the meat has actually become ashes but has merely reached the stage of hardness, it is regarded as ashes. If however it still retains the softness of meat, it obviously is not ashes and must not be removed.]

I. Objected R. Kahana, “‘Every day the priest would take up the ashes at cockcrow or slightly before or slightly afterward. On the Day of Atonement, however, he does it at midnight; on festivals, he does it at the first watch.’ [20B] *Now if you hold that it is on the authority of the Torah that the altar must be cleared from midnight onwards, how are we going to push up the time for clearing the ashes?*”

J. Said R. Yohanan, “Since it is said, ‘all night,’ [‘This is the law of the burnt offering: it is that which goes up on its firewood upon the altar all night...and he shall burn thereon...’ (Lev. 6: 2-5)], do I not know that it may be done until morning? And why then does Scripture say, ‘until morning’? It is to indicate that [Freedman:] one should add another morning to the morning of the night [Freedman: the morning of the night is the dawn, while the additional morning is any earlier hour when priests might rise to commence the service, according to the requirements of the day. Since this is not fixed, it can be put forward or deferred as may be necessary]. *Therefore every day it is sufficient to do so from cockcrow. But on the Day of Atonement, it is done at midnight, on account of the consideration of the exhaustion of the High Priest. On festivals, when there were many sacrifices, so Israelites came very early, it was done at the first watch, as the continuation shows, and before cockcrow the Temple court was full of Israelites.*”

- K. *And that accords with the reason for the ruling that the Tannaite formulation gives: **And never did the cock crow before the courtyard was filled with masses of Israelites.***
- I.2.** A. *What is the definition of **the cock crow**?*
- B. *Rab said, “It is the call of a man” [since the word for man and cock share the same consonants].*
- C. *R. Shila said, “It is the call of a cock.”*
- I.3.** A. *Rab visited the locale of R. Shila. There was no public speaker to appoint to stand next to R. Shila to serve him in presenting his public address, so Rab took the position next to him to serve as his loud speaker.*
- B. *He explained, “What is the definition of **the cock crow**? It is the call of a man.”*
- C. *Said to him R. Shila, “But will the master please say, It is the call of a cock?”*
- D. *He said to him, “A flute makes great music for nobles, but hand it to weavers, and they won’t take it at all.” [Jung: fools criticize what persons of taste admire.] When I stood before R. Hiyya [as his public voice] and interpreted the matter so — What is the definition of **the cock crow**? It is the call of a man — he didn’t say a word to me! And yet you say to me, But will the master please say, It is the call of a cock!”*
- E. *He said to him, “Sir, you, there, Rab! Will you please sit down, sir!”*
- F. *He said to him, “People say, ‘If you have hired yourself out to someone, pull his wool [and do the job properly, without introducing considerations of dignity].”*
- G. *There are those who say, This is what he said to him: “One’s status as to sanctification is raised but never lowered.”*
- I.4.** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of Rab, and it has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Shila.*
- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of Rab: What does Gebini, the Temple crier, call out? “Arise, you priests, for your rite, you Levites for your platform, Israel for your post! And his voice could be heard for three parasangs.*
- C. *There was the story of King Agrippa, who was coming along the way and heard the sound at a distance of three parasangs. When he came home, he sent him presents.*
- D. *Nonetheless, the high priest was more praiseworthy still than he, for said a master, “It already happened that when the high priest prayed the prayer, “Oh Lord,” his voice was heard in Jericho.*
- E. *And Rabbah bar bar Hana said R. Yohanan said, “From Jerusalem to Jericho is ten parasangs, and even though here there is weakness [the high priest being burdened with his labor and weak from fasting] and there none, here day [the high priest says the prayer by day] and there night, for said R. Levi, “How come the human voice does not travel by day as it does by night? Because the traverse of the sun saws in the sky like a carpenter sawing cedars; and the sun-notes are called ‘la la la,’ [being mere particles (Jung)], in line with what Nebuchadnezzar said, ‘And all the inhabitants of the world are considered as “la”’ (Dan. 4:32).”*

- F. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- G. If it were not for the traverse of the sun, the roar of the crowds of Rome would be audible world wide, and were it not for the roar of the crowds of Rome, the sound of the traverse of the sun could be heard world wide.
- H. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. There are three roars that are heard from one end of the world to the other, and these are they:
- J. The roar of the traverse of the sun,
- K. the roar of the crowd in Rome,
- L. and the roar of the soul when it leaves the body.
- M. And there are those who say: also the sound of childbirth.
- N. **[21A]** And there are those who say, Also the sound of the angel of rain [Jung].
 - O. *And our rabbis prayed for mercy for the soul when it leaves the body, and that ended that sound.*
- P. *and it has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Shila:*
- Q. He who goes forth onto the public way prior to the cock's crow — his blood is on his own head.
- R. R. Josiah says, "He who does so before it has crowed twice."
- S. Some say, Until it has crowed three times.
 - T. What kind of cock?
 - U. The ordinary kind.

II.1 A. [And never did the cock crow before the courtyard was filled with masses of Israelites:] Said R. Judah said Rab, "When the Israelites come up for the festivals, they stand jammed together. But when they prostrated themselves, but they prostrate themselves with wide spaces between them all; and they extend eleven cubits behind the back wall of the Holy of Holies."

- B. *What is the sense of that statement?*
- C. *This is what he meant to say:* Even though they extended eleven cubits behind the back wall of the Holy of Holies, standing jammed together, when they prostrated themselves, they prostrated themselves with wide spaces between them all.
- D. *That is one of the ten miracles that were done in the Temple, as we have learned in the Mishnah:*
- E. **Ten wonders were done for our fathers in the Temple:**
- F. **(1) A woman never miscarried on account of the stench of the meat of Holy Things.**
- G. **(2) And the meat of the Holy Things never turned rotten.**
- H. **(3) A fly never made an appearance in the slaughterhouse.**
- I. **(4) A high priest never suffered a nocturnal emission on the eve of the Day of Atonement.**
- J. **(5) The rain never quenched the fire on the altar.**

- K. (6) No wind ever blew away the pillar of smoke.
- L. (7) An invalidating factor never affected the sheaf of first barley [the omer], or the Two Loaves,
- M. (8) When the people are standing, they are jammed together. When they go down and prostrate themselves, they have plenty of room.
- N. (9) A snake and a scorpion never bit anybody in Jerusalem.
- O. (10) And no one ever said to his fellow, "The place is too crowded for me (Isa. 49:20) to stay in Jerusalem" [M. Abot 5:5].
- P. The framer of the passage has commenced by reference to miracles in the Temple but concluded with miracles done in Jerusalem.
- Q. *There are two more miracles that pertain to the Temple, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- R. Never did the rain put out the fire on the wood pile on the altar;
- S. As to the smoke rising from the wood pile, even if all the wind in the world came to blow, it could not push it away from its proper location.
- T. *But were there no more miracles? And which Shemaiah of Kalnebo set forth as a Tannaite statement: "Sherds of clay utensils were swallowed up on the spot."*
- U. And said Abbayye, "The crop, feathers, ashes removed from the inner altar and from the candlestick, all were swallowed up in the place where they were removed."
- V. *There were three miracles but they were reckoned in a single category, so you take off two and add two.*
- W. *If so, then the cases of things that were swallowed up should be encompassed in a single rubric, leaving the count one short.*
- X. *There were other miracles [to make up the number], 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)."*
- Y. *And were there no more? And lo, said R. Levi, "This teaching we have in hand as a tradition from our fathers: The place of the ark and cherubim is not reckoned in the measured space." [B. B.B. 99a: So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority: The ark that Moses made had a free space of ten cubits on all sides.]*
- Z. And said Rabbanai said Samuel, "The Cherubim that Solomon made stood by a miracle: 'And five cubits was the one wing of the cherub and five the other, from the uttermost part of the one wing to the uttermost part of the other were ten cubits' (1Ki. 6:24)."
- AA. *The miracles that were done outside the Temple count, but the miracles that were done inside the Temple are not counted.*
- BB. *If so, then what about the show bread, which was a miracle that was done inside the Temple!*
- CC. *That miracle took place outside, for R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "What is the meaning of the statement, 'Upon the pure table before the Lord' (Lev. 24: 6)? That statement bears the implication that while pure, it was susceptible to uncleanness."*

- DD. **[21B]** But it was a wooden utensil that was intended for resting, and any wooden utensil intended for resting is not susceptible to uncleanness but in fact interposes against uncleanness.
- EE. Rather, it teaches that they raise it up to show to the pilgrims who came up for the festivals, and they say to them, “See how much you are beloved by the Omnipresent, for it is as fresh when it is taken off the table as it was when it was put on, in line with the statement, ‘to put hot bread in the day it was taken away’ (1Sa. 21: 7).”
- FF. *And were there no more?* And lo, said R. Oshaia, “When King Solomon built the house of the sanctuary, he planted within it all kinds of trees of golden delights. These produced their fruit in due season, and as the winds caressed them, the fruit would fall of the trees: ‘May his fruits rustle like Lebanon’ (Psa. 72:16). But when the gentile [troops] entered the Temple, the fruits withered: ‘And the flower of Lebanon languishes’ (Nah. 1: 4). But the Holy One, blessed be he, is going to restore them: ‘It shall blossom abundantly and rejoice, even with joy and singing, the glory of Lebanon shall be given to it’ (Isa. 35: 2).”
- GG. *Those miracles that were permanent are not reckoned in the count.*
- HH. *Now that you’ve come that far, we may also say that the ark and the cherubs fall into the category of miracles that were permanent.*

II.2. A. The master has said: As to the smoke rising from the wood pile, even if all the wind in the world came to blow, it could not push it away from its proper location.

- B. *But did smoke arise from the pile of wood? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Five statements were made with reference to the smoke of the pile of wood:
- D. (1) it was lying like a lion,
- E. (2) it was as pellucid as sunlight,
- F. (3) its flame was solid,
- G. (4) it consumed wet wood as easily as dry wood,
- H. (5) it caused no smoke to arise from it.
- I. *When we made that statement, it had to do with smoke from wood outside of the sanctuary, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- J. “And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire on the altar” (Lev. 1: 7): they said, “Even though the fire comes down from heaven, it is a religious duty to bring some natural fire.”

II.3. A. it was lying like a lion:

- B. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Said R. Hanina, prefect of the priests, “I myself saw it, and it was crouched like a dog”?
- D. *No problem, the one speaks of the first sanctuary, the other of the second sanctuary?*
- E. *But was it present in the second sanctuary?* Didn’t R. Samuel bar Inia say, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘And I will

take pleasure in it and I will be glorified' (Hag. 1: 8)? Why is the word for 'take pleasure in it' written without the expected H? It is to indicate that in five aspects, the first sanctuary differed from the second: the ark, the ark cover, the Cherubim, the fire, the Presence of God, the Holy Spirit [prophecy], and the Oracle Plate"?

- F. Say: they were present, but they did not do so much good as they had.

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

- B. There are six kinds of fire: fire that eats but does not drink, fire that drinks but does not eat, fire that eats and drinks, fire that consumes what is dry as well as what is wet, fire that pushes fire away, fire that eats fire.
- C. fire that eats but does not drink: *that refers to our fire [that is put out by water].*
- D. fire that drinks but does not eat: *that is the fever of those who are sick.*
- E. fire that eats and drinks: *that is the fire of Elijah, concerning which it is written, "And licked up the water that was in the trench" (1Ki. 18:38).*
- F. fire that consumes what is dry as well as what is wet: *that is the fire of the wood pile on the altar.*
- G. fire that pushes fire away: *That is the fire of Gabriel.*
- H. fire that eats fire: *that is the fire of the Presence of God.*
- I. For a master has said, "[Said R. Judah said Rab, "When the Holy One, blessed be he, proposed to create man, he created a group of ministering angels. He said to them, 'Shall we make man in our image?' They said to him, 'Lord of the ages, what sort of things will he do?' He said to them, 'These are the sorts of the things he will do.'" They said before him, 'Lord of the ages, 'What is man that you are mindful of him, and the son of man that you think of him' (Psa. 8: 5)?] He poked his little finger among them and burned them up, [and so with the second group of ministering angels]...."

II.5. A. And as to the fire on the wood pile on the altar, even all of the winds in the world cannot stir it up from its place.

- B. But did not R. Isaac bar Abdimi say, "At the conclusion of the final festival day of the Festival of Sukkot, everyone were staring at the smoke arising from the wood pile. If it swayed toward the north, the poor were glad and the householders sad, because the rain in the coming year would be abundant, and the fruit would rot [and sell cheaply], if it swayed toward the south, the poor were sad and the householders glad, because the rains for the coming year would be sparse, and the produce would stay in storage. If the wind swayed to the east, everyone was glad, if they swayed toward the west, everyone was sad"?

C. *What it means is, it swayed this way and that like a tree, but it did not scatter.*

II.6. A. The master has said: If the wind swayed to the east, everyone was glad, if they swayed toward the west, everyone was sad —

B. *And by way of objection:*

C. the east wind is always beneficial, the west, always detrimental, the north is good for wheat that has grown a third of its usual height, but bad for olives in bud; the south wind is bad for wheat that has reached a third of its height and good for olives in bud. *And in this connection said R. Joseph and some say, Mar Zutra, “Your mnemonic is, the table was at the north, the candelabrum at the south; the one wind is good for increasing what is good for the table, the other, what is good for increasing what is good for the candlestick.”*

D. *No problem, the one statement refers to us [in Babylonia, the east wind always bringing rain], the other speaks of them [in the land of Israel].*

Unit I:1, bearing in its wake its own materials of amplification, establishes a broader context in which to understand our Mishnah-paragraph’s rule. II:1 does the same with a still richer corpus of topical appendices.