

XIV

BAVLI ZEBAHIM CHAPTER FOURTEEN

FOLIOS 112A-120B

14:1-10

14:1

- A. [On account of] a [red] cow for purification [ashes] [Num. 19:9] that one burned outside of its pit —
- B. and so: a goat to be sent forth that one offered outside of the Temple —
- C. he is free,
- D. as it is said, “To the door of the tent of meeting he did not bring it” (Lev. 17: 4) —
- E. For whatever is not appropriate to come to the door of the tent of meeting they are not liable [if such a classification of offering is carried out outside of the Temple].

14:2

- A. (1) The animal which had sexual relations with a human, and (2) the animal with which a human had sexual relations, and (3) the animal set aside for idolatrous worship, and (4) the animal which had been worshipped, and (5) the animal used for the hire of a harlot, and (6) the animal used to pay for a dog, and (7) the crossbred animal, and (8) the animal which turns out to be terefah, and (9) the animal which went forth from the side [M. 8:1],
- B. which one offered outside —
- C. he is free,
- D. as it is said, “Before the altar of the Lord” (Lev. 17: 4) —
- E. Whatever is not appropriate [to come] before the altar of the Lord — they are not liable on its account.
- F. Blemished animals, whether permanently blemished [112B] or temporarily blemished, which one offered outside —
- G. he is free.
- H. R. Simeon says, “Permanently blemished animals [which one offered outside] — he is free.

- I. “But temporarily blemished animals [which one offered outside] — they transgress a negative commandment [Deu. 12: 8, 13].”
- J. Turtledoves whose time had not yet come and young pigeons whose time had passed, which one offered outside —
- K. he is free.
- L. R. Simeon says, “Pigeons whose time had passed [which he offered up outside] — he is free,
- M. “Turtledoves whose time had not yet come [which he offered up out-side] — [they transgress] a negative commandment.”
- N. (1) It and its offspring [Lev. 22:28: And whether the mother is a cow or a ewe, you shall not kill both her and her young in one day], and that (2) [within seven days of birth, Exo. 22:29] whose time [to be offered] had not yet come [which one offered outside] —
- O. he is free.
- P R. Simeon says, “Lo, this one has transgressed a negative commandment.”
- Q. For R. Simeon did say, “Whatever is appropriate to come at a later time, lo, this one has transgressed a negative commandment, but extirpation does not apply to it.”
- R. And sages say, “Whatever is not subject to extirpation is not subject to a negative commandment.”

14:3

- A. [An animal] whose time had not yet come — whether in itself or in respect to its owner.
- B. What is an offering whose time had not yet come in respect to its owner?
- C. The Zab, and the Zabah, and the woman who has given birth, and the person afflicted with the skin ailment, who [during their time of counting clean days] offered their sin offering and [solely in the case of the person afflicted with the skin ailment of Lev. 13] — their guilt offering outside are free [since the offerings serve neither to fulfill an obligation nor to be counted as a thank offering].
- D. [If they offered] their burnt offerings and [in the case of the Nazirite] their peace offering outside, they are liable.
- E. He who offers up (1) part of the flesh of a sin offering, (2) part of the flesh of a guilt offering, (3) part of the flesh of Most Holy Things, (4) part of the flesh of Lesser Holy Things, (5) the residue of the omer, and the two breads, and the showbread, and (6) the residue of meal offerings [all of which are eaten by the priests, not offered on the altar] —
- F. he who (1) pours out [oil over the meal offering], he who (2) mixes [meal with the oil], he who (3) breaks [meal offering cakes] into pieces, he who (4) salts [meal offering], he who (5) waves [it], he who (6) brings it near [opposite the southwest corner of the altar], he who (7) arranges [the bread on table], he who (8) trims the lamps, he who (9) takes the handful, he who (10) receives the blood [none of which actions completes the sacrificial rite] —
- G. outside —

- H. is free.
- I. They are not liable on its account either (1) because of being alien [not being priest], or (2) because of uncleanness, or (3) because of lacking the proper vestments, or (4) because of having unwashed hands and feet.

14:4

- A. Before the tabernacle was set up, (1) the high places were permitted, and (2) [the sacrificial] service [was done by] the first born [Num. 3:12-13, 8:16-18].
- B. When the tabernacle was set up, (1) the high places were prohibited, and (2) the [sacrificial] service [was done by] priests.
- C. Most Holy Things were eaten within the veils, Lesser Holy Things [were eaten] throughout the camp of Israel.

14:5

- A. They came to Gilgal.
- B. The high places were permitted.
- C. Most Holy Things were eaten within the veils, Lesser Holy Things, anywhere.

14:6

- A. They came to Shilo.
- B. The high places were prohibited.
- C. (1) There was no roof beam there, but below was a house of stone, and hangings above it, and (2) it was “the resting place” [Deu. 12: 9].
- D. Most Holy Things were eaten within the veils, Lesser Holy Things and second tithe [were eaten] in any place within sight [of Shilo].

14:7

- A. They came to Nob and Gibeon.
- B. The high places were permitted.
- C. Most Holy Things were eaten within the veils, Lesser Holy Things, in all the towns of Israel.

14:8

- A. They came to Jerusalem.
- B. The high places were prohibited.
- C. And they never again were permitted.
- D. And it was “the inheritance” [Deu. 12: 9].
- E. Most Holy Things were eaten within the veils, Lesser Holy Things and second tithe within the wall.

14:9

- A. All the Holy Things which one sanctified at the time of the prohibition of the high places and offered at the time of the prohibition of high places outside —
- B. lo, these are subject to the transgression of a positive commandment and a negative commandment, and they are liable on their account to extirpation [for sacrificing outside the designated place, Lev. 17: 8-9, M. 13:1A].

- C. [If] one sanctified them at the time of the permission of high places and offered them up at the time of the prohibition of high places,
- D. lo, these are subject to transgression of a positive commandment and to a negative commandment, but they are not liable on their account to extirpation [since if the offerings had been sacrificed when they were sanctified, there should have been no violation].
- E. [If] one sanctified them at the time of the prohibition of high places and offered them up at the time of the permission of high places,
- F. lo, these are subject to transgression of a positive commandment, but they are not subject to a negative commandment at all.

14:10

- A. These are the Holy Things offered in the tabernacle [of Gilgal, Nob, and Gibeon:
 - B. Holy Things which were sanctified for the tabernacle.
 - C. Offerings of the congregation are offered in the tabernacle.
 - D. Offerings of the individual [are offered] on a high place.
 - E. Offerings of the individual which were sanctified for the tabernacle are to be offered in the tabernacle.
 - F. And if one offered them up on a high place, he is free.
 - G. What is the difference between the high place of an individual and the high place of the community?
 - H. (1) Laying on of hands, and (2) slaughtering at the north [of the altar], [113A] and (3) placing [of the blood] round about [the altar], and (4) waving, and (5) bringing near.
 - I. R. Judah says, “There is no meal offering on a high place [but there is in the tabernacle]” —
 - J. and (1) the priestly service, and (2) the wearing of garments of ministry, and (3) the use of utensils of ministry, and (4) the sweet-smelling savor and (5) the dividing line for the [tossing of various kinds of] blood, and (6) the rule concerning the washing of hands and feet.
 - K. But the matters of time, and remnant, and uncleanness are applicable both here and there [by contrast to M. 14:3F-I].
- I.1** A. [On account of a red cow for purification ashes (Num. 19: 9) that one burned outside of its pit — and so: a goat to be sent forth that one offered outside of the Temple — he is free, as it is said, “To the door of the tent of meeting he did not bring it” (Lev. 17: 4) — for whatever is not appropriate to come to the door of the tent of meeting they are not liable:] *what is the meaning of, outside of its pit?*
- B. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “It means, outside of the place that has been inspected for that purpose [to make certain there was no corpse matter buried beneath the spot].”
 - C. Said to him R. Yohanan, “But is not the whole of the Land of Israel classified as a place that has been inspected for that purpose [to make certain there was no corpse matter buried beneath the spot]?”

- D. Rather, said R. Yohanan, "It would be exemplified by a case in which one had slaughtered the red cow inside the wall of Jerusalem [rather than outside, where it was supposed to be]."
- E. *Why not assign the rule to a case in which one has slaughtered the red cow outside of the wall of Jerusalem, but not opposite the door of the hall in which the altar was located?* For said R. Adda bar Ahbah, "If one slaughtered the red cow outside of the wall of Jerusalem, but not opposite the door of the hall in which the altar was located, it is invalid, as it is said, 'And he shall slay it...and sprinkle of its blood toward the front of the tent of meeting' (Num. 19: 3). Just as the sprinkling of the blood must be toward the door, so the slaughtering of the beast must be facing the door."
- F. *And should you say that [Yohanan] draws no such analogy, lo, it has been stated:*
- G. If one slaughtered the beast not opposite the door,
- H. R. Yohanan said, "It is invalid: 'and he shall slaughter...and sprinkle....'"
- I. R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "It is valid: 'and shall be brought forth outside the camp and he shall slay....'"
- J. *So too it has been stated:*
- K. If one burned the beast not opposite the door,
- L. R. Yohanan said, "It is invalid."
- M. R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "It is valid."
- N. R. Yohanan said, "It is invalid: 'and he shall slaughter...and sprinkle....'"
- O. R. Oshaia said, "It is valid: 'with her dung it shall be burned,' that is to say, in the place at which she departs to death, there she is to be burned." [The words for "dung" and "depart" share the same consonants.]
- P. *I shall reply: the sense of [Yohanan's] statement is to move to a still more decisive position, in this manner, "It is not only the fact that if the rite is done outside of the wall, not opposite the door, that the rite is invalid, because it is still further removed from the sanctuary, but even if it were slaughtered within the wall, so that the rite is done nearer the sanctuary, and I mist then suppose that on that account it is fit, he takes the position that it is unfit."*

I.2. A. A master has said: Said to him R. Yohanan, "But is not the whole of the Land of Israel classified as a place that has been inspected for that purpose [to make certain there was no corpse matter buried beneath the spot]?"

B. *What is at stake in this dispute [on whether or not the whole of the Land of Israel classified as a place that has been inspected to make certain there was no corpse matter buried beneath the spot]?*

C. One authority takes the position that the Flood descended upon the Land of Israel, and the other authority maintains that the Flood did not descend upon the Land of Israel.

D. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "And both parties interpret the same verse of Scripture: 'Son of man, say to her: you are a land that is not purified nor rained upon in the day of indignation' (Eze. 22:24). R. Yohanan maintains that the statement expresses amazement: O

Land of Israel, were you not purified from uncleanness? Have not the rains fallen upon it ‘in the day of indignation’? *And R. Simeon b. Laqish maintains that the verse is to be read as a simple declarative statement: O Land of Israel, you were not purified from uncleanness, the rains have not fallen upon it ‘in the day of indignation.’*”

- E. *R. Simeon b. Laqish objected to R. Yohanan, **There were courtyards in Jerusalem, built on rock, and under them was a hollow, which served as a protection against a grave in the depths. And they bring pregnant women, who give birth there, and who raise their sons there. And they bring oxen, and on them are doors, and the youngsters sit on top of them, with cups of stone in their hands. [When] they reached the Siloam, they descended and filled them, and mounted and sat on top of them [M. Par.3:2A-D].*** [This procedure protected against buried corpse matter, but Yohanan thinks there was none.]
- F. Said R. Huna b. R. Joshua, “They imposed an unusually strict rule on the performance of the rite of burning the red cow.”
- G. *R. Yohanan objected to R. Simeon b. Laqish: **One time bones were found in Jerusalem in the woodshed of the Temple, and sages proposed to declare Jerusalem unclean [M. Ed.8:5B-C].*** Arose to his feet and said to them R. Joshua, “**It would be a shame and a disgrace for us to declare our holy house unclean. Where are the dead of the Flood? Where are the corpses of those slain by Nebuchadnezzar? Where are the bones of those who were slain in the recent war, and up to now? But they have said, ‘If it is a matter of certainty, it is of course unclean, but if it is a matter of doubt, the doubt is resolved in favor of cleanness’**” [T. Ed.3:3A-D]. *Now since he said, Where are the dead of the Flood? he surely meant to imply that they had not been there in Jerusalem.*
- H. *But on your reasoning, is it the case also of those slain by Nebuchadnezzar that they had never been there! But they certainly were there, but they had been removed. Here too, they had been in the Land of Israel, but they had been removed.*
- I. *If they had been removed, however, [113B] then they had been removed [so one way or the other, the Land of Israel has no corpse matter buried in the ground].*
- J. *While they had been cleared away from Jerusalem, they had not been cleared away from the rest of the entirety of the Land of Israel.*
- K. *There are those who state the matter in this way: R. Simeon b. Laqish objected to R. Yohanan, “**Where are the dead of the Flood? Where are the corpses of those slain by Nebuchadnezzar?** Is it not then the fact that, since the latter were in the Land of Israel, the former were there too?”*
- L. *Not at all, not at all! Each was subject to its own situation. [Freedman: the latter had been there but were cleared out, the former were never there.]*

- M. *R. Simeon b. Laqish objected to R. Yohanan: “...whatever was in the dry land died’ (Gen. 7:22) — now, from my viewpoint, which maintains that the Flood came down upon the Land of Israel, there is no problem, for on that account they died. But on your view, how come they died?”*
- N. *“It was because of the heat, in line with what R. Hisda said.”*
- O. For said R. Hisda, “They sinned with boiling passion, and they died with boiling heat. Here we find ‘and the water cools’ (Gen. 8: 1), and elsewhere, ‘then the king’s wrath cooled down’ (Est. 7:10).”
- P. *Others say: R. Yohanan objected to R. Simeon b. Laqish: “...whatever was in the dry land died’ (Gen. 7:22) — now, from my viewpoint, which maintains that the Flood never came down upon the Land of Israel, there is no problem, for on that account it is called, the dry land. But on your view, why is it called the dry land?”*
- Q. *“It is a place that was originally dry land. And why specify the dry land? It is in accord with what R. Hisda said.”*
- R. For said R. Hisda, “In the generation of the Flood the decree of destruction was not directed against the fish in the sea: ‘Whatever was in the dry land died,’ but not the fish in the sea.”
- S. *Now from the perspective of him who has said that the Flood did not descend onto the Land of Israel, there is no problem, for then we may understand why the buffalo [my conjecture for re'em, Freedman: a huge animal too big to enter the ark] stayed there. But on the view that the flood did descend on the Land of Israel, then during the flood, where did the buffalo roam [so as to survive the flood]?*
- T. Said R. Yannai, “The whelps they took into the ark.”
- U. *But did not Rabbah bar bar Hannah say, “I saw a sea-buffalo one day old, and it was as big as Mount Tabor? And how big is Mount Tabor? Forty parasangs. Its neck, stretched out, was three parasangs, the place where its head rested was a parasang and a half. Its ball of shit was so big that it stuffed the Jordan”?*
- V. Said R. Yohanan, “Into the ark they took only the head.”
- W. But has not the master said, “*Its neck, stretched out, was three parasangs*”!
- Y. They took the tip of the nose into the ark.
- Z. But has not R. Yohanan said, “The flood did not descend upon the Land of Israel”?
- AA. *He made the foregoing statement within the premise of R. Simeon b. Laqish.*
- BB. *But the ark rode the waves up and down [so how did the buffalo hold on]?*
- CC. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Its horns did they tie to the ark.”
- DD. And has not R. Hisda said, “The men of the Flood sinned with boiling passion, and they died with boiling heat. Here we find ‘and the water cools’ (Gen. 8: 1), and elsewhere, ‘then the king’s wrath

cooled down' (Est. 7:10)”? *So on your reasoning how did the ark travel at all* [the pitch of the seams would dissolve in the hot water (Freedman)]! *Furthermore, how did Og, king of Bashan, survive? Rather, a miracle was done for them, so the water cooled down around the ark.*

- EE. *And from the viewpoint of R. Simeon b. Laqish, even if we grant that the Flood came down upon the Land of Israel, lo, none of the dead were left there anyhow.*
- FF. *For said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Why is Babylonia called *mesulah*? Because the dead of the Flood were dumped there [the word for dump shares consonants with the word *mesulah*.]”*
- GG. *And R. Yohanan said, “Why is it called *Shinar*? For all the dead of the Flood were shaken out there [the word for shaken out there shares consonants with *Shinar*.]”*
- HH. *One way or the other, it is not possible that none of them should not have stayed there [in the Land]!*
- II. *Said R. Abbahu, “Why is it called *Shinar*? Because it shakes out its wealthy men [who cannot make a living there].”*
- JJ. *But lo we see that there really are rich people there!*
- KK. *The money does not last for three generations.*
- LL. *Said R. Ammi, “Whoever eats the dirt of Babylonia is as though he ate the meat of his ancestors.”*
- MM. *So too it has been taught as a Tannaite statement:*
- NN. *Whoever eats the dirt of Babylonia is as though he ate the meat of his ancestors.*
- OO. *And some say, “...is as though he ate abominations and creeping things.”*

II.1 A. and so: a goat to be sent forth that one offered outside of the Temple — he is free, as it is said, “To the door of the tent of meeting he did not bring it” (Lev. 17: 4) — For whatever is not appropriate to come to the door of the tent of meeting they are not liable if such a classification of offering is carried out outside of the Temple]: [But is the goat not appropriate to come to the door of the tent of meeting?] *And the following may be cited in contradiction: “...or sacrifice” (Lev. 17: 8) — might I suppose that [covered by the law are] even Holy Things that have been designated for the upkeep of the house, which are classified as an offering in line with the following, “And we have brought the Lord’s offering” (Num. 31:50: jewels, gold, armlets)? Scripture states, “And brings it not to the door of the tent of meeting,” so the law applies only to what is appropriate to come to the door of the tent of meeting, with the result that Holy Things that have been designated for the upkeep of the house are excluded.*

- B. *Then might I suppose that these things are excluded, which are not eligible, but I should not exclude the scape goat that is sent away, for that is eligible to come to the door of the tent of meeting [since one of the goats will be sacrificed and the other sent away, and we do not know which until the lots are cast]?*

- C. Scripture states, “to sacrifice it to the Lord,” excluding the goat that is sent away, which is not consecrated to the Lord. [So to begin with the goat is eligible to be brought to the door of the tent of meeting.]
- D. *But there is, then, no problem at all, for the one rule pertains to the goats prior to the casting of the lots, the other, after the casting of the lots.*
- E. *But even after the casting of the lots, there is still the confession [to be made over the other goat]!*
- F. *Said R. Mani, “There still is no problem, for the one rule pertains to the time prior to the confession, the other, afterward.”*

III.1 A. (1) The animal which had sexual relations with a human, and (2) the animal with which a human had sexual relations, and (3) the animal set aside for idolatrous worship, and (4) the animal which had been worshipped, and (5) the animal used for the hire of a harlot, and (6) the animal used to pay for a dog, and (7) the crossbred animal, and (8) the animal which turns out to be terefah, and (9) the animal which went forth from the side, which one offered outside — he is free, as it is said, “Before the altar of the Lord” (Lev. 17: 4) — whatever is not appropriate [to come] before the altar of the Lord — they are not liable on its account:

- B. *Now may I not infer this too from the statement, “to the door of the tent of meeting” [so why present a different proof-text from the foregoing]?*
- C. **[114A]** *With reference to the animal which had sexual relations with a human, and the animal with which a human had sexual relations there is no problem [in explaining why two proof-texts are required], for here the other proof-text would be necessary, for example in a case in which one first consecrated the beast and then the act of bestiality was committed upon it [so to begin with it was fit to come to the door of meeting but it may not now be offered upon the altar].*
- D. *But as to the categories of the animal set aside for idolatrous worship, and the animal which had been worshipped, a person cannot impose a prohibition on something that does not belong to him [so how can such classifications of beasts be prohibited once they have been consecrated]?*
- E. *We deal with Lesser Holy Things, within the premise of R. Yosé the Galilean, who has said that Lesser Holy Things belong to their owner. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. *“‘If any one sin and commit a trespass against the Lord...then he shall bring his guilt offering’ (Lev. 5:21) — encompassing Lesser Holy Things, because they are the property of the owner,” the words of R. Yosé the Galilean.*
- G. *Therefore, in the catalogue of the Mishnah, the second proof text is required on the following counts:*
- H. **(1) The animal which had sexual relations with a human, and (2) the animal with which a human had sexual relations:** that is a matter of fornication.
- I. **(3) the animal set aside for idolatrous worship, and (4) the animal which had been worshipped:** that is a matter of Lesser Holy Things.
- J. *As to (5) the animal used for the hire of a harlot, and (6) the animal used to pay for a dog, and (7) the crossbred animal, and (8) the animal which turns out to be terefah, and (9) the animal which went forth from the side, the*

second proof text is required because the offspring of Holy Things are themselves holy as soon as they come into being.

IV.1 A. [1] **Blemished animals, whether permanently blemished or temporarily blemished, which one offered outside — he is free. R. Simeon says, “Permanently blemished animals [which one offered outside] — he is free. But temporarily blemished animals [which one offered outside] — they transgress a negative commandment [Deu. 12: 8, 13].”** [2] **Turtledoves whose time had not yet come and young pigeons whose time had passed, which one offered outside — he is free. R. Simeon says, “Pigeons whose time had passed [which he offered up outside] — he is free.** [3] **Turtledoves whose time had not yet come [which he offered up outside] — [they transgress] a negative commandment.”** (1) **It and its offspring [Lev. 22:28: And whether the mother is a cow or a ewe, you shall not kill both her and her young in one day], and that (2) [within seven days of birth, Exo. 22:29] whose time [to be offered] had not yet come [which one offered outside] — he is free. R. Simeon says, “Lo, this one has transgressed a negative commandment:”**

- B. *[The controversy involving Simeon and sages] is required in all three cases [blemished animals, turtledoves, and It and its offspring].*
- C. *For if the Tannaite statement had referred only to blemished animals, then the operative consideration would be that they are repulsive, but as to turtledoves, which are not repulsive, I might have thought that sages concede R. Simeon's position. And if the Tannaite statement had referred only to turtledoves, then I might have supposed that the operative consideration is that they are not rejected once they have been eligible, but as to blemished animals, which were eligible but became rejected, I might have thought that R. Simeon concurs with the position of rabbis.*
- D. *And if the Tannaite statement had encompassed these two but made no reference to “it and its young,” I might have supposed that the operative consideration is that these are disqualified by intrinsic traits, but as to the animal and its young, the disqualification is extrinsic, so I might have supposed that rabbis concur with R. Simeon.*
- E. *Accordingly, all three disputes had to be spelled out.*

V.1 A. **For R. Simeon did say, “Whatever is appropriate to come at a later time, lo, this one has transgressed a negative commandment, but extirpation does not apply to it.” And sages say, “Whatever is not subject to extirpation is not subject to a negative commandment:”**

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Simeon?*
- C. *Said R. Ilai said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Because Scripture has said, ‘You shall not do after all that we do here this day, every one whatever is right in his own eyes’ (Deu. 12: 8). This is the sense of what Moses said to Israel, ‘When you enter the Land, you shall offer what is right in your eyes [offerings made by vow], but obligatory offerings you shall not offer.’ So Gilgal, in relationship with Shilo, was premature, and Moses said to them, ‘You shall not do after all that we do here this day, every one whatever is right in his own eyes.’” [Obligatory offerings were premature at Gilgal and would have to wait until they came to Shilo, and Moses*

forbids sacrificing them at the high places. This is a negative commandment. From that Simeon infers that the premature sacrifice of all animals at the high places, before they became eligible, is forbidden by a negative commandment (Freedman).]

- D. *Said R. Jeremiah to R. Zira, "If that is the case, [114B] then why not incur a flogging as well! How come then said R. Zira, 'Scripture transformed it into a positive commandment'?"*
- E. *That is solely from the perspective of Rabbis, but from the perspective of R. Simeon, it is quite so [that one would be flogged].*
- F. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "Inside the veils, at Gilgal, is classified as outside of the veils in the setting of Shilo [and obligatory sacrifices could not be offered there]."*

V.2. A. *Rabbah said, "The scriptural basis for the position of R. Simeon is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:"*

- B. *R. Simeon says, "How on the basis of Scripture do we know that one who sacrifices an animal designated as a Passover offering on a high place belonging to an individual at the time that the high places were forbidden has violated a negative commandment? Scripture states, 'You may not sacrifice the Passover offering within one of your gates' (Deu. 16: 5). Might one then suppose that that is the case also when the high places were permitted? Scripture says, 'within one of your gates,' meaning, I have said to you that one violates a negative commandment only at a time at which all Israelites enter through a single gate [that is, a Temple in Jerusalem, but when the high places were permitted, there was no 'single gate]."*
- C. *Now when is that the case? If we say it is after midday [on the fourteenth of Nisan], then let the one who does so incur the sanction of extirpation as well [since at that time the Passover offering is to be received inside the veils], so it must be, before midday [when it is premature to make the offering]. [It follows that an animal that is sacrificed prematurely outside of the Temple, under its correct classification, involves the violation of a negative commandment (Freedman).]*
- D. *Not at all, the reference is to after midday, but it refers to the time at which the high places were permitted.*
- E. *But the passage explicitly states, "when the high places were forbidden"!*
- F. *The intent is, a time when the use of a high place was forbidden for that sacrifice but was permitted for some other. [Freedman: it was forbidden for a Passover offering but permitted for votive offerings. The sense then is this: you might think that this is so even when the Passover offering may be sacrificed at a high place, that is, before midday, when it can be offered as a peace offering; therefore it says, "in one of your gates..." meaning, at the public high place, with reference to Passover offerings, which are prepared after midday.]*

VI.1 A. **[An animal] whose time had not yet come — whether in itself or in respect to its owner. What is an offering whose time had not yet come in respect to its owner? The Zab, and the Zabah, and the woman who has given birth, and the person afflicted with the skin ailment, who [during their time of counting clean days] offered their sin offering and [solely in the case of the**

person afflicted with the skin ailment of Lev. 13] — their guilt offering outside are free [since the offerings serve neither to fulfill an obligation nor to be counted as a thank offering]:

- B. *Are these who are listed subject to bringing guilt offerings at all?*
- C. *Said Zeiri, "Add to the list one who has been afflicted with the skin ailment [who does have to bring a guilt offering]."*

VII.1 A. [An animal] whose time had not yet come — whether in itself or in respect to its owner. What is an offering whose time had not yet come in respect to its owner? The Zab, and the Zabah, and the woman who has given birth, and the person afflicted with the skin ailment, who [during their time of counting clean days] offered their sin offering and [solely in the case of the person afflicted with the skin ailment of Lev. 13] — their guilt offering outside are free [since the offerings serve neither to fulfill an obligation nor to be counted as a thank offering]. [If they offered] their burnt offerings and [in the case of the Nazirite] their peace offering outside, they are liable:

- B. *Do those who are listed have to bring peace offerings?*
- C. *Said R. Sheshet, "Add to the Tannaite formulation, 'a Nazirite' [who does have to bring peace offerings]."*
- D. *In the opinion of Zeiri, the Tannaite framers included it in so many words, and in the opinion of R. Sheshet the Tannaite framers did not include it in so many words.*

VII.2. A. Said R. Hilqiah b. R. Tobi, "The rule [that if a person afflicted by the skin ailment offers his guilt offering before the proper time, but outside of the Temple, he is not culpable] speaks of a case in which he made the offering under the classification of a guilt offering. But if he made it under a different classification, he is liable, since under a different classification if it were offered inside of the Temple, it would be eligible for offering."

- B. *If that is the case, then even if it were offered outside of the Temple under the designation for which it has been set apart, he should be liable, since it is suitable to be offered inside the Temple not under the original designation as a guilt offering!*
- C. *[Before it can be eligible,] the original designation has to be removed [so that it is no longer a guilt offering, that classification having been abrogated, and if this is not done, it is not eligible for offering inside the Temple anyhow].*
- D. *Objected R. Huna, "But is there anything that if slaughtered under its original designation is unfit but if slaughtered under some other than the original designation is fit?"*
- E. *But is there no such thing? Lo, [115A] there is the case of animal designated as a Passover offering, which, if slaughtered on any other day during the rest of the year under its own classification is unfit, but if slaughtered under a different designation than the Passover offering on any other day during the rest of the year certainly is fit [that is, as peace offerings]!*
- F. *The Passover offering during the rest of the year serves as a peace offering [and when it is slaughtered as such, it is under its correct designation].*

- VII.3.** A. [Said R. Hilqiah b. R. Tobi, “The rule that if a person afflicted by the skin ailment offers his guilt offering before the proper time, but outside of the Temple, he is not culpable speaks of a case in which he made the offering under the classification of a guilt offering. But if he made it under a different classification, he is liable, since under a different classification if it were offered inside of the Temple, it would be eligible for offering.”] *May we say that the following statement supports the position of R. Hilqiah: :*
- B. Might one suppose that I should also exclude [from the requirement of bringing to the door of the tent of meeting] a burnt offering, which can be premature in relationship to its owner [that is, the owner might not be fit at the time it is presented, e.g., in the case of a person afflicted with the skin ailment or a woman after childbirth], the guilt offering of a Nazirite or the guilt offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment?
- C. Scripture states, “an ox,” thus, under all circumstances, “or a lamb,” under all circumstances, “or a goat,” under all circumstances.” *Thus he omits all reference to a sin offering.*
- D. *Now what case is under discussion here? If we say that when it is sacrificed at the proper time, then why make reference in particular to a guilt offering, when even if it were a sin offering too, there would be liability. It must follow that in context under discussion is a case in which it is not sacrificed in the proper time. And under what circumstances? If we say, it is when he sacrifices it for the purpose for which the animal was originally designated, then why is he liable for a guilt offering? So the meaning must be, when he sacrifices it under a designation other than that for which it was originally consecrated. [Freedman: thus what is not fit when offered within the Temple under its own designation is fit under a different designation.]*
- E. *Well, as a matter of fact, it is an offering presented at the proper time, but not under the designation for which the beast was originally consecrated, and it represents the position of R. Eliezer, who has said, “We draw an analogy from the guilt offering to the sin offering,” and the Tannaite formulation presents a secondary case, but the same law would apply to the principal one.*
- F. *Come and take note:* Might you suppose that I should encompass under the law a burnt offering that is premature by reason of its own physical condition [having been born less than eight days ago], and a sin offering that is premature only by reason of its own physical condition or through the situation of its owners [who are not yet ready to present the offering, e.g., a Nazirite whose time has not yet come]? Scripture states, “And has not brought it to the door of the tent of meeting” — for whatever is not eligible to come to the door of the tent of meeting you bear no liability. *Thus he omits all reference to a guilt offering.*
- G. *Now what case is under discussion here? If we say that when it is sacrificed that it was offered for the purpose for which it is originally designated, then for a guilt offering also one should not be liable. So it must mean that when one does not sacrifice it for the purpose for which it was originally designated, the law applies. [As before, thus what is not fit when offered within the Temple under its own designation is fit under a different designation.]*

- H. *This rule represents the position of R. Eliezer, who has said, "We draw an analogy from the guilt offering to the sin offering," and the Tannaite formulation presents a secondary case, but the same law would apply to the principal one.*
- I. *Come and take note that when R. Dimi came, he said, "The Tannaite authority of the household of R. Livai [said], 'Might you suppose that I should exclude from the law also the burnt offering that was premature in terms of its owner [who did not yet owe it], or a guilt offering of a Nazirite or a guilt offering of one afflicted by the skin ailment.' Now the authority then implies that one is liable, but I do not know on what basis."*
- J. *Said Rabina, "Scripture states, 'an ox,' thus, under all circumstances, 'or a lamb,' under all circumstances, 'or a goat,' under all circumstances. Thus he omits all reference to a sin offering. Now what case is under discussion here? If we say that when it is sacrificed at the proper time, then why make reference in particular to a guilt offering, when even if it were a sin offering too, there would be liability. It must follow that in context under discussion is a case in which it is not sacrificed in the proper time. And under what circumstances? If we say, it is when he sacrifices it for the purpose for which the animal was originally designated, then why is he liable for a guilt offering? So the meaning must be, when he sacrifices it under a designation other than that for which it was originally consecrated. [Freedman: thus what is not fit when offered within the Temple under its own designation is fit under a different designation.]*
- K. *But what's the problem [that this should refute Huna(Freedman)]? Perhaps it is to be explained as it was earlier!*
- L. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "The reason is that this Tannaite authority of the household of R. Livai contradicts that which Levi taught, namely: in the case of a guilt offering presented for a Nazirite or a guilt offering presented for a person cleansed of the skin ailment which one slaughtered under a designation other than the one for which the beasts were originally consecrated, they are valid, though they have not fulfilled the obligation of their owners. If one slaughtered them prematurely, either by reason of the condition of their owner or by reason of the fact that they were two years old when slaughtered, they are unfit." [Freedman: and if they were slaughtered outside the Temple under such conditions, they do not entail liability, in accord with the general rule that what is unfit inside does not entail liability without; thus contradicts the earlier teaching.]*
- M. *There is no contradiction, in the one case he slaughtered the beast for the purpose for which it had originally been designated, in the other he did not do so. [Freedman: Bar Livai's statement is that he is culpable if he slaughtered it under a designation other than the original one, while Levi teaches that they are unfit, hence entail no liability if slaughtered outside, when they were slaughtered for their own sake, so the two clauses of Levi's teaching do not deal with the same circumstances.]*
- N. *R. Ashi contrasted our Mishnah's rule [one is not liable for a guilt offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment] and that in the external Tannaite formulation [one is liable for offering outside of the Temple a guilt offering of a person afflicted with the skin ailment], and he reconciled them along these same lines: there is no contradiction, in the*

one case he slaughtered the beast for the purpose for which it had originally been designated, in the other he did not do so. May we then say that this contradicts the position of R. Huna?

- O. *R. Huna may say to you, "Here with what case do we deal? It is one in which one set aside two animals to serve as guilt offerings, for the sake of making sure that if one was lost, he would at any rate have the other. To begin with, therefore, one of them was a burnt offering. [115B] This accords with what R. Huna said Rab said, for R. Huna said Rab said, "If a guilt offering was set out to pasture and then one slaughtered it without articulating the purpose, it is deemed valid as a burnt offering." [Freedman: hence if he slaughtered one of these outside of the Temple as a burnt offering, it counts as having been slaughtered for its own sake, and therefore he is liable.]*

VIII.1 A. He who offers up (1) part of the flesh of a sin offering, (2) part of the flesh of a guilt offering, (3) part of the flesh of Most Holy Things, (4) part of the flesh of Lesser Holy Things, (5) the residue of the omer, and the two breads, and the showbread, and (6) the residue of meal offerings [all of which are eaten by the priests, not offered on the altar] — he who (1) pours out [oil over the meal offering], he who (2) mixes [meal with the oil], he who (3) breaks [meal offering cakes] into pieces, he who (4) salts [meal offering], he who (5) waves [it], he who (6) brings it near [opposite the southwest corner of the altar], he who (7) arranges [the bread on table], he who (8) trims the lamps, he who (9) takes the handful, he who (10) receives the blood [none of which actions completes the sacrificial rite] — outside — is free:

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

C. How on the basis of Scripture do we know that **He who offers up (1) part of the flesh of a sin offering, (2) part of the flesh of a guilt offering, (3) part of the flesh of Most Holy Things, (4) part of the flesh of Lesser Holy Things, (5) the residue of the omer, and the two breads, and the showbread, and (6) the residue of meal offerings [all of which are eaten by the priests, not offered on the altar] — outside — is free?** Scripture says, "Whatsoever man..offers a burnt offering" — just as a burnt offering is eligible for offering up at the altar, so everything that is eligible for offering upon the altar involves liability if it is offered up outside [and none of the items on this list falls into that category].

D. How do we know that **he who (1) pours out [oil over the meal offering], he who (2) mixes [meal with the oil], he who (3) breaks [meal offering cakes] into pieces, he who (4) salts [meal offering], he who (5) waves [it], he who (6) brings it near [opposite the southwest corner of the altar], he who (7) arranges [the bread on table], he who (8) trims the lamps, he who (9) takes the handful, he who (10) receives the blood [none of which actions completes the sacrificial rite] — outside — is free?** Scripture says, "...who offers a burnt offering or sacrifice:" as offering up completes the act of service, so everything that completes the act of service involves liability [and none of these falls into that category].

IX.1 A. Before the tabernacle was set up, (1) the high places were permitted, and (2) [the sacrificial] service [was done by] the first born [Num. 3:12-13, 8:16-

18]. When the tabernacle was set up, (1) the high places were prohibited, and (2) the [sacrificial] service [was done by] priests. Most Holy Things were eaten within the veils, Lesser Holy Things [were eaten] throughout the camp of Israel.

- B. *R. Huna b. R. Qattina went into session before R. Hisda and recited the following verse of Scripture, “‘And he sent forth the young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt offerings and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen to the Lord’ (Exo. 24: 5) [Freedman: the young men were the firstborn, not priests, and the occasion was when Moses built an altar at the foot of Mount Sinai].”*
- C. *He said to him, “This is what R. Assi said, ‘But then that form of offering came to an end’” [Freedman: and this was the last time that the firstborn performed the sacrificial service, though it was nearly a year before the tabernacle was set up].*
- D. *He gave thought to refuting this position on the basis of the Mishnah-paragraph before us [before the tabernacle was set up...the sacrificial service was done by the first born], but, when he heard that which was stated in the name of R. Ada bar Ahbah, “The burnt offerings that the Israelites offered in the wilderness is not subject to flaying and cutting up,” he preferred to refute what he had said on the basis of the Tannaite formulation external to the Mishnah, which pertains to the entirety of the matter. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. **Before the tabernacle was set up, the high places were permitted and the sacrificial service was carried on by firstborn sons. And it was permitted to offer up just anything: domesticated animals, wild beasts, birds, male and female animals, unblemished or blemished animals, clean but not unclean ones, and everybody could present a burnt offering, and the burnt offering that the Israelites offered in the wilderness had to be flayed and cut up, but gentiles are permitted to do so in these days [T. Zeb.13:1A-E].**
- F. *In point of fact, the matter is subject to a conflict among Tannaite formulations, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- G. *“And let the priests also, who come near the Lord, sanctify themselves” (Exo. 19:22) —*
- H. *R. Joshua b. Qorha says, “This refers to the separation of the first born” [priests’ here referring to firstborn and this verse told them to keep away from the mountain (Freedman)].*
- I. *Rabbi says, “This refers to the separation of Nadab and Abihu.”*
- J. *Now from the perspective of him who has said, “This refers to the separation of Nadab and Abihu,” that is in line with that which is said, “This is what the Lord spoke, saying, ‘through those who are near me, I will be sanctified’” (Lev. 10: 3). But from the perspective of him who has said, “This refers to the separation of the first born,” where is there an intimation of any such warning [for the priests had not been admonished]?*
- K. *It is in the following: “And there I will meet with the children of Israel and the tent shall be sanctified by my glory” (Exo. 29:43). Pronounce the words to read not “my glory” but “my honored ones.”*
- L. *This is what the Holy One, blessed be he, said to Moses, who did not know what it meant until the sons of Aaron died. [He had hinted that he would meet the*

children of Israel at the consecration of the tabernacle and would be sanctified there through his honored ones, the priests, but they did not grasp the point (Freedman).] But when the sons of Aaron died, Moses said to him, “Aaron, my brother, your sons died only so as to sanctify the name of the Holy One, blessed be he.” When Aaron then grasped that it was his sons who were the honored ones of the Omnipresent, he kept silence, and he got a reward for his silence: “And Aaron held his peace” (Lev. 10: 3) [and consequently received a direct message from God to him personally].

IX.2. A. So too Scripture says of David, “Be silent before the Lord and wait patiently for him” (Psa. 37: 7) — “though he casts down many slain [a word that uses the same consonants as wait patiently] out of you, keep silence before him.”

B. So too in the case of Solomon Scripture says, “There is a time to keep silence and a time to speak” (Qoh. 3: 7) — “sometimes one keeps silence and is rewarded for his silence, and sometimes one speaks and is reward for his speech.”

C. *And that is in line with what R. Hiyya bar Abba said in the name of R. Yohanan, “What is the meaning of the statement of Scripture, ‘Fearful is God out of your holy places’ (Psa. 68:36) — do not read ‘out of your holy places’ but ‘through those who are sanctified to you.’ When the Holy One, blessed be he, does justice with those who are sanctified to him, he is feared, exalted, and praised.”*

IX.3. A. *[Reverting to the statement that the burnt offering did not have to be flayed and cut up:] still, the burnt offering presents a contradiction [since in point of fact it was necessary to flay and cut it up]!*

B. *What we have are two contradictory Tannaite versions on the matter, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. R. Ishmael says, “The generative principles were set forth at Sinai, but the details were set forth only in the tent of meeting.” [Freedman: hence until the tent of meeting was set up, burnt offerings were not flayed and cut up.]

D. R. Aqiba says, “The generative principles and also the details were set forth at Sinai; they were repeated in the tent of meeting; they were restated yet again in the plains of Moab.”

IX.4. A. The master has said, “**And it was permitted to offer up just anything: domesticated animals, wild beasts, birds, male and female animals, unblemished or blemished animals, clean but not unclean ones:**”

B. *What is the scriptural source for this opinion?*

C. Said R. Huna, “Said Scripture, ‘And Noah built an altar to the Lord and took of every clean domesticated beast and of every clean bird and offered burnt offerings on the altar’ (Gen. 8:20). ‘Domesticated beast and bird’ bear their ordinary meaning. **Wild beasts** are encompassed within the classification of domesticated beasts.”

IX.5. A. **[116A] ...male and female animals, unblemished or blemished animals** — *this excludes an animal that lacks a limb, for that was not acceptable for sacrifice.*

- B. Said R. Eleazar, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that the beast that was lacking a limb was forbidden for use by the children of Noah? Scripture says, ‘And of every living thing of all flesh’ (Gen. 6:19) — The Torah thus said, ‘Present a beast of which the principle limbs are alive.’”
- C. *But perhaps the intention here was to exclude terefah-beasts?*
- D. *That derives from the phrase, “to keep seed alive” (Gen. 7: 3) [and a terefah-beast cannot give birth and keep seed alive (Freedman)].*
- E. *That poses no problem to him who maintains, “A terefah-beast cannot give birth.” But from the perspective of him who says, “A terefah-beast can give birth,” what is to be said?*
- F. Has not Scripture said, “to keep them alive with you,” meaning, those that are like you [and not terefah].
- G. *So maybe Noah himself was terefah?*
- H. *In point of fact, Scripture refers to him as “unblemished.”*
- I. *But perhaps the intent was to say, “unblemished in his ways”?*
- J. *Scripture refers to him as “righteous.”*
- K. *So maybe the intent was to say, “unblemished in his ways and righteous in his deeds”?*
- L. *If you could even imagine that Noah was terefah, then could God have said to him, “Take into the ark only such as are like you, but do not take in whole animals”?*
- M. *Now, since we derive the fact from “with you [=like you],” what is the point of saying, “to keep seed alive”?*
- N. *What might you otherwise have said? “With you” means merely, to keep you company, thus even old or castrated beasts would qualify. Hence the phrase tells us that that is not the case.*

IX.6. A. [The master has said,] **“clean but not unclean ones:”**

- B. *But was there any distinction in classifications of unclean and clean beasts at that time?*
- C. Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, “The sense is: among those with which a sin had not been committed.”
- D. *So how did they know one from the other?*
- E. *It is in accord with R. Hisda, for said R. Hisda, “He marched them before the ark. Any that the ark would receive was identified as one that was clean, and any that the ark would not accept was identified as one that was unclean.”*
- F. R. Abbahu said, “Said Scripture, ‘And they who went in went in male and female’ (Gen. 7:16) — they were those who went in on their own.”

IX.7. A. The master has said, **“and everybody could present a burnt offering:”**

- B. Burnt offerings but not peace offerings? *But it is written*, “and the sacrificed peace offerings of oxen” (Exo. 24: 5)!
- C. *Rather, state the matter in this language: and everybody could present a burnt offering and peace offerings.*
- D. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:* But not peace offerings, only burnt offerings?
- E. *That is formulated within the principle that* the children of Noah did not present peace offerings at all [and Exo. 24: 5 was stated after the revelation at Sinai].
- F. *For it has been stated:*
- G. R. Eleazar and R. Yosé bar Hanina:
- H. One said, “The children of Noah offered peace offerings.”
- I. And the other said, “The children of Noah did not offer peace offerings.”
- J. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of him who says,* “The children of Noah offered peace offerings”?
- K. *It is because it is written*, “And Abel too brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof” (Gen. 4: 4). And what is the offering the fact of which alone is offered on the altar but the whole of which is not offered on the altar? You must say that it is a peace offering.
- L. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of him who says,* “The children of Noah did not offer peace offerings”?
- M. *It is that it is written*, “Awake, O north, and come, you south,” meaning, (Son. 4:16) — “awake, people the rites of whom are performed at the north side of the altar [the children of Noah, only burnt offerings], and come, people the rites of whom will be performed at the north and at the south side of the altar [by joining Israel through the Torah, people can sacrifice at the north and the south side of the altar].”
- N. But surely it is written, “and of the fat thereof”?
- O. This means, “their fat ones.”
- P. And as to the other, surely it is written, “Awake O north”!
- Q. That refers to the gathering of the exiles.”

IX.8. A. But it has as a matter of fact been written, “And Moses said, ‘You must also give into our hand sacrifices and burnt offerings’” (Exo. 10:25) [since burnt offerings are mentioned explicitly, “sacrifices” must refer to peace offerings, which then were presented prior to the giving of the Torah (Freedman)].

B. “the sacrifices” were for food, the “burnt offerings” for presentation as offerings.

- C. But lo, it is written, “Jethro, the father in law of Moses, took a burnt offering and sacrifices for God” (Exo. 18:12).
- D. That took place after the giving of the Torah.
 - E. *That poses no problem to him who maintains that Jethro also came along after the giving of the Torah. But to him who holds that Jethro also came along prior to the giving of the Torah, what is to be said?*
 - F. *For it has been stated:*
 - G. The sons of R. Hiyya and R. Joshua b. Levi — one said, “Jethro appeared prior to the giving of the Torah.”
 - H. The other said, “Jethro appeared after the giving of the Torah.”
 - I. From the perspective of him who said that Jethro was prior to the giving of the Torah, the children of Noah presented peace offerings.

IX.9. *A. There is a conflict of Tannaite formulations on the matter:*

- B. “Jethro, the priest of Midian, Moses’ father-in-law, heard” (Exo. 18: 1) — “What had he heard that made him come and convert?”
- C. R. Joshua says, “He heard about the war of Amalek and came, as is written in the immediately prior passage.”
- D. For lo, it is written alongside, ‘And Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people with the edge of the sword’ (Exo. 17:13).”
- E. R. Eleazar the Modiite says, “He heard about the giving of the Torah and therefore came along.
- F. “When the Holy One, blessed be He, revealed the Torah to Israel, the sound of the matter echoed from one end of the earth to the other, and all the kings of the world shook in their palaces,
- G. “so they recited a psalm, ‘And in his palace all say glory’ (Psa. 29: 9).

- H. “At that time all the nations of the world collected around the wicked Balaam and said to him, ‘What is this enormous noise that we are hearing? Perhaps the Omnipresent is going to do to us as he did to the generation of the flood, as it is said, The Lord say enthroned at the flood’ (Psa. 29:10)?”
- I. “He said to them, “‘The Lord sits enthroned as king forever.’ The Holy One, blessed be he, has taken an oath to Noah that he will not bring a flood into the world, for it is said, “For this is as the waters of Noah to me; for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah shall no more go over the earth...” (Isa. 54: 9).”
- J. “They said, ‘Perhaps he will not bring a flood of water, but he may bring a flood of fire? “For by fire will the Lord contend” (Psa. 18:12)’
- K. “He said to them, ‘He has already taken an oath that he will not destroy all flesh.’
- L. “They said to him, ‘Then what is this row that we have heard?’
- M. ““He has a valued treasure in his storehouse, hidden by him for nine hundred and seventy four generations before the world was created, and he wants to give it to his children: “The Lord is giving strength to his people” (Psa. 29:11).’
- N. “Forthwith they exclaimed, ““The Lord will bless his people with peace”” (Psa. 29:11).
- O. R. Eliezer says, “It was the splitting of the Red Sea that he heard, so he came along.
- P. “For when the Red Sea was split open for Israel, the sound was heard from one end of the world to the other:
- Q. ““And it came to pass, when all the kings of the Amorites...heard’ (Jos. 5: 1).
- R. “And so Rahab the whore said to Joshua’s messengers, ‘For we have heard how the Lord dried up the water of the Red Sea before you,

- when you came out of Egypt...and as soon as we had heard it, our hearts melted, and no spirit remained in any one, because of you' (Jos. 2:10-11)."
- S. *And why does the former verse say, "neither was there spirit in them any more," while the latter says, "neither did there remain any more spirit in any man"?*
- T. **[116B]** *They couldn't even get a hard on.*
- U. *And how did she know?!*
- V. A master said, "There wasn't a prince or ruler who had not come upon Rahab the whore."
- W. They say that Rahab was ten years old when the Israelites went forth from Egypt.
- X. During all those forty years that the Israelites were in the wilderness, she was a hooker.
- Y. At the end of her fiftieth year, she converted, and she said before the Holy One, blessed be he, "Lord of the world, in three matters I have sinned. In three ways forgive me: on account of the cord, the window, and the wall:
- Z. "Then she let them down by a cord through the window, for her house was upon the side of the wall, and she dwelt upon the wall" (Jos. 2:15).

IX.10. A. The master has said, "**but gentiles are permitted to do so in these days.**"

- B. *What is the scriptural source for this opinion?*
- C. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. "Speak to the children of Israel" (Lev. 17: 2) — the children of Israel are subject to the commandment not to slaughter sacrifices outside of the tent of meeting, but gentiles are not subject to the commandment not to slaughter sacrifices outside of the tent of meeting.
- E. Therefore each one of them may build himself a high place and offer on it anything he wants.

IX.11. A. Said R. Jacob bar Aha said R. Assi, "It is forbidden to assist them to carry out their mission."

- B. Said Rabbah, "But it is permitted to teach them."

- IX.12.** A. *Along this lines Ifra Hormiz, mother of King Shapur, sent an animal sacrifice to Raba, with the request to offer it up in her behalf for the sake of Heaven.*”
- B. *He instructed R. Safra and R. Aha bar Huna, “Go, get to young men of the same age, find a spot [Freedman:] where the sea has thrown up alluvial mud; take new twigs, produce a fire with a new flint, and off it up in the honor of Heaven.”*
- C. *Said to him Abbayye, “In accord with whom are these instructions? In accord with R. Eleazar b. Shammua. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. *“R. Eleazar b. Shammua says, ‘Just as the altar is such that it may not have been utilized by an ordinary purpose, so the wood must not have been used by an ordinary person.’*
- E. *“But lo, R. Eleazar b. Shammua concedes that in the case of the high place, that is not an operative consideration. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. *“R. Eleazar b. Shammua says, ‘One verse of Scripture states, “So David gave to Ornan for the place six hundred shekels of gold by weight” (1Ch. 21:25), while another verse of Scripture states, “So David bought the threshing floor and the oxen for fifty shekels of silver” (2Sa. 24:24). And how are these to be reconciled? He collected fifty from each tribe, six hundred in all.’*
- G. *“Rabbi says in the name of R. Yosé b. Dosetai, ‘The oxen, wood, site of the altar, were bought for fifty, and the site of the whole Temple for six hundred.’*
- H. *“R. Eleazar b. Shammua says, ‘The oxen, wood, and site of the altar were for fifty, and the site of the whole Temple for six hundred: “And Araunah said to David, let my lord the king take and offer what seems good to him; behold the oxen for the burnt offering and the threshing instruments and furniture of the oxen for wood” (2Sa. 24:22).’”*
[Freedman: thus he took utensils that had already been used for a secular purpose and used them as fuel for the altar, and since the Temple was not then built, David was building a mere high place.]
- I. *And Raba?*
- J. *He can say to you, “There these were new too [never having been used].”*

IX.13. A. *What is the meaning of “furniture”?*

B. *Said Ulla, “A bed of turbel.”*

C. *So what’s “A bed of turbel”?*

D. *Said Abbayye, [Freedman] “A goat with hooks, with which the threshers thresh.”*

- E. *Said Abbayye, “What verse of Scripture shows it? ‘Behold I make you a new threshing sledge having sharp teeth; you shall thresh mountains’ (Isa. 41:15).”*

IX.14. A. *Raba cited for his son and contrasted these verses of Scripture with one another: “‘So David gave to Ornan for the place six hundred shekels of gold by weight’ (1Ch. 21:25). ‘So David bought the threshing floor and the oxen for fifty shekels of silver’ (2Sa. 24:24). And how are these to be reconciled? He collected fifty from each tribe, six hundred in all.”*

- B. *Still, they contradict one another, for there it was silver and here gold!*
- C. *Say: he collected silver to the value of six hundred shekels of gold.*

X.1 A. **[Most Holy Things were eaten within the veils,] Lesser Holy Things [were eaten] throughout the camp of Israel:**

- B. *Said R. Huna, “Wherever Israelites were located, but there was no camp [so one could eat Lesser Holy Things even if he left the camp of the Israelites].”*
- C. *R. Nahman objected to this statement of R. Huna, “Now were there really no camps in the wilderness? And lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. **“Just as in the wilderness there were three camps, the camp of the Indwelling Presence of God, the camp of the Levites, and the camp of the Israelites, so in Jerusalem there were three camps: from the gate of Jerusalem to the gate of the Temple Mount is the camp of Israel; from the gate of the Temple Mount to Nicanor’s gate is the camp of the Levites; from Nicanor’s gate and inward is the camp of the Indwelling Presence of God. And that corresponded to the place within the curtains in the wilderness. In the time of journeying, no aspect of sanctity applied to them, and people were not liable on their account in regard to uncleanness [T. **Kelim**B.M.1:12A-F]?”**
- E. *Then frame matters in this way: “Wherever the camp of the Israelites was located” [Freedman: if they broke camp and pitched their camp elsewhere, a sacrifice that had been offered at the former site could be eaten in the new site].*
- F. *That’s obvious!*
- G. *What might you otherwise have imagined? The meat of Lesser Holy Things under such conditions would be disqualified on the count of having been taken out [of the camp of the Israelites]. So we are informed that that is not the case.*
- H. *But maybe it is the case!*
- I. *Scripture says, “Then the tent of meeting shall set forward” (Num. 2:17) — even when it sets forward, it is still the tent of meeting. [Freedman: the camps when they are travelling still are regarded as camps.]*

X.2. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. *R. Simeon b. Yohai says, “There was still another place there, which was the women’s court, and they would not impose a penalty on its account [if one went in there while unclean]. In Shilo there were only two camps alone.”*
- C. *Which one then was omitted?*

- D. *Said Abbaye, "It stands to reason that there assuredly was the camp of the Levites, for if you should imagine that there was no camp of the Levites, [117A] it would turn out that persons afflicted with flux [Gen. 15] and those unclean with corpse uncleanness would be sent out of only one camp [that is, the camp of the Presence of God, since they are permitted in the camp of the Israelites], while the Torah has said, 'That they not defile their camps' (Num. 5: 3), which bears the sense, there has to be a camp for this one and a camp for that one."* [Freedman: each is sent into a different camp, one unclean through the dead being expelled from the camp of the Presence of God but permitted in the Levitical camp, the one afflicted with flux being expelled from the Levitical camp as well.]
- E. *Said to him Raba, "Then what is the upshot? That there was no camp of Israelites? It would turn out that persons afflicted with flux [Gen. 15] and those unclean with corpse uncleanness would be sent to a single camp, but the Torah has said, 'he shall dwell alone' (Lev. 13:46), bearing the implication that no other unclean person should dwell in the same camp with him.*
- F. *"Accordingly, all three camps were there. But what is the sense of the statement, 'In Shilo there were only two camps alone'? That was in regard to affording shelter for the involuntary man-slaughterer."* [In the wilderness, he could take shelter in the Levitical camp, but in Shilo the Levitical camp lost that function (Freedman).]
- G. *So is that to imply that in the wilderness the Levitical camp afforded refuge for the one who had committed involuntary manslaughter?*
- H. *Yes indeed, and so it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. *"Then I will appoint for you a place whither he may flee" (Exo. 21:13) —*
- J. *"you" — in your lifetime.*
- K. *"you a place" — in your place [that is, the Levites' camp]].*
- L. *"whither he may flee" — this teaches that when they banished a man-slaughterer in the period of the wilderness, to where did they exile him? To the camp of the Levites.*
- M. *On this basis they have said:*
- N. *A Levite who committed involuntary manslaughter goes into exile from one district to another district. If he fled to his own precinct, his precinct must afford him refuge.*
- O. *On the basis of what verse of Scripture?*
- P. *Said R. Aha b. R. Iqa, "'Because he must remain in his city of refuge' (Num. 35:28) — a city that has already accorded him refuge."*

XI.1 A. They came to Gilgal. The high places were permitted. Most Holy Things were eaten within the veils, Lesser Holy Things, anywhere:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **"Whatever [classification of offering] is subject to a vow- or a freewill-offering is offered on the high place belonging to an individual. Whatever is not subject to a vow or a freewill-offering is not offered on the high place belonging to an individual; a meal offering and the offerings of a Nazirite were offered at a high place," the words of R. Meir.**

- D. And sages say, “Offered on the high place of an individual are only a burnt offering and peace offerings alone.”
- E. R. Judah says, “Anything that the community and the individual offer up in the tent of meeting that is in the wilderness do they offer up in the tent of meeting that is in Gilgal. The only difference between the situation prevailing at the time of the tent of meeting that was in the wilderness and that at the time of the tent of meeting in Gilgal is that in the wilderness there was no permission for high places elsewhere, while in Gilgal it was permitted to maintain high places elsewhere. In the case of one who has his high place on the top of his roof, the individual offers thereon only a burnt offering and peace offerings alone.”
- F. And sages say, “Anything that the community offers in the tent of meeting that was in the wilderness do they offer in the tent of meeting that is in Gilgal. In both cases the individual offers on it only a burnt offering and peace offerings alone.”
- G. R. Judah says, “Also the community offered in the tent of meeting that was in the wilderness only that which was assigned to it by the Torah alone.”
- H. R. Simeon says, “Also the community offered up only the Passover offering alone [117B] and also obligatory offerings that had been assigned a fixed time [e.g., the daily whole offering]” [T. **Zeb.13:12A-C,13A-C,14,15A-D,16A**].

XI.2. A. *What is the scriptural basis of the position of R. Meir?*

- B. “You shall not do after all that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his eyes” (Deu. 12: 8) —
- C. Said Moses to the Israelites, “When you enter the Land, offerings by reason of a vow you may present, but obligatory offerings you may not present.” *And Meal offerings and those of the Nazirite fall into the classification of votive offerings.*
- D. And the rabbis?
- E. Meal offerings were not presented at the high place at all, and the Nazirite offerings in fact fall into the classification of obligatory ones.

XI.3. A. Said Samuel, “At issue between them are the sin offering and guilt offering [presented by a Nazirite at the end of the spell of his vow], but all concur that as to burnt offerings and peace offerings of a Nazirite, these fall into the classification of votive offerings *and they are presented on a high place.*”

- B. *Objected Rabbah*, “**The breast and the thigh, the raising up of the loaves of the thanksgiving offering [four of the forty, all of which are assigned to the priest] belong to the priest at a public high place but not at a private high place [T. **Zeb.13:17F**].** But as to the boiled shoulder, the Tannaite framer of that statement has omitted all reference to it! Now, if you take the view that they differ in regard to the burnt offering and peace offerings, then who can stand behind that view? It is rabbis. But if you hold that they disagree solely about the sin offering and the guilt offering, who can be responsible for this statement? Rather, if Samuel made a statement, this is the statement he had to have made: ‘At issue between them are the sin offering and guilt offering [presented by a Nazirite at the end of the spell of his vow], but as to burnt offerings and the guilt

offering, all parties concur *that these fall into the classification of obligatory offerings and are not offered.*”

XI.4. A. The master said: **And sages say, “Anything that the community offers in the tent of meeting that was in the wilderness do they offer in the tent of meeting that is in Gilgal. In both cases the individual offers on it only a burnt offering and peace offerings alone.”**

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for the ruling of rabbis?*
- C. “Every man whatsoever is right in his eyes” (Deu. 12: 8) — *only a man may offer voluntary sacrifices and not obligatory ones, but the community must offer obligatory ones as well.*
- D. **[118A]** *And R. Judah will say to you, “‘Whatsoever is right’ refers to ‘in his eyes,’ but as to the great high place, one could offer even obligatory offerings.”*
- E. *But the passage explicitly states, “a man,” and does that not bear the sense that only a man may offer voluntary but not obligatory sacrifices?*
- F. *The purpose of writing, “a man” is to validate even a non-priest.*
- G. *That a non-priest is fit for this altar derives from the following verse: “And the priest shall sprinkle the blood on the altar of the Lord at the door of the tent of meeting” (Lev. 17: 6) [thus: at the door of the tent of meeting a priest is the one to do it, but at a high place anybody can].*
- H. *You might have said that the sanctification of the first born is required [since they had originally officiated before the priesthood], and so we are informed that that is not the case.*

XI.5. A. *In the cited passage, sages say the same thing as the initial, anonymous statement!*

- B. *Said R. Pappa, “At issue between them is whether or not libations were offered in the wilderness.” [The initial position is that libations were not offered in the wilderness and indicate only that peace offerings and burnt offerings were permitted at the high place; the named sages hold that libations were offered in the wilderness, and so: whatever the community had to offer in the wilderness, including libations, they also had to offer at Gilgal (Freedman)].*

XI.6. A. A master has said, **“R. Simeon says, “Also the community offered up only the Passover offering alone **[117B]** and also obligatory offerings that had been assigned a fixed time [e.g., the daily whole offering].”**

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Simeon?*
- C. “And the children of Israel encamped in Gilgal and they offered Passover offerings” (Jos. 5:10).
- D. *So what else is new!*
- E. *But the statement informs us that they offered only obligatory sacrifices that are comparable to the Passover offering, but they did not offer obligatory offerings that were not comparable to the Passover offering.*
- F. *And the contrary view?*
- G. *He requires that verse to make the point that R. Yohanan said, for said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Benaah, “An uncircumcised person received sprinkling [of purification water, if he contracted corpse uncleanness, and then he might deal*

with Holy Things, for the majority of the people in Gilgal had not been circumcised in the wilderness].”

XI.7. A. *Recited a Tannaite authority before R. Adda bar Ahbah, “The only difference between a public high place and a private high place was in regard to the Passover offering alone and also obligatory offerings that had been assigned a fixed time [M. Meg.1:10].”*

B. *He said to him, “In accord with what authority has this statement been made to you? It accords with R. Simeon, who says, ‘The only difference between a great high place and a private high place was in regard to Passover offerings and obligatory offerings that had been assigned a fixed time,’ but then you have to make your formulation refer also to the statutory burnt offering, as there is also a votive burnt offering. [The daily and additional burnt offerings are obligatory offerings subject to a fixed time, but the statutory sin offerings of festivals could not be offered there (Freedman).] But as to the sin offering, is there a votive sin offering?” [Obviously not. Simeon includes only those obligatory offerings of which there are also votive offerings, for if he meant all obligatory offerings that have a fixed time, he should simply mention ‘them,’ and not the Passover offering at all, since that too is an obligatory offering with a fixed time. Hence this is what he means: the only difference between public and private high places was in respect to the Passover offerings, which were offered at the former but not at the latter, while as for other sacrifices that were offered at both, the difference is that at the private high place only votive offerings were offered, while at the public high place statutory offerings that have a fixed time also were offered.]*

C. *But why not speak of the obligatory meal offering, which involve a sort of cake baked on a griddle?” [Lev. 6:13, statutory daily offerings, and there also were votive meal offerings, so here is another candidate that meets the requirements (Freedman).]*

D. *He takes the view that meal offerings in any event were not offered at a high place.*

XII.1 A. **They came to Shilo. The high places were prohibited. (1) There was no roof beam there, but below was a house of stone, and hangings above it, and (2) it was “the resting place” [Deu. 12: 9]:**

B. *What is the scriptural source of this rule?*

C. *Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “One verse of Scripture states, ‘And she brought him to the house of the Lord in Shilo’ (1Sa. 1:24), while another verse of Scripture states, ‘And he forsook the tabernacle of Shilo, the tent that he had made to dwell among men,’ and further, ‘moreover, he abhorred the tent of Joseph and chose not the tribe of Ephraim’ (Psa. 78:60, 67). How are these several descriptions to be reconciled? It had no roof above, but there were stones below and curtains above” [Freedman: so it was partly like a house and partly like a tent].*

XIII.1 A. **Most Holy Things were eaten within the veils, Lesser Holy Things and second tithe [were eaten] in any place within sight [of Shilo]:**

B. *What is the scriptural source of this rule?*

C. *Said R. Oshaia, “Said Scripture, ‘Take heed for yourself that you do not offer your burnt offerings in every place that you see’ (Deu. 12:14) — ‘in every place*

that you see' you shall not make your offerings, but you may eat 'in every place that you see.'"

- D. *Might I say*, "'in every place that you see' you may not make an offering, but you may sacrifice the beast 'in every place that you see'?"
- E. Said R. Yannai, "Said Scripture, 'There you shall offer...and there you shall sacrifice the beast' (Deu. 12:14)." [Freedman: thus it must be slaughtered and offered in one and the same place.]
- F. R. Abedimi bar Hasa said, "Said Scripture, [118B] 'And there was the lamenting of Shilo' (cf. Jos. 16: 6)— a place that made everybody who saw it mourn for the sacrifices that he ate there [Freedman: before the tabernacle was destroyed]."
- G. R. Abbahu said, "Said Scripture, 'Joseph is a fruitful vine, a fruitful vine through the eye' (Gen. 19:22) — [since Shilo was in Ephraim's territory and Ephraim was Joseph's son, the sense is this:] 'The eye that did not want to feed and enjoy something that was not his should now have the merit of eating sacrifices as far as it can see.'"
- H. R. Yosé b. R. Hanina said, "'And the desire of him who lived in hatred' (Deu. 33:16) — [since Shilo was in Ephraim's territory and Ephraim was Joseph's son, the sense is this:] 'The eye that did not want to feed and enjoy something that was not his should now have the merit of eating sacrifices among those who hated it.'" [Freedman: in the territories surrounding Shilo, which belonged to the other tribes, whose founders had hated Joseph, since "as far as the eye could see" would embrace the borders of those territories.]

XIII.2. A. *A Tannaite formulation: ...in any place within sight [of Shilo] of which they have spoken means from any place from which one could see the tabernacle without any intervening structure."*

- B. *[Following Freedman's text:] Said R. Simeon b. Eliaqim to R. Eleazar, "For instance?"*
- C. *He said to him, "For instance, the synagogue at Maon"* [Freedman: from there one would have an uninterrupted view of the Tabernacle at Shilo].

XIII.3. A. Said R. Pappa, "...in any place within sight [of Shilo] of which they have spoken does not mean one sees the whole of the tabernacle, but one must say part of it."

- B. *R. Pappa raised this question: "If when standing one can see the tabernacle, but when sitting, one cannot see it, what is the rule?"*
- C. *R. Jeremiah raised this question: "If when standing at the edge of a valley one could see it, but when sitting in the valley one could not see it, what is the rule?"*
- D. *These questions stand.*

XIII.4. A. *When R. Dimi came, he said, "The Indwelling Presence of God came to rest on Israel in three locations: Shilo, Nob-and-Gibeon, and the eternal house, and in all these instances it came to rest only within the portion of Benjamin: 'He covers him all day' (Deu. 33:12). All 'coverings' too will be only in the portion of Benjamin."*

- B. *When Abbayye went and reported this before R. Joseph, he said, "Kaylil [Abbayye's father] had one son, and he is not finished [but half baked]. Surely it*

is written, 'And he forsook the tabernacle of Shilo,' and further, 'Moreover, he abhorred the tent of Joseph and did not choose the tribe of Ephraim' (Psa. 78:60, 67)."

- C. *Said R. Adda, "Where's the beef? Perhaps the Presence of God was in the portion of Benjamin, while the great Sanhedrin was located in the portion of Joseph, for we find in the case of the eternal house that the Presence of God was in the portion of Benjamin, while the great Sanhedrin was located in the portion of Joseph."*
- D. *He said to him, "But what kind of a comparison is that! In that case the territories of Judah and Benjamin were side by side, but were they side by side here [at Shilo]?"*
- E. *"Here too they were indeed side by side here [at Shilo], in line with that which R. Hama bar Hanina said, "There was a strip of land that extruded from the portion of Judah and entered into the portion of Benjamin, and on that strip of land the altar was built. Benjamin, the righteous man, was upset about that every day, wanting to take it over.' Here too, a strip of land extruded from the portion of Joseph into that of Benjamin, and that is the sense of 'the Sorrow of Shilo' (Jos. 16: 6)."*
- F. *The same issue is subject to a conflict among Tannaite statements on the matter, as follows:*
- G. *"He covers him" refers to the first temple; "all day long" to the second Temple, "and dwells between his shoulders," speaks of the days of the Messiah. [Freedman: on this view only the two Temples were in Benjamin's territory, not the tabernacles at Shilo and elsewhere.]*
- H. *Rabbi says, "'He covers him' in this world; 'all day long,' in the days of the Messiah; 'and he dwells between his shoulders,' in the world to come."*

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

- B. The time span of the tent of meeting in the wilderness was forty years less one; the time span of the tent of meeting at Gilgal was fourteen years, seven of them during the conquest, and seven during the division, of the land. The time span of the tent of meeting at Nob-and-Gibeon was fifty-seven years; leaving for Shilo three hundred and seventy less one.

XIII.6. A. "The time span of the tent of meeting in the wilderness was forty years less one:"

- B. *What is the basis for this allegation?*
- C. *It is in line with what a master has said, "In the first year of the exodus, Moses made the tabernacle, in the second, he set it up and he sent out the spies."*

XIII.7. A. "the time span of the tent of meeting at Gilgal was fourteen years, seven of them during the conquest, and seven during the division, of the land:"

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for this allegation?*
- C. *It is in line with what Caleb said, "I was forty years old when Moses, servant of the Lord, sent me from Kadesh-barnea to spit out the land, and I brought him back word as it was in my heart,' 'and now, lo, I am this day [at the start of the division of the land] eighty-five years old' (Jos. 14:7, 10).*

- D. *Now, when he crossed the Jordan, how old was he? He was seventy-eight, and he said, "I am eighty-five," yielding seven years for the conquest.*
- E. *And as to the seven years for dividing the country up?*
- F. *If you want, you may say that since it took seven years to conquer, it would take seven years to divide it up.*
- G. *And if you like, you may say that in no other way can we explain the verse, "In the fourteenth year after the city was smitten" (Eze. 40: 1). [Freedman: the Temple was built four hundred eighty years after the exodus, four hundred and forty years after the entry into the land of Israel. It took four hundred and ten years, so eight hundred and fifty years from the entry until the destruction, which is thirty-seven jubilees. Deducting the fourteen years for conquest and division, as these did not count for the jubilee calculation, we find that the temple was destroyed fourteen years before a jubilee year, and therefore the fourteenth year after its destruction was a jubilee year.]*

- XIII.8.** A. "The time span of the tent of meeting at Nob-and-Gibeon was fifty-seven years; leaving for Shilo three hundred and seventy less one:"
- B. *What is the scriptural basis for this allegation?*
 - C. "And it came to pass when he made mention of the ark of God that he [Eli the priest] fell off his seat and died" (1Sa. 4:18).
 - D. *It was taught as a Tannaite statement:* when Eli, the priest, died, Shilo was destroyed, and they came to Nob; when Samuel the Ramatite died, Nob was destroyed and they came to Gibeon.
 - E. And it is written, "And it came to pass, from the day that the ark dwelt in Kiriat-yearim, that the time was long, for it was twenty years, and all the house of Israel yearned after the Lord:" (1Sa. 7: 2).
 - F. *Now as to these twenty years:* there were ten years in which Samuel ruled on his own, a year in which Samuel and Saul ruled, two years that Saul ruled on his own, and the seven of David [at Hebron], as it is written, **[119A]** "And the days that David reigned over Israel were forty years, seven in Hebrew, thirty-three in Jerusalem" (1Ki. 2:11). And of Solomon: "and he began to build...in the fourth year of his reign" (2Ch. 3: 2). Thus left for Shiloh is the span of three hundred seventy years less one. [Freedman: the period of Nob and Gibeon is calculated from the time that the ark was taken to Kiriat yearim until Solomon began building the Temple. The Temple was consecrated four hundred and eighty years after the exodus; the figure three hundred and sixty nine is arrived at by deducting the forty years in the wilderness, the fourteen at Gilgal, and the fifty-seven of Nob and Gibeon.]

XIV.1 A. They came to Nob and Gibeon. The high places were permitted. Most Holy Things were eaten within the veils, Lesser Holy Things, in all the towns of Israel:

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for this allegation?*
- C. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. "For your have not yet come to the rest and the inheritance which the Lord your God gives you" (Deu. 12: 9) —
- E. "the rest:" this refers to Shilo.

- F. “and the inheritance.” this refers to Jerusalem.
- G. Why does Scripture refer to them separately?
- H. So as to permit [high places in the span of time] between the destruction of the one and the building of the other.

XIV.2. A. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish to R. Yohanan, “If so, then there should be an allusion to the consideration of second tithe as well [since, if Shilo’s sanctity was over, then it should be legislated that second tithe must be eaten at Nob and Gibeon alone (Freedman)].”*

- B. *He said to him, “As for tithe, we derive the meaning of ‘there’ [with reference to eating the tithe in Jerusalem, as at Deu. 14:23, ‘and you shall eat before the Lord your God, in the place which he shall choose to cause his name to dwell there,] from the use of ‘there’ in connection with the ark (Exo. 40: 3): ‘and you shall put there the ark of the testimony’] [thus connecting the one to the other]. Since there was no ark at Nob and Gibeon, there also was no consideration of eating second tithe there.”*
- C. *“If so, then there should also be no consideration of eating the Passover and Holy Things there either, if it is the fact that we derive the rule governing that place from the shared meaning of ‘there’ used in connection with the ark, specifically, since there was no ark at Nob and Gibeon, there also should have been no consideration of these other matters there as well!”*
- D. *He said to him, “Who told you this? It is surely R. Simeon, who took the view that even though the community offered only the Passover and obligatory offerings assigned a fixed time, but obligatory offerings not assigned a fixed time could not be offered at either location. And in this case there is no offering made of the animal designated as tithe represents an obligatory offering not assigned a fixed time, and tithe of grain is then treated as comparable to tithe of the herd.”*

XIV.3. A. *Does it follow, then, that R. Judah takes the view that second tithe would be eaten only at Nob and Gibeon [when they formed the cultic center of Israel]?*

- B. *Yes indeed, and that is in line with what R. Adda bar Mattenah said, “In the opinion of R. Judah, the animal designated as tithe represents an obligatory offering not assigned a fixed time, and tithe of grain.”*
- C. *But lo, is not the presence of a residence for the divinity required too?*
- D. *Did not R. Joseph state as a Tannaite formulation:*
- E. *There were three divine residences, in Shilo, Nob-and-Gibeon, and the eternal house.*
- F. *He is the one who stated it as a Tannaite formulation, and he is also the one who explained it: these are in regard to the eating of second tithe, within the position of R. Judah.*

XV.1 A. **They came to Jerusalem. The high places were prohibited. And they never again were permitted. And it was “the inheritance” [Deu. 12: 9]. Most Holy Things were eaten within the veils, Lesser Holy Things and second tithe within the wall:**

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

- C. “For you have not yet come to the rest and the inheritance which the Lord your God gives you” (Deu. 12: 9) —
- D. “What is ‘the rest’?”
- E. “This refers to Shilo.
- F. “What is ‘and the inheritance’?”
- G. “This refers to Jerusalem.
- H. “So Scripture says, ‘For you have not come as yet to the rest and to the inheritance’ (Deu. 12: 9; and further, ‘My inheritance is to me a painted bird’ (Jer. 12: 9); and further, ‘My inheritance was to me as a lion in the forest,’ (Jer. 12: 8),” the words of R. Judah.
- I. R. Simeon says, “‘Inheritance refers to Shilo, ‘rest’ refers to Jerusalem, as it says, ‘The Lord has chosen Zion; this is my resting place forever; there I shall dwell, because I have desired it’ (Psa. 132:13-14)” [T. [Zeb.13:20A-I](#)].

XV.2. A. *Now from the perspective of him who says, “What is ‘the rest’? This refers to Shilo,” there is no problem, and that is in line with “to the rest and to the inheritance” [in the proper chronological order].*

B. *But from the perspective of him who says, “‘Inheritance refers to Shilo, ‘rest’ refers to Jerusalem,” the cited verse should read, “to the inheritance and to the rest”!*

C. *This is the sense of the matter: not only have you not reached “the rest” which is Jerusalem, but you have not even gotten to “the inheritance” which is Shilo.”*

XV.3. A. *A Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [stated], “Both words speak of Shilo.” [Freedman: yet even so, high places were permitted after the destruction of the Sanctuary at Shilo, for he holds that they were permitted even after the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem.]*

B. R. Simeon b. Yohai says, “Both words refer to Jerusalem.”

XV.4. A. *Now from the perspective of him who says, “What is ‘the rest’? [119B] This refers to Shilo,” or even the reverse, there is no problem, and that is in line with “to the rest and to the inheritance” [in the proper chronological order].*

B. *But from the perspective of him who maintains that both words refer to Shilo or both words refer to Jerusalem, the verse should say, “to the rest and inheritance.”*

C. *That’s a problem.*

XV.5. A. *From the perspective of him who says that both words refer to Shilo, there is no problem, for “rest” means, when they rested from the conquest of the land, and “inheritance” refers to dividing the inheritance, as it is said, “And Joshua cast lots for them in Shilo before the Lord, and there Joshua divided the land to the children of Israel according to their divisions” (Judges 18:10).*

B. *But from the perspective of the one who maintains that both words refer to Jerusalem, while there is no problem with regard to the word “inheritance,” meaning, an eternal inheritance, what is the point of “rest”?*

C. *The place where the ark came to rest: “Arise O Lord to your resting place, you and the ark of your strength” (Psa. 132: 8).*

XV.6. A. *From the perspective of him who maintains that both words speak, of Jerusalem, but during the period of Shilo, the high places were permitted, there is no problem in line with the following: “So Manoah took the kid with the meal offering and offered it upon the rock to the Lord” (Jud. 13:19). But from the perspective of him who says that both allude to Shilo, and the high places at that time were forbidden, how can it be that “Manoah took the kid with the meal offering and offered it upon the rock to the Lord” (Judges 13:19)?*

B. *It was a special dispensation for the occasion.*

XV.7. A. *The Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael is in accord with R. Simeon b. Yohai, who has said, “Both refer to Jerusalem.”*

B. *Your mnemonic is, one man drew many men [Freedman: Simeon won over the whole household of R. Ishmael].*

XVI.1 A. **All the Holy Things which one sanctified at the time of the prohibition of the high places and offered at the time of the prohibition of high places outside — lo, these are subject to the transgression of a positive commandment and a negative commandment, and they are liable on their account to extirpation [for sacrificing outside the designated place]. [If] one sanctified them at the time of the permission of high places and offered them up at the time of the prohibition of high places, lo, these are subject to transgression of a positive commandment and to a negative commandment, but they are not liable on their account to extirpation [since if the offerings had been sacrificed when they were sanctified, there should have been no violation]. [If] one sanctified them at the time of the prohibition of high places and offered them up at the time of the permission of high places, lo, these are subject to transgression of a positive commandment, but they are not subject to a negative commandment at all:**

B. *[With reference to the clause, [If] one sanctified them at the time of the permission of high places and offered them up at the time of the prohibition of high places, lo, these are subject to transgression of a positive commandment and to a negative commandment, but they are not liable on their account to extirpation:] said R. Kahana, “This statement has been made only with regard to slaughtering the animal as a sacrifice, but as to actually offering it up, one does indeed also incur the penalty of extirpation.*

C. *“What is the scriptural basis for that view? Scripture says, ‘And you shall say to them’ (Lev. 17: 8), meaning, ‘those just now listed.’” [Freedman: those who have consecrated the animal when the high places were permitted but sacrifice them when they were forbidden].*

D. *To this proof objected Raba, “But is it written, ‘concerning them’? What is written is obviously, ‘to them.’”*

E. *“And furthermore, it has been taught as a Tannaite statement: There were four generative propositions that R. Simeon would state with regard to Holy Things: ‘if one consecrated the animals at the time of the prohibition of high places — he who offers it up outside on a high place is liable on account of a positive commandment and liable on account of a negative commandment and liable for extirpation. [If] one sanctified them at the time of the*

permission of high places and offered them up at the time of the prohibition of high places, lo, these who offered up the offering outside are subject to transgression of a positive commandment and to a negative commandment, but they are not liable on their account to extirpation [since if the offerings had been sacrificed when they were sanctified, there should have been no violation]. [If] one sanctified them at the time of the prohibition of high places and offered them up at the time of the permission of high places, lo, these are subject to transgression of a positive commandment, but they are not subject to a negative commandment at all. If he consecrated them when the high places were permitted and slaughtered the animal and offered it up when the high places were permitted, of course he is not subject to any liability whatever' [T. Zeb.13:7A-D]. *Is this not a refutation of the position of R. Kahana?*

F. *It is indeed a valid refutation.*

XVII.1 A. These are the Holy Things offered in the tabernacle [of Gilgal, Nob, and Gibeon: Holy Things which were sanctified for the tabernacle. Offerings of the congregation are offered in the tabernacle. Offerings of the individual [are offered] on a high place. Offerings of the individual which were sanctified for the tabernacle are to be offered in the tabernacle. And if one offered them up on a high place, he is free. What is the difference between the high place of an individual and the high place of the community? (1) Laying on of hands, and (2) slaughtering at the north [of the altar], and (3) placing [of the blood] round about [the altar], and (4) waving, and (5) bringing near.

B. **Laying on of hands** *is not done at a private high place in line with the following verse of Scripture:* “before the Lord, and he shall lay his hand” (Lev. 1:3) [meaning, a public place of sacrifice].

C. **slaughtering at the north [of the altar]:** “And he shall kill at on the side of the altar northward before the Lord” (Lev. 1:11).

D. **placing [of the blood] round about [the altar]:** “And he shall sprinkle the blood round about the altar that is at the door of the tent of meeting” (Lev. 1: 5).

E. **waving:** “to wave it for a wave offering before the Lord” (Lev. 10:15).

F. **bringing near:** “The sons of Aaron shall present it before the Lord in front of the altar” (Lev. 6: 7).

XVIII.1 A. R. Judah says, “There is no meal offering on a high place [but there is in the tabernacle]:”

B. R. Sheshet said, “In the view of him who says, ‘A meal offering is presented at the high places,’ then fowl also will be offered at the high places, and in the opinion of him who says, ‘A meal offering is not presented at the high places,’ fowl also are not presented there. Why not? ‘...and sacrifice them for sacrifices’ (Lev. 17: 5) — ‘sacrifices,’ not meal offerings; ‘sacrifices,’ not bird offerings.”

XIX.1 A. the priestly service:

B. *Because it is written,* “And the priest shall sprinkle the blood on the altar of the Lord at the door of the tent of meeting” (Lev. 17: 6).

XX.1 A. the wearing of garments of ministry:

- B. *Because it is written*, “And the priestly vestment shall be upon Aaron and upon his sons to minister in the holy place” (Exo. 28: 4).

XXI.1 A. The use of utensils of ministry:

- B. *Because it is written*, “The utensils of ministry wherewith they minister in the sanctuary” (Num. 4:12).

XXII.1 A. the sweet-smelling savor:

- B. *Because it is written*, “A sweet savor to the Lord” (Lev. 1: 9).

XXIII.1 A. the dividing line for the [tossing of various kinds of] blood:

- B. *Because it is written*, “That the net may reach half way up the altar” (Exo. 27: 5).

XXIV.1 A. the washing of hands and feet:

- B. *Because it is written*, “And when they came near to the altar, they should wash” (Exo. 40:32).

XXV.1 A. [Supply the dividing line for the [tossing of various kinds of] blood:] Said Rami bar Hama, “The rule just now given pertains only to Holy Things of a public high place that were offered up at a public high place. But in the case of Holy Things of a private high places that were offered up at a public high place, no such line of demarcation was required.”

- B. *Objected Rabbah*, “**The breast and the thigh, the raising up of the loaves of the thanksgiving offering [four of the forty, all of which are assigned to the priest] belong to the priest at a public high place but not at a private high place [T. Zeb.13:17F].**” [Freedman: this implies that these laws operated whenever a sacrifice was offered at a public high place, even if it had been consecrated for a private high place, and the same rule should apply to the other laws that governed the public high place.]
- C. *Here is how to state the matter*: The rule just now given pertains only to Holy Things of a public high place but not to Holy Things of a private high places.
- D. *There are those who lay the matter out in the following way*:
- E. Said Rami bar Hama, “The rule just now given pertains only to a time in which a public high place was required. But when private high places were permitted, even if one made the offering at a public high place, there was no requirement of a dividing line around the altar.”
- F. *Objected Rabbah*, “**The breast and the thigh, the raising up of the loaves of the thanksgiving offering [four of the forty, all of which are assigned to the priest] belong to the priest at a public high place but not at a private high place [T. Zeb.13:17F].**”
- G. *This is how to frame the initial statement*: The rule just now given pertains only to a time in which a public high place was required but not when private high places were permitted.
- H. *He differs from R. Eleazar, for* said R. Eleazar, “The burnt offering prepared at a private high place which one brought inside — the veils accept it in every respect.” [Freedman: if a burnt offering was consecrated for a private high place and was carried into the precincts of a public high

place, the veils of the public high place receive it and all the laws governing the public high place apply. Even sacrifices consecrated for a private high place therefore are governed by the laws of the public high place. The laws of the public high place hold good at all times, whether or not the private high place was permitted.]

XXV.2. A. *R. Zira raised the following question: “A burnt offering consecrated for a private high place [120A] which one brought within and then took out — what is the law? [Freedman: does the law of the public high place apply, so that it must be brought back in and have its breast and thigh waved before the altar?] Do we maintain, since it has entered within, the veils accept it in every respect? Or perhaps, since it has been taken back to the private high place, it has been taken out [and the laws of the private high place apply]?”*

B. *Is this not in line with the dispute of Rabbah and R. Joseph? For we have learned in the Mishnah: **Most Holy Things which one slaughtered in the south [side of the altar] — the laws of sacrilege apply to them [M. Me.1:1A-B].** In this context, the question was raised: If they have been were put up on the altar, what is the law about taking them down from there? Rabbah said, “They are to be taken down from there.” R. Joseph said, “They are not to be taken down from there.” [Freedman: Rabbah who says that they must be taken down holds that these are not the same as other sacrifices that were disqualified in the sanctuary, but as though they are killed improperly; he holds that the hangings have not received them; Joseph, who rules that they must be taken down, holds that the barrier have received them.]*

C. *The question pertains to both the position of Rabbah and the position of R. Joseph:*

D. *The question pertains to the position of Rabbah: Rabbah takes the position that he does only in connection with the altar, for what is appropriate to the altar is sanctified by the altar, and what is not appropriate to the altar is not sanctified by the altar, while the hangings around the courtyard may have the effect of receiving even what is not eligible for that area. Or perhaps there is no such distinction to be drawn.*

E. *The question pertains to the position of R. Joseph: R. Joseph takes the position that he does only in in the case of the Temple, which is a single place but here, where we deal with two locations [namely, public and private high places], he may not hold the same view. Or perhaps there is no such distinction to be drawn.*

F. *The question stands.*

XXV.3. A. *What was self-evident to Rabbah on the one extreme, and to R. Joseph on the other extreme, posed a problem to R. Yannai.*

B. *For R. Yannai raised the following question: “As to the limbs of a burnt offering presented at a private high places that were put on the altar and taken off — what is the law?”*

C. *“In a case in which the fire has not taken hold of them, there is no question [that they must be taken off the altar]. Where there is a question, it is in a case in which the fire has taken hold of them.”*

D. *The question stands.*

XXV.4. A. *It has been stated:*

- B. As to slaughtering at a private high place by night —
- C. Rab and Samuel —
- D. One said, “It is valid.”
- E. And the other said, “It is invalid.”
- F. *What is at issue between them is what concerned R. Eleazar, for R. Eleazar contrasted verses of Scripture against one another in the following manner: “It is written, ‘And he said, “You have dealt treacherously, roll a great stone to me this day”’ (1Sa. 14:33) [and this would then have formed a private high place, and the emphasis on ‘this day’ indicates the offering had to be made by day, not by night (Freedman)]. And it is further written, ‘And Saul said, “Disperse yourselves among the people and say to them, ‘Bring me hither every man his ox and every man his sheep and slay them here and eat and do not sin against the Lord in eating with the blood.” And all the people brought, each one his ox with him that night and slew them there’ (1Sa. 14:34).”*
- G. *[In the context of the foregoing,] one master said, “Here [1Sa. 14:33] we deal with unconsecrated animals, there [1 Sam 14:34] with Holy Things.” [Holy Things must be slaughtered by day even at a private high place (Freedman)].*
- H. *The other master said, “One verse refers to Holy Things on a public high place, the other to Holy Things at a private high place.”*

XXV.5. A. *It has been stated:*

- B. A burnt offering prepared at a private high place —
- C. Rab said, “It does not require flaying and cutting up.”
- D. And R. Yohanan said, “It does require flaying and cutting up.”
 - E. *At issue is the statement of R. Yosé the Galilean, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - F. R. Yosé the Galilean says, “The burnt offering that the Israelites presented in the wilderness did not require flaying and cutting up. For flaying and cutting up are procedures that are carried out only from the tent of meeting and onward.”
 - G. *One master maintains, “‘...from the tent of meeting and onward’ there is no distinction to be drawn between a public high place and a private high place.”*
 - H. *And the other master holds, “The procedure is carried out at a public high place but not at a private high place.”*
- I. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Yohanan:*
- J. The differences between a public high place and a private high place: the provision of a horn for the altar, a ramp upward, a base, and the square dimensions, [which is indispensable] for high places that were major [and

served the community,] but not provided for high places that were minor [and served only individuals]. There was a laver with its base at the public high place, but no laver and base at a private high place. The waving of the breast and thigh took place at a public high place but not at a private high place. The points in common between a public high place and a private high place: an act of slaughter was required at a public high place and at a private high place; flaying and cutting up the offering were required at a public high place and at a private high place. The valid sprinkling of the blood permitted the officiating person to eat the meat and an improper attitude rendered the offering refuse at a public high place and at a private high place. The considerations of blemish and the proper observance of time restrictions pertains at both the public high place and at the private high place.

XXVI.1 A. But the matters of time, and remnant, and uncleanness are applicable both here and there:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. How on do we know that the consideration of time pertains to both a private and a public high place?
- D. For one might propose that the Torah has said that meat that is kept over night is to be burned, and meat that is taken out of its permitted area is to be burned. Just as meat that is taken outside in the case of a private high place is fit, so meat that is kept over night at a private high place is fit.
- E. And does the case of fowl not yield an argument a fortiori in exactly the opposite direction?
- F. **[120B]** If in the case of fowl, time disqualifies, though a blemish does not disqualify, then it is not reasonable to suppose that time should disqualify offerings presented at a private high place, since a blemish would disqualify them?
- G. But the operative consideration for fowl is that a non-priest is not fit to offer them up, while a non-priest is fit to officiate at a private high place, so the considerations of time should not disqualify the offering.
- H. For these reasons it is necessary for Scripture to state, “And this is the law of the sacrifice of peace offerings” [Lev. 7;11), which treats time at a private high place as equivalent in effect to time at a public high place. [All peace offerings, wherever offered, are governed by the same law in respect to time, refuse, and uncleanness (Freedman).]