

III

BAVLI TRACTATE YOMA CHAPTER THREE

FOLIOS 28A-39A

3:1-2

3:1

- A. The supervisor said to them, “Go and see whether the time for slaughtering the sacrifice has come.”
- B. If it has come, he who sees it says, “It is daylight!”
- C. Mattithiah b. Samuel says, “[He says], ‘Has the whole east gotten light?’
- D. “‘To Hebron?’
- E. “And he says, ‘Yes.’”

3:2

- A. And why were they required to do this?
- B. For once the moonlight came up, and they supposed that the eastern horizon was bright, and so they slaughtered the daily whole offering and had to bring it out to the place of burning.
- C. They brought the high priest down to the immersion hut.
- D. This governing principle applied in the Temple: Whoever covers his feet [and defecates] requires immersion, and whoever urinates requires sanctification [the washing] of hands and feet.
- I.1.** A. [28B] [If it has come, he who sees it says, “It is daylight!”: What is the meaning of the language, “It is daylight”?] *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - B. R. Ishmael says, “The morning star is shining.”
 - C. R. Aqiba says, “The morning star has risen.”
 - D. Nehoma b. Apeqision says, “The morning star is already in Hebron.”
- II.1** A. **Mattithiah b. Samuel**, who is appointed to be in charge of the lotteries, **says**, “[He says], ‘Has the whole east gotten light? To Hebron?:’”
 - B. R. Judah b. Betera says, “[He says,] ‘The whole of the east has gotten light, even to Hebron. And all of the people have gone out to their jobs’”
 - C. *If so, then it would be much too late.*

- D. Rather: "And all of the people have gone out to hire day laborers."
Having defined the time of the morning prayer, we now take up the definition of the time at which the prayers to be recited at dusk are due.

II.2. A. Said R. Safra, "*The prayer ordained by Abraham [which is recited at dusk] is to be said from the point at which the walls begin to fall into shadows [without direct sunlight].*"

B. Said R. Joseph, "*Now are we supposed to go and learn our laws from the practice of Abraham [who lived prior to the giving of the Torah]?*"

C. Said Raba, "*A Tannaite authority derived the authoritative law from the case of Abraham, and are we not going to derive the law from his example for ourselves!? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

D. "'And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised' (Lev. 12: 3), teaches that the entire day is suitable for the rite of circumcision, but people who are really prompt carrying out the religious duty before it is required to do so, as it is said, 'And Abraham got up early in the morning' (Gen. 22: 3)."

E. Rather said Raba, "*This is what R. Joseph identified as a difficult, for we have learned in the Mishnah: [If, however,] the eve of Passover coincided with the eve of the Sabbath [Friday], it was slaughtered at half after the sixth hour [12:30 P.M.] and offered up at half after the seventh hour [1:30 P. M.], and [then] the Passover offering [was slaughtered] after it [M. Pes. 5:1D]. But why not have it slaughtered from the point at which the walls begin to fall into shadows [without direct sunlight].*"

F. *But what sort of a problem is this? Maybe the walls of the house of the sanctuary got dark from half after the sixth hour, since they were not exactly straight [being narrower above than below, so the walls cast a shadow later in the afternoon (Jung)]. Or perhaps the case with Abraham was exceptional, since he was an expert in astronomical calculations. Or maybe it was because he was an elder, who participated in the session.*

G. For said R. Hama bar Hanina, "In the days of our fathers, the session of authorities never was interrupted. When they were in Egypt, the session was with them, as it is said, 'Go and gather the elders of Israel together' (Exo. 3:16). When they were in the wilderness, the session was with them: 'Gather to me seventy men of the elders of Israel' (Num. 11:16)."

H. [Moreover,] our father, Abraham, was an elder and a member of the session: "And Abraham was an elder, well along in years" (Gen. 24: 1).

I. Our father, Isaac, was an elder and a member of the session: "And it came to pass when Isaac was an elder" (Gen. 27: 1).

J. Our father, Abraham, was an elder and a member of the session: "Now the eyes of Israel were dim with age."

K. [Even] Eliezer, Abraham's servant, was an elder and a member of the session: "And Abraham said to his servant, the elder of his house, who ruled over all that he possessed" (Gen. 24: 2).

L. Said R. Eleazar, "He controlled over the Torah of the master."

M. "Eliezer of Damascus."

- N. Said R. Eleazar, "That means, 'He drew and gave others to drink of his master's Torah.'"
- O. Said Rab, "Abraham carried out the entirety of the Torah: 'Because Abraham has obeyed me, kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws' (Gen. 26: 5)."
- P. *Said R. Shimi bar Hiyya to Rab, "But say: maybe this refers only to the seven commandments assigned to the children of Noah?"*
- Q. *Yeah, but then there's circumcision [so that cannot be the meaning of the cited verse].*
- R. *But say: the seven commandments assigned to the children of Noah plus circumcision?*
- S. He said to him, "If so, what's the sense of, 'my commandments, my statutes, and my laws'?"
- T. Said Raba, and some say, R. Ashi, "Abraham carried out even the rules governing the preparation of a fictive meal to represent the union of the festival that comes on a Friday with the Sabbath that follows it, [by cooking on the holy day food that may be eaten for the Sabbath, a non-Scriptural provision]. For it is said, 'my Torahs,' meaning, one the written, the other the oral, part of the Torah."

III.1 A. Mattithiah b. Samuel says, "[He says, 'Has the whole east gotten light?' 'To Hebron?'" "And he says, 'Yes:'"]

- B. *Who is it who says this "yes"? Should I say it was a man standing on the roof? Then is the one who is the dreamer also appointed as the interpreter of dreams? [Is the one who asks the question the same as the one who answers it?] So it must be someone who is standing on the ground. But then, how would he know?*
- C. *If you wish, I shall say, it is the one who is standing on the ground, and if you wish, I shall say, it is the one who is standing on the roof.*
- D. *If you wish, I shall say, it is the one who is standing on the ground: he is the one who says, **Has the whole east gotten light?** And the one who is standing on the ground replies, **To Hebron**, and he says to him, **Yes**.*
- E. *...and if you wish, I shall say, it is the one who is standing on the roof: he is the one who says, **Has the whole east gotten light?** And the other answers, **To Hebron?** And then he says, **Yes**.*

IV.1 A. And why were they required to do this? For once the moonlight came up, and they supposed that the eastern horizon was bright, and so they slaughtered the daily whole offering and had to bring it out to the place of burning:

- B. *Can there be confusion between the light of the moon and the light of the sun? But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Rabbi says, "The rising column of the moon is not similar to that of the sun. The light column of the moon rises straight, like a stick, but that of the sun [which is the dawn] radiates in all directions."
- D. *A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael: "It was a cloudy day, so the light was diffused in all directions." [Jung: on a cloudy day the rising column of*

the sun is invisible because of the heavy clouds, and it is only where the clouds are somewhat scattered that it is visible, hence the confusion is possible.]

IV.2. A. Said R. Pappa, *“That yields the observation that on a cloudy day the sun is felt all over.”*

B. *So what?*

C. *It makes a difference in spreading hides.*

D. Or, also, as Raba expounded, *“A woman should not knead dough either in the sun or in the heat of the sun.”*

IV.3. A. Said R. Nahman, *“The diffused light of the sun is harsher than the sun itself, and your analogy is a jar of vinegar [Jung: which emits a stronger smell through a small opening than when wide open]. The sun shining through the clouds is worse than the open sun, your analogy being slow drippings from the roof [which are harder to take than a shower].”*

B. **[29A]** *Sexual fantasies are harder to take than the act itself, your analogy being the smell of meat.*

C. *The fading summer is harsher than the summer itself, and your analogy is the hot oven.*

D. *A fever in winter is harsher than a fever in summer, and your analogy is a cold over.*

E. *It is harder to remember well what is long familiar than to memorize something new, the analogy being cement made of old cement.*

IV.4. A. [Resuming from 1:C:] Said R. Abbahu, *“What is the scriptural foundation for the position of Rabbi? As it is written, ‘For the leader, upon the Ayelet Hashahar [the hind of the dawn]’ (Psa. 22: 1). Just as the hind’s antlers branch off in both directions, so the light of the dawn is diffused in all directions.”*

IV.5. A. Said R. Zira, *“How come Esther is compared to a hind? To tell you: just as a hind has a narrow womb and therefore is as desirable to her mate all later times as she was the first time, so Esther was as desirable to King Ahasuerus at all later times as she was the first time.”*

B. Said R. Assi, *“Why was Esther compared to the dawn? To tell you: just as the dawn marks the end of the entire night, so Esther marked the end of all miracles.”*

C. *Sure, but what about the miracle that is commemorated by Hanukkah?*

D. *We make reference to those that are covered in Scripture.*

E. *That poses no problem to the position of him who says that the book of Esther was supposed to be written down, but what can be said from the perspective of him who maintained that it was not meant to be written down?*

F. *Interpret matters in accord with what R. Benjamin bar Japheth said R. Eleazar said, for said R. Benjamin bar Japheth said R. Eleazar, “Why are the prayers of the righteous compared to a hind? To tell you: just as, in the case of the hind, as long as it grows, its*

antlers add branches from year to year, so with the righteous, the longer they pray, the more their prayer will be heard.”

V.1 A. and so they slaughtered the daily whole offering and had to bring it out to the place of burning. They brought the high priest down to the immersion hut:

- B. *When did this mistake take place, so that the high priest was brought down to immerse? Should I say that it took place on any of the other days of the year? Then had they then to offer it up? So it must have happened on the Day of Atonement. But on that day [the tenth of the lunar month of Tishré], is any moonlight visible then?*
- C. *This is the sense of the statement: On the Day of Atonement, when the man said, “It is daylight,” they would then take the high priest down to the place of immersion. [The error took place on some other day; then we refer to the Day of Atonement, with the sense, when the one says, “It is daylight,” then, on the Day of Atonement, the high priest is taken down to immerse (Jung).]*

V.2. A. The father of R. Abin repeated as a Tannaite statement: “Not only this alone [that is, that the daily whole offering slaughtered at night has to be burned], but even a bird that was presented as a burnt offering, the neck of which was pinched by night, or the meal offering from which a handful was taken at night have to be thrown out at the place of burning. Now with regard to the bird presented as a burnt offering, that is no problem, for it was not possible to bring it back. But as to the meal offering, [29B] why can’t he put the handful back and take it out again by day?”

- B. *He is the one who repeated the Tannaite statement and associated observation, and he is the one who explained it: “The use of the utensil of service sanctifies the contents thereof even outside the proper time” [Cashdan, *Menahot*, to p. 100A: and once the handful has been taken out and put into a utensil of ministry, it cannot be put back and mixed with the remainder of the meal offering].*
- C. *An objection was raised: This is the governing principle: whatever is offered up by day can be consecrated only by day, and whatever is offered by night can be consecrated only by night, and whatever can be offered day or night may be consecrated day or night. “Whatever is offered up by day can be consecrated only by day” — but not by night!*
- D. *Well, while it does not become consecrated by night so that it may be offered, it does become consecrated by night so that it may be invalidated.*
- E. *An objection was raised by R. Zira, “ [If] one set out the bread and the dishes [of frankincense] after the Sabbath and burned the dishes on [the next] Sabbath, it is invalid. [They have not been left from Sabbath to Sabbath.] How should one do it? Let him leave it for the coming Sabbath [thirteen days in all], for even if it is on the table for many days, that is of no account. Now why should that be so? For if you take the view that utensils of service have the power to sanctify offerings presented in them not at their proper time, then the offering should be both sanctified and therefore invalidated!”*
- F. *Said Raba, “That’s a perfectly good question, but the father of R. Abin is citing a formulation on Tannaite authority. [Harmonizing these rules is possible along*

the following lines:] the framer of the Tannaite statement before us takes the view that the night is not classified as 'at the wrong time' [Cashdan: for with regard to holy things the night following the day is included in it, so utensils of ministry can hallow by night as well as by day, though the offering may not be presented by night]. But days may be classified as 'at the wrong time.'"

- G. *Still, in the end when the eve of the Sabbath comes, let the bread and dishes of frankincense be both consecrated and also invalidated!*
- H. *Said Rabina, "We must take as our premise that the priest had removed it before then [Friday just prior to the Sabbath, then replaced them at the proper time on the Sabbath]."*
- I. *Mar Zutra, and some say, R Ashi, said, "You may even say that the priest had not removed it before then [Friday just prior to the Sabbath, then replaced them at the proper time on the Sabbath]. But since the priest had laid matters out not in accord with the religious duty that pertains to the rite, it is treated as though a mere ape [utterly lacking in a valid will] had laid out the offerings" [Cashdan: and the table will not sanctify the offering when the Sabbath eve draws near, nor will the Sabbath day sanctify it, but the priest will have to enter on the next day, remove it and replace it, and only then will the table sanctify it. But when the handful was taken from the meal offering at night and put into a utensil of service, the night is not considered 'the wrong time,' so the utensil will sanctify it.]*

VI.1 A. This governing principle applied in the Temple: Whoever covers his feet [and defecates] requires immersion, and whoever urinates requires sanctification [the washing] of hands and feet:

- B. *There is no difficulty understanding why there must be immersion of the feet, because of the splashings, but why is it necessary to wash hands?*
- C. *Said R. Abba, "This is to say, [30A] it is a religious duty to wipe off splashings."*
- D. *That conclusion supports the view of R. Ammi, for said R. Ammi, "It is forbidden for someone to go out with splashings on his feet, since then he may look as though he had his penis cut off, and he may thereby provoke gossip against his children, people saying they are illegitimate."*

Rulings on Hygiene in Connection with Excrement

VI.2. A. Said R. Pappa, "If there is shit in its place [the anus], it is forbidden to recite the Shema."

- B. *To what circumstance does this statement pertain? If the shit can be seen, that is self-evident! And if it cannot be seen, well, the Torah was not given to ministering angels [so why should it be forbidden to recite the Shema]?*
- C. *The rule was necessary to deal with a situation in which, if the man is citing, the shit is visible, but if he is standing, it is not invisible.*
- D. *And how does this matter differ from the case in which there is shit on his body, for it has been stated as an Amoraic teaching:*
- E. *It has been stated on Amoraic authority:*
- F. *[If there is] excrement on one's body, or one's hand was [poked through a window] into a privy,*

- G. R. Huna said, "It is permitted to recite the Shema."
- H. R. Hisda said, "It is forbidden to recite the Shema."
- I. *When in its place, the stench is overwhelming, but when not in its place, the stench is not overwhelming.*

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

- B. **A ruling regarding the communal meal:**
- C. **one who leaves to urinate must wash one hand [upon returning].**
- D. **[One who goes out] to speak to his fellow and walked a distance must wash both his hands [upon returning].**
- E. **[T.: Where does he wash? He enters and sits in his place and washes] [T. [Ber. 4:11A-E](#)].**
- F. And when he washes his hands, he should not wash outside and then come in, because of suspicion [that he may not have washed properly, people not having seen him do so], but he comes back in, takes his seat, and then washes both hands, and then the pitcher is passed around among the guests.
- G. Said R. Hisda, "That which we have said pertains only to drinking, but, as to eating, he may wash his hands outside and come back in, *for everybody knows that he is fastidious.*"
- H. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "And as for me, even if I go only to drink too, people know that I am most fastidious."*

Apart from the topical appendix at the end, the entire composite is organized and presented solely as a commentary to our Mishnah-paragraph. I:1 and II:1 work on the language and wording of the Mishnah. II:2 is tacked on for thematic reasons. III:1 goes back to Mishnah-clarification. IV:1 asks a pressing question, and the remainder form a sequence of glosses and glosses to glosses. V:1 raises a most pertinent question of Mishnah-clarification, and V:32 is tacked on for obvious, formal reasons; it is secondary here and primary in its location in another tractate. VI:1 then concludes with another Mishnah-comment. So the whole is carefully arranged and derives its coherent and cogency from the Mishnah — there alone.

3:3-4A

3:3

- A. **A person does not enter the courtyard for the service, even if he is clean, unless he immerses.**
- B. **Five acts of immersion, and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet, does the high priest carry out on that day.**
- C. **And all of them are in the sanctuary at the Parvah chamber, except for this one alone.**

3:4A

- A. **They spread out a linen sheet between him and the crowd.**

I.1. A. **[A person does not enter the courtyard for the service, even if he is clean, unless he immerses:] They asked Ben Zoma, "What is the reason for this immersion?"**

- B. He said to them, “If one who goes in from one holy area to another, or from a place not subject to the punishment of extirpation to one that is, requires immersion, he who enters from an ordinary area to a holy place, which is subject to punishment of extirpation, surely should require immersion.”
- C. R. Judah says, “This immersion too was required only because of real dirt.
- D. “Sometimes an old source of uncleanness clings to one’s hands.
- E. “Because one is going to immerse [to clean up], he remembers that he is unclean and goes along” [T. **Kip. 1:16B-F**].
- F. *What is at issue between these two opinions?*
- G. **[30B]** *What is at issue between them is whether or not a priest who officiates without immersing profanes the act of service. In the opinion of Ben Zoma, a priest who officiates without immersing profanes the act of service, and in the opinion of R. Judah, a priest who officiates without immersing does not profane the act of service.*
- H. *But in the opinion of Ben Zoma, does a priest who officiates without immersing really profane the act of service? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. **A high priest who did not immerse and sanctify himself [by washing the hands and the feet] between putting on one garment and putting on another, or between one act of service and the next, but performed an act of service — his act of service remains valid. But all the same are a high priest and an ordinary priest who did not sanctify the hands and the feet [through washing them] prior to performing the act of service at dawn — the act of service is invalid [T. **Kippurim 1:17**].**
- J. *Rather, at issue between them is whether or not the priest who does this violates a positive commandment. Ben Zoma maintains that the priest who does this violates a positive commandment. R. Judah holds the position that the priest who does this does not violate a positive commandment.*
- K. *But does R. Judah take that position? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- L. **A leper immerses in the court of the lepers.**
- M. **He comes and stands in Nicanor’s gate.**
- N. **And R. Judah says, “He did not require immersion, for he had already immersed on the preceding day.”**
- O. **[T. proceeds:] They said to him, “This [which you have said] is not part of the law. But whoever enters the courtyard through Nicanor’s gate would immerse in that same courtyard” [T. **Negaim 8:9A-E**]**
- P. *But he takes the position that he does in that case for the reason that the Tannaite formulation sets forth, namely, for he had already immersed on the preceding day.*
- Q. *[Since the answer is so compelling,] as to him who raised this question [K], how come he presented it at all?*
- R. *It is because he wanted to raise another question specifically, why was it called the cell of those afflicted with the skin ailment? It is because those afflicted with the skin ailment immerse themselves there. R. Judah says, “It is not concerning*

those afflicted with the skin ailment alone that they have spoke, but any person [immerses there].” [Jung: the language, “not only...,” implies that those afflicted by the skin ailments are encompassed, and so by implication Judah requires re-immersion, and that contradicts his earlier statement].

- S. *That presents no problem, the one statement addresses a case in which he had immersed, the other one in which he had not.*
- T. *If he had not immersed at all, then he would require the setting of the sun to complete the process of purification! [Immersion is only one step in the procedure.] Rather, both statements pertain to a case in which he had immersed, but the one case speaks of someone who is assumed to have been distracted from the requirement of avoiding further contamination, and the other case speaks of one who is not assumed to have ceased to pay close attention to avoiding further contamination.*
- U. *But if he is assumed to have been distracted from the requirement of avoiding further contamination, surely he requires sprinkling with purification water on the third and seventh day [in line with the rite of purification from corpse uncleanness, Numbers 19], for said R. Dosetai bar Mattun said R. Yohanan, “If one became careless about avoiding uncleanness, he has to be sprinkled on the third and seventh days.”*
- V. *Rather, both statements pertain to a case in which he is not assumed to have ceased to pay close attention to avoiding further contamination. And there still is no contradiction, for in the one case, the man has immersed with the intention of becoming so cultically clean as to be able to enter the sanctuary, and in the other case, the man has not immersed with the intention of becoming so cultically clean as to be able to enter the sanctuary.*
- W. *And if you prefer, you may formulate the Tannaite statement in this language: They spoke not of those afflicted with the skin ailment, but of any man.*
- X. *Rabina said, “R. Judah made his statement within the premises of the rabbis with whom he was engaged in argument, namely: In my opinion, the person afflicted with the skin ailment does not have to immerse once more. But in your view, you surely should admit at the very least: It is not concerning those afflicted with the skin ailment alone that they have spoke, but any person [immerses there]!”*
- Y. *And rabbis?*
- Z. *The person afflicted with the skin ailment is used to his uncleanness, all other people are not used to their uncleanness [so the former will not pay attention to matters of cultic uncleanness, the latter will].*
- I.2.** A. *Said Abbayye to R. Joseph, “May we say that the rabbis who differ from R. Judah concur with the position of Ben Zoma? And the reason, then, that their Tannaite formulation makes reference to the person afflicted with the skin ailment is to show you how far R. Judah is prepared to go? Or perhaps they would regard the person afflicted with the skin ailment as an exceptional case, since he is accustomed to his status as to uncleanness?”*
- B. *He said to him, “They would regard the person afflicted with the skin ailment as an exceptional case, since he is accustomed to his status as to uncleanness?”*

- C. *Said Abbayye to R. Joseph, "In connection with the immersion that is under discussion here, [31A] would an interposed object invalidate it or not?" [Jung: an immersion requires undisturbed contact between the water and the body of the person who is immersing himself; any interposed object invalidates the immersion. But perhaps that pertains only to immersion required by the Torah; Judah deems it immersion for the sake of uniformity might take the view that in this case an intervening object might not be considered sufficiently disturbing to render the immersion invalid.]*
- D. *He said to him, "Whatever our rabbis have ordained is comparable to what the Torah has ordained."*
- E. *Said Abbayye to R. Joseph, "Is entry of only part of the body into the sanctuary classified as entering the sanctuary, or is it not so classified?"*
- F. *He said to him, "The case of the thumb and the toe [Lev. 14:14: the blood of the guild offering is dabbed on the thumb and the toe of the person afflicted with the skin ailment as part of his purification rite] will prove the point, for here we deal with entry of only part of the body into the sanctuary, and it has been taught on Tannaite authority: **A leper immerses in the court of the lepers. He comes and stands in Nicanor's gate .**"*

I.3. A. *The question was raised:*

- B. *What is the rule as to preparing an exceptionally long slaughtering knife and using it for slaughtering [so that the priest does not have to immerse, since he will not enter the courtyard but may slaughter the animal while standing outside]?*
- C. *Address the question to Ben Zoma, address the question to rabbis who dispute with R. Judah.*
- D. *Address the question to Ben Zoma: Ben Zoma imposes obligatory immersion only in the case of one who actually enters the courtyard, but not upon one who stands outside; or perhaps he would impose immersion even in the latter case, since he may slide over into the sanctuary?*
- E. *...address the question to rabbis who dispute with R. Judah: perhaps these rabbis take the position that they do in that case only because he does not perform an act of service, so he does not have to immerse, but if the priest really does officiate at a service, they would concur that he has to immerse, or perhaps they would see no difference?*
- F. *The question stands.*

II.1 A. **Five acts of immersion, and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet, does the high priest carry out on that day:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **Five acts of immersion, and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet, does the high priest carry out on that day. And all of them are in the sanctuary at the Parvah chamber, except for this one alone [M. Yoma. 3:3B-C].** which was on unconsecrated ground, on top of the gate that was beside his own cell.
- D. *Said Abbayye, "That statement yields the inference that the Etam well was twenty-three cubits above the ground of the Temple Court, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **All of the entrances and gates which were there were twenty***

cubits high and ten cubits wide, except for that of the porch. [M. Mid. 2:3I]. *And it has been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘And he shall wash his body in water’ (Lev. 14: 9) — ‘In water,’ means, ‘in water that is collected;’ ‘all his flesh,’ means, ‘water in which all his body can be immersed,’ and how much is that? It is a volume of a cubic cubit. And sages estimated that the water of an immersion pool must at a minimum be forty seahs..” [Jung: The water in the pool on top of the Water Gate had thus to rise to a height of twenty-three cubits above the level of the Temple Court — twenty cubits for the height of the doorway and three cubits for the height of the pool, which would have been impossible unless the Etam well was situated on at least a corresponding height.]*

- E. **[31A]** *Now lo, there is also a cubit of the ceiling and a cubit of the flooring.*
- F. *As to the gates of the sanctuary, since they are made of marble, they were made of only some small thickness.*
- G. *And lo, there is a bit of additional thickness, even though it is small.*
- H. *Since it was not so much as a cubit in thickness, he did not reckon it in his calculation.*

III.1 A. They spread out a linen sheet between him and the crowd:

- B. *Why linen in particular?*
- C. It is in line with what R. Kahana said, “It is so as to indicate that the service of the day is to be carried out in garments of linen. *Here too*, it is so as to indicate that the service of the day is to be carried out in garments of linen.”

I:1, with its secondary expansion, and II:1, which moves off in its own direction, both commence with Mishnah-exegesis, nothing more.

3:4B-G+3:5

3:4B-G

- B. **He took off his clothes, went down, immersed, came up, and dried off.**
- C. **They brought him golden garments, and he put them on, and he sanctified his hands and feet.**
- D. **They brought him the daily whole offering.**
- E. **He cut [the windpipe and gullet], and another priest completed the slaughtering on his behalf.**
- F. **He received the blood and tossed it.**
- G. **He went in to offer up the incense offering of the morning, to trim the lamps, and to offer up the head and limbs, Baked Cakes, and wine.**

3:5

- A. **The incense offering of the morning was offered between the tossing of the blood and the offering up of the limbs.**
- B. **That of twilight [was offered up] between the burning of the limbs and the drink offerings.**

C. **If the high priest was decrepit or infirm, they heated hot water for him and poured it into the cold water, to relieve the chill.**

- I.1 A. **[He took off his clothes, went down, immersed, came up, and dried off. They brought him golden garments, and he put them on, and he sanctified his hands and feet.]** *Our rabbis stated before R. Pappa, "Lo, this teaching [Jung: that only one sanctification is carried out in connection with the first immersion, when he changes from his non-holy garments into the garments of gold] does not accord with the position of R. Meir, for if it were to accord with his view, [there would be a conflict between sayings of his, for] since he has said [in connection with the second immersion, when the high priest changes from garments of gold to linen, he takes off his clothes first, then sanctifies himself], there must be two sanctifications for putting on the garments, here too, there should be two sanctifications for putting on the garments."*
- B. *Said to them R. Pappa, "Whether in the view of rabbis or of R. Meir, one sanctification corresponds to removing the holy garments and one for putting on the holy garments. [Meir can therefore agree with the ruling before us.] And here, what is at issue between them? It concerns the verse, 'He shall put off, he shall bathe, and he shall put on' (Lev. 16:23, 24). R. Meir takes the view that there is an analogy between taking off and putting on the garments. Just as when he puts them on he puts them on and then he performs an act of sanctification, so, when he takes them off, he takes them off and then he performs an act of sanctification. And rabbis maintain that there is an analogy between taking off and putting on the garments. Just as in the case of putting on the garments, when when he is dressed, he sanctifies, so when he takes off the garments, when he is dressed, he sanctifies."*
- C. *Said rabbis to R. Pappa, "But can you really say this? For has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: **They spread out a linen sheet between him and the crowd. He took off his clothes, went down, immersed, came up, and dried off. They brought him golden garments, and he put them on, and he sanctified his hands and feet.** R. Meir says, 'He took off his clothes, he sanctified his hands and his feet, he went down and immersed, he came up and dried off. They brought him golden garments, and he put them on and then sanctified his hands and feet.'"*
- D. *He said to them, "If that is what has been taught on Tannaite authority, that is what has been taught on Tannaite authority [and nothing more is to be said, so you must be right]."*
- E. *Now from R. Meir, there is no problem, since on that basis we can identify **[32A] ten acts of sanctification [Five acts of immersion, and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet, does the high priest carry out on that day].** But from rabbis' perspective, there really are only nine.*
- F. *Rabbis would say to you, the final act of sanctification is carried out when he takes off the holy garments and puts on the secular ones [at the end of the Day of Atonement].*

The Five Acts Of Immersion, And Ten Acts Of Sanctification Of The Hands And Feet, That The High Priest Carries Out On That Day

We now turn to a sustained topical appendix on the stated theme. At issue here is not Mishnah-amplification but the presentation of the correct order [of the sequence of actions in connection with the rite.

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

- B. “And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting” (Lev. 16:23) — Why does he come in?
- C. He comes only to remove the censer and fire-pan.
- D. The entire passage is stated in the correct order [of the sequence of actions that are described] except for this one verse.
- E. *How come?*
- F. *Said R. Hisda, “It has been learned: **Five acts of immersion, and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet, does the high priest immerse or sanctify on that day.** But if he performed them in the order that Scripture sets forth, there would be no more than three immersions and six sanctifications.”* [Jung: One immersion each for the continual offering of the morning, for the service of the day, which includes censer and coal-pan function, and one between that and the offering up of the rams, which includes the additional and continual afternoon offering. Thus there would be three immersions only, as against the five; so the necessity of a change in the program, the interpolation of the offering of the rams between the service within the day’s service and the bringing out of censer and coal pan. So that the censer and coal pan function now interrupts between the offerings of the rams and the continual afternoon offering, with the result that there are now five immersions necessary; one for the morning’s continual offering, in the golden garments; one for the service of the day, in white garments; one for the offering of the two rams on the outer altar, in the golden garments; one for the taking out of censer and coal pan, in white garments, and the fifth for the additional and the continual afternoon offering, in the golden garments. The five immersions imply ten sanctifications, one each, before each putting off, and before each putting on, of the garments required for each service.]

I.3. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Said R. Judah, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know about **the five acts of immersion, and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet, that the high priest immerses or sanctifies on that day?** Scripture states, ‘And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting and shall put off the linen garments...and he shall wash his flesh in water in a holy place and put on his other garments and come forth and offer his burnt offering’ (Lev. 16:23, 24). Lo, in this way you have learned that whoever changes from the performance of one act of service to another is required to immerse.”
- C. Said Rabbi, How on the basis of Scripture do we know about **the five acts of immersion, and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet, that the high priest immerses or sanctifies on that day?** Scripture states, ‘He shall put on the

holy linen tunic and he shall have the linen breeches on his flesh and shall be girded with the linen girdle, and with the linen miter shall he be attired; they are holy garments, and he shall bathe his flesh in water and put them on' (Lev. 16: 4). Lo, in this way you have learned that whoever changes from the performance of one act of service to another is required to immerse. And Scripture further states, '...they are holy garments...' All of the various garments are in this way treated as analogous to one another.

- D. "And, further, there are five acts of service: the whole offering of the morning, in golden garments, the rite of the day, in white garments, his ram and the ram of the people, in golden garments, the censer and fire pan, in white garments, the whole offering of twilight, in golden garments. And how on the basis of Scripture do we know that for each act of immersion there must be two acts of sanctification? Scripture states, 'And he shall put off...and he shall wash...and he shall wash, and he shall put on' (Lev. 16:23-24)."
- E. R. Eliezer b. R. Simeon says, "It yields an argument a fortiori, namely: if in a situation in which immersion is not required, sanctification is required, in a case in which immersion is required, is it not logical to suppose that sanctification is required? If, then, one wishes to proceed, just as in the latter context, a single act of sanctification is required, so here a single act of sanctification is required — Scripture states to the contrary, 'And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting and shall put off the linen garments that he had put on,' so what is the meaning of, 'that he put on'? Does someone not take off anything other than what he put on? Rather, the phrase indicates that the putting off is comparable to the putting on of the garments, with the result: just as putting on the garments requires an act of sanctification, so putting off the garments requires an act of sanctification."
- I.4. A. [The master has said:] Said R. Judah, "How on the basis of Scripture do we know about **the five acts of immersion, and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet, that the high priest immerses or sanctifies on that day?** Scripture states, 'And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting and shall put off the linen garments...and he shall wash his flesh in water in a holy place and put on his other garments and come forth and offer his burnt offering' (Lev. 16:23, 24). Lo, in this way you have learned that whoever changes from the performance of one act of service to another is required to immerse."
- B. *Thus we have found the rule governing the change from the white garments to the golden garments. How on the basis of Scripture do we know the rule governing a change from the golden garments to white garments?*
- C. [32A] *A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael:* "It is an argument a fortiori that that should be the case, namely: if for the golden garments, in which the priest does not enter the inner sanctum, require an act of immersion, the white garments, in which the priest does enter the inner sanctum, surely should require an act of immersion!"
- D. *But there is the possibility of raising the following challenge:* the particular quality affecting the golden garments is that while wearing them, the priest accomplishes atonement in considerable measure [used as they are every day]. Can you say the same for the other? *Rather, he draws the inference from the statement of Rabbi.*

I.5. A. [The master has said:] Said Rabbi, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know about **the five acts of immersion, and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet, that the high priest immerses or sanctifies on that day?** Scripture states, ‘He shall put on the holy linen tunic and he shall have the linen breeches on his flesh and shall be girded with the linen girdle, and with the linen miter shall he be attired; they are holy garments, and he shall bathe his flesh in water and put them on’ (Lev. 16: 4). Lo, in this way you have learned that whoever changes from the performance of one act of service to another is required to immerse. And Scripture further states, ‘...they are holy garments...’ All of the various garments are in this way treated as analogous to one another. And, further, there are five acts of service: the whole offering of the morning, in golden garments, the rite of the day, in white garments, his ram and the ram of the people, in golden garments, the censer and fire pan, in white garments, the whole offering of twilight, in golden garments. And how on the basis of Scripture do we know that for each act of immersion there must be two acts of sanctification? Scripture states, ‘And he shall put off...and he shall wash...and he shall wash, and he shall put on’ (Lev. 16:23-24).”

- B. *Thus we have found the rule governing the change from the golden garments to the white garments. How on the basis of Scripture do we know the rule governing a change from the white garments to golden garments?*
- C. *A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael: ““It is an argument a fortiori that that should be the case, namely: if for the white garments, wearing which the priest does not effect abundant atonement, require a prior act of immersion, the golden garments, wearing which the priest does effect abundant atonement, surely should require a prior act of atonement!*
- D. *But there is the possibility of raising the following challenge: the particular quality affecting the white garments is that wearing them the priest enters the inner sanctum. Can you say the same of the golden garments [which he does not wear when entering the inner sanctum]?*
- E. *That is why the Tannaite formulation proceeds, “And it also says, ‘They are holy garments and he shall bathe his flesh in water and put them on.’”*

I.6. A. [The master has said:] “And, further, there are five acts of service: the whole offering of the morning, in golden garments, the rite of the day, in white garments, his ram and the ram of the people, in golden garments, the censer and fire pan, in white garments, the whole offering of twilight, in golden garments. And how on the basis of Scripture do we know that for each act of immersion there must be two acts of sanctification? Scripture states, ‘And he shall put off...and he shall wash...and he shall wash, and he shall put on’ (Lev. 16:23-24).”

- B. *But that statement refers to immersions!*
- C. *If it is not required to deal with immersion, which derives from the clause, “they are holy garments,” apply it to the matter of sanctification.*
- D. *But then why should the All-Merciful not have used the explicit language of “sanctification”?*

- E. *By framing matters in this way, we are informed that immersion is comparable to the act of sanctification: just as the act of sanctification is performed in a holy place, so the act of immersion is performed in a holy place.*
- F. *And how does R. Judah derive that fact?*
- G. *He derives that fact from the formulation of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon.*

I.7. A. *Said R. Hisda, "The position of Rabbi excludes that of both R. Meir and rabbis vis à vis R. Meir. [Meir: when at the second immersion the priest changes from gold to linen, he disrobes first and then sanctifies; rabbis have the sanctification prior to disrobing].*

B. *"It excludes that of rabbis vis à vis Meir: rabbis maintain that when the priest is fully robbed, he sanctifies, but he has said that when he removes the garments is when he sanctifies.*

C. *"It excludes that of R. Meir: R. Meir maintains that on the occasion of the final act of sanctification, when he is robbed he sanctifies, while he has said, when he takes off the garments he sanctifies."*

I.8. A. *Said R. Aha bar Jacob, "All concur with regard to the second act of sanctification that the priest does it when he is clothed. [Freedman: the changing of the garments by the high priest on the Day of Atonement was preceded by immersion, and the immersion was preceded and followed by sanctification. All agree that the second sanctification is done after the priest has donned the robes into which he was to change.] For Scripture has said, 'when they approach,' meaning, he who lacks only the act of approaching washes hands and feet, but that then excludes this one, who has yet to clothe himself and then make the approach."*

B. *Said R. Aha b. Raba to R. Ashi, "R. Hisda does not concur with R. Aha, nor does R. Aha concur with R. Hisda. For otherwise there would be fifteen acts of sanctification that Rabbi would require." [Jung: According to Hisda, Rabbi requires two sanctifications between stripping and dressing, and according to Aha, Rabbi requires the sanctification after being dressed before the service, for if their views were not incompatible, Rabbi would be found to require fifteen acts of sanctification.]*

II.1 A. **They brought him the daily whole offering. He cut [the windpipe and gullet], and another priest completed the slaughtering on his behalf. He received the blood and tossed it:**

B. *What is the meaning of "cut"?*

C. *Said Ulla, "Said Ulla, "It refers to killing the animal."*

D. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "What verse of Scripture so indicates? 'Egypt is a very fair heifer. But the gadfly [using the letters that yield, also, cut] out of the north is come, it is come' (Jer. 46:20)."*

E. *So how does this make the point?*

F. *It is in line with the Aramaic rendering of R. Joseph: "A fair kingdom is Egypt, but murderous nations from the north will come upon it."*

II.2. A. **How far is the cut that the high priest makes?**

B. *Said Ulla, "The greater part of both organs."*

C. *And so said R. Yohanan, "The greater part of both organs."*

- D. *And so R. Simeon b. Laqish maintains, “The greater part of both organs” for said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Since we have learned that cutting through the larger part of an organ is tantamount to cutting through the whole of it, why have we learned, ‘the larger part of one organ’ must be cut in the case of a fowl, and the larger part of the two organs in the case of an animal? [He who slaughters cuts one organ, either the windpipe or the gullet in the case of fowl, or two both the windpipe and the gullet in the case of a beast — his act of slaughter is valid. And the greater part of one of the organs is equivalent to the whole of (M. Hul. 2:1A-B).]* It is because we have learned in the Mishnah: **They brought him the daily whole offering. He cut [the windpipe and gullet], and another priest completed the slaughtering on his behalf. He received the blood and tossed it.”**
- E. Might one suppose that if someone else did not complete the killing for him, the rite would be invalidated?
- F. ...if someone else did not complete the killing for him, the rite would be invalidated? *If so, then you would have an act of service that has been performed by someone other than the high priest! And it has been taught on Tannaite authority: All acts of service on the Day of Atonement are valid only if done by him [the high priest].*
- G. *Rather, this is the sense of the statement:* might one suppose that on the authority of rabbis it might be invalid?
- H. **[33A]** Therefore we have learned in the Mishnah: **[He who slaughters cuts one organ, either the windpipe or the gullet in the case of fowl, or two both the windpipe and the gullet in the case of a beast — his act of slaughter is valid.**
- I. *Now, since from the perspective of rabbis there is no aspect of invalidation, why does the other priest have to finish the job?*
- J. *It is a religious duty to complete the job [to get the requisite blood out].*

The proper order of the daily priestly rites

The following Mishnah-clauses, which specify the sequence of acts of service, are presented only after a sizable exposition of the order of service, which follows. This is a free-standing composition, bearing in its wake its own secondary exposition, a large composite.

- II.3.** A. *Abbaye set forth the proper order of the daily priestly rites in the name of tradition and from the perspective of the opinion of Abba Saul [He should not trim the lamps and then burn the incense, but he should burn the incense first and then trim the lamps. Abba Saul says, “He trims and then burns.”]: The large pile takes precedence over the second pile for the incense; the second pile for the incense comes before laying in order the two logs of wood, laying in order of two logs of wood takes precedence over removing the ashes from the inner altar, removing ashes from the inner altar takes precedence over trimming the five lamps, trimming the five lamps takes precedence over the blood of the daily whole offering, the blood of the daily whole offering takes precedence over the trimming of the two lamps, the trimming of the two lamps takes precedence over the incense, the incense takes precedence over the limbs, the limbs take precedence*

over the meal offering, the meal offering takes precedence over the pancakes, the pancakes take precedence over the drink offerings, the drink offerings take precedence over the additional offerings, the additional offerings take precedence over the frankincense censers, the frankincense censers take precedence over the daily whole offering of twilight, as it is said, “And he shall make smoke thereon the fat of the peace offerings” (Lev. 6: 5) — herewith all of the offerings are complete.

- II.4.** A. The master has said: The large pile takes precedence over the second pile for the incense:
- B. *How on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?*
 - C. *It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - D. “This is the law of the burnt offering, it is that which goes up on its fire wood upon the altar all night” (Lev. 6: 2) — this refers to the large pile. “And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereby” (Lev. 6: 2). This refers to the second pile, for the incense.
 - E. *But perhaps matters are the opposite [and the pile for incense takes priority]?*
 - F. It stands to reason that the large pile should take priority, since it produces atonement in greater volume [every act of smoking an offering except an incense is performed here].
 - G. To the contrary, the pile for the incense is takes priority, since they bring some of it to the inner sanctum.
 - H. *Even so, the one that brings atonement in greater abundant takes priority.*
 - I. *And if you prefer, I shall say, if there is no wood for the second pile, wouldn’t one bring it into the sanctuary from the large pile? [Of course one would, which is why the latter takes priority.]*
- II.5.** A. [The master has said:] the second pile for the incense comes before laying in order the two logs of wood:
- B. *How on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?*
 - C. *Because it is written, “And the priest shall kindle wood upon it every morning” (Lev. 6: 5) — on it, and not on the other pile.*
 - D. *That bears the implication that the other pile is already arranged.*
 - E. *But the word “upon it” is required to make its own point.*
 - F. *“Upon it” is written twice.*
- II.6.** A. [The master has said:] laying in order of two logs of wood takes precedence over removing the ashes from the inner altar:
- B. *Even though here it is written, “In the morning, in the morning” (Exo. 30: 7) [Jung: with reference to the smoking of incense, which also includes the removal of the ashes from the inner altar that must precede the incense offering], and there it is written, “In the morning, in the morning” (Lev. 6: 5), nonetheless, that which prepares for the incense burning takes priority. [Jung: the embers of the wood are essential, for without them no incense can be smoked.]*
 - C. *What is it that is deemed, “that which prepares...”*
 - D. It is the two logs of wood.
 - E. *But you have said that the two logs of wood go for the great pile!*

- F. Said R. Jeremiah, "It is the laying out of the wood" [wood is essential for the incense, even though not this wood (Jung)].
- G. Rabina said, "Since he started with laying out the wood, he finishes that task also."
- H. *R. Ashi said, "If he found no wood in the second pile, wouldn't he bring it in from the big pile?"*

II.7. A. [The master has said:] trimming the five lamps takes precedence over the blood of the daily whole offering:

- B. *How come?*
- C. *Said Abbaye, "We have learned a tradition, but I don't know the reasoning behind it."*
- D. *And Raba said, "It is in accord with the statement of R. Simeon b. Laqish, for said R. Simeon b. Laqish, 'People do not bypass the occasion for carrying out a religious duty.' [33B] Now, when the priest enters the sanctuary, first he comes upon the altar [and that is why he immediately turns to the present task]. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: The table [where the show bread was arrayed] was to the north, two and a half cubits away from the wall; the candlestick was to the south, two and a half cubits away from the wall, the altar stood in the exact middle, extending somewhat outward."*
- E. *But let the altar stand exactly in the middle?*
- F. *Since it is written, "And the candlestick over against the table" (Exo. 26:35), we require that it be possible for the candlestick and table to be within the same line of sight.*
- G. *Said Raba, "On the basis of the statement of R. Simeon b. Laqish, we may further infer that it is forbidden to bypass the arm, when putting on phylacteries, in favor of the forehead. [First the arm, then the forehead, receives the box.] How does one do it? From the one for the arm, he proceeds to the other, for the forehead."*

II.8. A. [The master has said:] the incense takes precedence over the limb:

- B. *How come?*
- C. *Said Abbaye, "The clauses, 'in the morning in the morning' (Lev. 6: 5) that are stated in the context of the two logs of wood, where the phrases are not needed, are assigned to the present case instead, one to trimming the five lamps prior to dealing with the blood of the daily whole offering, the other to the blood of the daily whole offering, which takes priority over trimming the two lamps.*
- D. *"...one to trimming the five lamps prior to dealing with the blood of the daily whole offering: for here [speaking of trimming the lamps] there are three statements [in the morning, Exo. 30: 7, twice, and Exo. 29:39; one of the first two we utilize as stated, the continual offering has only one 'in the morning, at Exo. 29:39, to which the one applied from the two logs of wood is to be added (Jung)]. There there are only two.*
- E. *"...the other to the blood of the daily whole offering, which takes priority over trimming the two lamps: for even though in each case there are two such references [Exo. 30: 7, two times, Jung: which apply to the two lamps equally as to the five, and twice in connection with the continual offering], nonetheless, that rite that conveys atonement still takes preference."*

- F. *Said R. Pappa to Abbaye, "Why not say: one is assigned to removing the ashes of the inner altar, which takes precedence over the blood of the daily whole offering, for here there are three such verbal signals, and there there are only two; and one applies to the blood of the daily whole offering, indicating that it takes priority over trimming the five lamps, for, as before, even though in each case there are two such references, nonetheless, that rite that conveys atonement still takes preference?"*
- G. *[He said to him,] "If so, with what rite will he interrupt [the trimming of the lamps] [Jung: according to Abba Saul trimming the lamps had to take place before the incense offering; since the order would be the blood of the continual offering, the trimming of the lamps, and the incense]?"*
- H. *That problem would pose no difficulty to R. Simeon b. Laqish, for he has said, "Why were the lamps trimmed and, after a break, trimmed again? That is so as to keep the whole Temple Court busy." But from the perspective of R. Yohanan, who has said, "The meaning of the usage, 'In the morning, in the morning' (Exo. 30: 7) is to divide the rite into two successive mornings [Jung: by interrupting it through the interpolation of another service in the midst of the original order], what is to be said?*
- I. *Said Rabina to R. Ashi, "Is the clause, 'In the morning, in the morning' (Exo. 30: 7), really superfluous? Lo, it is required to make its own point, for the intent of the All-Merciful is to state that they should take priority over the second pile, the one for the incense."*
- J. *He said to him, "But have we not already established the sense of the matter: 'And the priest shall kindle wood upon it every morning' (Lev. 6: 5) — on it, and not on the other pile. That bears the implication that the other pile is already arranged."*

II.9. A. [The master has said: trimming the five lamps takes precedence over the blood of the daily whole offering]: *How come he trims the five lamps first, let him do the two first?*

B. *Since he commenced the project already, let him do the larger part of the work.*

C. *Well, then, let him do six lamps?*

D. Said Scripture, "When he dresses the lamps, he shall burn it" (Exo. 30: 7), and "lamps" refers to a minimum of two.

II.10. A. [The master has said:] trimming the two lamps takes precedence over burning the incense:

B. *For said Scripture, "When he dresses the lamps" (Exo. 30: 7), and then, "He shall burn [the incense]."*

II.11. A. [The master has said:] the incense takes precedence over the limbs:

B. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. Let a matter concerning which "in the morning, in the morning" — twice — is stated take precedence over a matter concerning which "in the morning" — only one time — is stated.

II.12. A. [The master has said:] the limbs take precedence over the meal offering:

B. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- C. How on the basis of Scripture do we know that nothing should take priority over the daily whole offering presented at dawn?
- D. **[34A]** Scripture says, “And he shall lay the burnt offering in order upon it” (Lev. 6: 5), and said Raba, “‘The burnt offering’ (Lev. 6: 5) refers to the first burnt offering.”

II.13. A. [The master has said:] the meal offering takes precedence over the pancakes:

- B. [in line with the verse of Scripture,] “Burnt offering and meal offering” (Lev. 23:37).

II.14. A. [The master has said:] the pancakes take precedence over the drink offerings:

- B. they too fall into the category of a meal offering.

II.15. A. [The master has said:] the drink offerings take precedence over the additional offerings:

- B. [in line with the verse of Scripture,] “‘A sacrifice and drink offerings” (Lev. 23:37).

II.16. A. [The master has said:] the additional offerings take precedence over the frankincense censers:

- B. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: The frankincense censers take priority over the additional sacrifices?*

C. *It is a conflict of Tannaite formulations.*

- D. *Said Abbaye, “It stands to reason that the correct position accords with the view of him who has said that the additional offerings take precedence over the frankincense censers. For have you not said that where we find the language, ‘in the morning, in the morning,’ then the rite that is discussed in that setting takes precedence over all others? So here too, the language, ‘on the day...on the day...’ (Lev. 24: 8), mean that that is the offering that is to be presented last on that day.”*

E. *Then what is the reasoning of him who maintains, The frankincense censers take priority over the additional sacrifices?*

F. *He draws an analogy based on the common usage of the word “statute” that appears also with reference to the pancakes.*

H. *If that is the source of the proof, then let him take a consistent position [and assign priority to the frankincense censers over the drink offerings]!*

I. *Here the words “on the day...on the day” serve to indicate that the frankincense censers are presented last in the order of the daily rites.*

III.1 A. **The incense offering of the morning was offered between the tossing of the blood and the offering up of the limbs:**

- B. *Now who can stand behind this anonymous statement, for it cannot be rabbis, since in their view the rite should intervene between the blood and the lamps [and be done before the lamps have been trimmed], and it cannot be in accord with Abba Saul, who would have the rite intervene between the lamps and the limbs!*

C. *In point of fact it accords with the position of rabbis, but the framer of the passage does not set forth the order here [not being particular about the details thereof].*

IV.1 A. That of twilight [was offered up] between the burning of the limbs and the drink offerings:

- B. *What is the source in Scripture for this rule?*
- C. Said R. Yohanan, “Said Scripture, ‘As the meal offering of the morning and as the drinking offering thereof, you shall present it’ (Num. 28: 8) — just as in the case of the meal offering in the morning, the incense takes priority over the drink offerings, so here too, the incense takes priority over the drink offerings.
- D. “And if one would propose, just as in the latter case, the incense takes priority over the burning of the limbs, so here too, the incense takes priority over the burning of the limbs, then is it written, ‘as to the limbs of the morning’? What is written is, ‘as the meal offering of the morning,’ meaning, as the meal offering of the morning but not as the offering of the limbs in the morning.”

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

- B. “And the drink offering thereof shall be the fourth part of a hin” (Num. 28: 8) —
- C. Why not then derive the rule concerning the requirement of a drink offering for the morning sacrifice from the rule governing the evening sacrifice [in line with the argument of 1.D above]?
- D. **[34B]** Rabbi says, “We derive the rule governing the evening offering from the rule governing the morning one.” [Jung: just as the one requires a drink offering, so does the other. The practical difference is the case in which there was enough wine for only one drink offering. If we derive the rule of the evening from that of the morning, the morning rite is the more important, and the drink offering is set forth in the morning. Then to which of the two daily whole offerings does the phrase, “for the one lamb” (Num. 28: 7) refer? Sages assign it to the evening one, Rabbi to the morning one.]
- E. *Now from the perspective of rabbis, there is no problem, since it is written in regard to the daily whole offering of the evening, but what is the basis for Rabbi’s position?*
- F. Said Rabbah bar Ulla, “Said Scripture, ‘For the one lamb’ (Num. 28: 7). Now which is the lamb in regard to which the word ‘one’ is used: Say, it is the lamb of the daily whole offering of the dawn.”
- G. *And rabbis?*
- H. *What is the meaning of “one”?* The most singular beast in its flock.
- I. *And Rabbi?*
- J. [That point derives from the language,] “And all your choice vows” (Deu. 12:11).
- K. *And rabbis?*
- L. *One refers to a beast that is obligatory, the other, a beast that is votive, and a specific verse is required to cover each case.*

V.1 A. If the high priest was decrepit or infirm, they heated hot water for him and poured it into the cold water, to relieve the chill:

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Said R. Judah, “They heated lamps of wrought iron on the eve of the Day of Atonement, which they would then toss into cold water to relieve the chill.”

- D. [But how could that be permitted on the Day of Atonement, for] would that not harden the iron?
- E. Said R. Bibi, “The level of heat was not such as to reach the hardening point.”
- F. *Abbayye said, “You may even say that the level of heat was not such as to reach the hardening point. For when it comes to something that one does not intend to accomplish [through the performance of an otherwise-legitimate action], it is permitted. [Since it is no one’s intention to heat the iron to the point of hardening it through immersion in cold water, such an action is legal.]”*
- G. *But did Abbayye make such a statement? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. “‘Flesh’ — even if there is a mark of the skin ailment there, ‘it shall be circumcised,’” the words of R. Josiah —
- I. *And in that context, we conducted the following reflection: So for what purpose do I require a verse of Scripture to make this point? For this is something that one does not deliberately intend to do, and something that one does not deliberately intend to do is permitted.*
- J. *And said Abbayye, “The proof is required only from the perspective of R. Judah, who has said, ‘Even a matter that one does not deliberately intend to do is forbidden.’”*
- K. *That applies to forbidden matters in the whole Torah in general, but here, hardening is forbidden only by the authority of rabbis.*

After an amplification at I:1, we turn, I:2-8, to a thematic exposition that is closely related to the general theme before us. Then at II:1-2, we revert to Mishnah-exegesis. II:3-16 present a systematic portrait of the correct order of the priestly rites, placing the rule of the Mishnah in its larger and systematic context. III:1, IV:1, and V:1 all gloss the Mishnah. The composite serving this Mishnah-paragraph shows how the same modes of analysis applied to Mishnah-statements also carry forward the examination of other Tannaite statements, with II:3 given a huge talmud of its own. I cannot point to a more ample demonstration that the modes of thought that characterize the whole come to bear at every important element in the composite; whatever the sages responsible for the document proposed to do, they did in a consistent way to any authoritative statements that had come down to them.

3:6-7

3:6

- A. **They brought him to the Parvah chamber, and it was in the sanctuary.**
- B. **They spread out a linen sheet between him and the crowd.**
- C. **(2) He sanctified his hands and feet and took off his clothes,**
- D. **R. Meir says, “He took off his clothes, sanctified his hands and feet.”**
- E. **He went down, immersed, came up, and dried off.**
- F. **They brought him white clothes.**
- G. **He put them on and (3) sanctified his hands and feet.**

- A. “At dawn he would put on a garment of Pelusium linen worth twelve manehs, and at dusk, he wore Indian linen worth eight hundred zuz,” the words of R. Meir.
- B. And sages say, “At dawn he would put on a garment worth eighteen manehs, and at dusk, one worth twelve manehs.
- C. “In all it was worth thirty manehs. “
- D. These belong to the public.
- E. And if he wanted to spend more, he could do so at his own expense.

I.1 A. [35A] What is the meaning of Parvah?

- B. Said R. Joseph, “Parvah” is a Magus” [Jung: a Persian priest who dug a cave under the ground of the sanctuary to watch the high priest at the service of the Day of Atonement; sages saw the digging and found the cave and called it by his name.]

II.1 A. They spread out a linen sheet between him and the crowd:

- B. *Why in particular was it made of linen?*
- C. Said R. Kahana, “It is to signal that the rite of the day was carried out in garments made of linen.”

III.1 A. At dawn he would put on a garment of Pelusium linen worth twelve manehs, and at dusk, he wore Indian linen worth eight hundred zuz,” the words of R. Meir. And sages say, “At dawn he would put on a garment worth eighteen manehs, and at dusk, one worth twelve manehs. In all it was worth thirty manehs:”

- B. *The Tannaite formulation including the sum total [In all it was worth thirty manehs] serves to indicate that with garments worth less than that sum the rite is not to be carried out. But if one set of clothing is worth less than the specific amount, and the other set of clothing more, we have no objection [so long as the sum total is as indicated].*
- C. *But everyone concurs that the garments worn in the morning should be worth more, and how on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?*
- D. Said R. Huna b. R. Ilai, “Said Scripture, ‘Linen...linen...linen...linen...’ (Lev. 16: 4). This means, the choicest linen.”
- E. **[35B]** *An objection was raised:* “And they shall put on other garments and they shall not sanctify the people with their garments” (Eze. 44:19) — *does this not mean, other garments that are more important than these?*
- F. No, it means, other garments that are less important than these.

IV.1 A. [Supply: These belong to the public. And if he wanted to spend more, he could do so at his own expense:] [With regard to garments provided by the priest out of his own funds.] R. Huna bar Judah, and some say, R. Samuel bar Judah, stated as a Tannaite ruling, “After the rite in behalf of the community has been completed, a priest whose mother made for him a tunic might put it on and officiate wearing that at a private service, on the stipulation that he then hand it over to the community.”

- B. *That is self-evident.*

- C. *What might you otherwise have thought? That we should take account of the possibility that he will not hand it over in a proper manner? So we are informed that that is not the case.*

- IV.2.** A. They say that [Tos.: M'SH B] Ishmael b. Phiabi's mother made for him a tunic worth a hundred *maneh*. And he would put it on and stand and make offerings on the altar wearing it [T. **Kip. 1:21D-E**].
- B. They say that [Tos.: SWB M'SH B] Eleazar b. Harsom's mother made for him a tunic for twenty thousand, and he would stand and make offerings on the altar while wearing it.
- C. [B.:But his brethren, the priests would not allow him to wear it]. [Tos.:] But his brethren, the priests, called him down, because [it was so sheer that] he appeared naked while wearing it [T. **Kip. 1:22A-D**].
- D. *But is it so sheer as to allow someone to appear naked? And has not a master said, "The thread was twisted six times"?*
- E. *Said Abbayye, "It was like wine shining through a glass cup."*

Wealth, Poverty, and Torah Study

The allusion to Eleazar b. Harsom and to the use of wealth for adorning the Temple and the priesthood carries in its wake the inclusion of this composite, in which the same authority figures in the same context.

- IV.3.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. The poor man, rich man, and wicked man come to judgment.
- C. To the poor man they say, "How come you did not engage in Torah-study?"
- D. If he says, "I was poor and preoccupied with earning my living," they say to him, "Were you ever poorer than Hillel?"
- E. They said concerning Hillel the Elder that every day he would work as a day-laborer and earn a tropa'ic. Half he paid [for tuition] to the bursar at the house of study, the other half he spent for food for himself and his family.
- F. One time he did not find day labor and the bursar did not let him enter. He climbed up and suspended himself and took up his seat at the mouth of the skylight to hear the words of the living God from the very mouth of Shemaiah and Abtalion.
- G. They say: that day was the eve of the Sabbath [Friday], in the winter solstice, and it snowed on him from heaven.
- H. At dawn said Shemaiah to Abtalion, "My brother, Abtalion, every day the house is illuminated [by dawn's early light], but today it's gloomy. Is it possibly a cloudy day?"
- I. They looked intently and recognized the shape of a man over the skylight. They went up and found him covered with three cubits of snow.
- J. They took him down, bathed him and anointed him and set him by the fire and said, "A man such as this is worthy that the Sabbath should be profaned on his account."
- K. To the rich man they say, "How come you did not engage in Torah-study?"

- L. If he says, “I was rich and preoccupied with managing my funds,” they say to him, “Were you ever richer than R. Eleazar?”
- M. They said concerning R. Eleazar b. Harsom that his father left him as his estate a thousand towns on shore and, correspondingly, a thousand ships at sea. And every day he would take a sack of flour on his shoulder [for his sustenance] and wander from town to town and city to city to learn Torah.
- N. One time his workers found him [but did not know who he was] and seized him for the corvée. He said to them, “Please let me be, so that I may go and study Torah.”
- O. They said to him, “By the life of R. Eleazar b. Harsom,, we shall not let you go.”
- P. [That was because] in his entire life he had never seen them, because he remained in session all day and all night, engaged with the Torah.
- Q. To the wicked person they say, “How come you did not engage in Torah-study?”
- R. If he says, “I was good-looking and preoccupied with fulfilling my sexual desires,” they say to him, “Were you better-looking than Joseph?”
- S. They said concerning Joseph, that righteous man, that every day the wife of Potiphar would try to seduce him with words. [Not only so, but] the garment that she put on for him in the morning she did not wear by night, and the garments that she put on for him by night she did not put on for him in the morning.
- T. She said to him, “Submit to me.”
- U. He said to her, “No.”
- V. She said to him, “Then I’ll put you in prison.”
- W. He said to her, “‘The Lord frees the bound’ (Psa. 146: 7).”
- X. She said to him, “Then I’ll cut you down to size.”
- Y. He said to her, “‘The Lord raises up those who are bowed down’ (Psa. 146: 8).”
- Z. She said to him, “Then I’ll blind your eyes.”
- AA. He said to her, “‘The Lord opens the eyes of the blind’ (Psa. 146: 8).”
- BB. She gave him a thousand talents of silver to submit to her, to lie with her, to be with her, but he did not want to submit to her,
- CC. “to lie with her — in this world,
- DD. “to be with her, in the world to come.”
- EE. It turns out that Hillel serves to convict the poor, R. Eleazar b. Harsom the rich, and Joseph the wicked.

I:1, II:1, III:1 and IV:1 serve to gloss the Mishnah’s statements in routine ways. IV:2, carrying in its wake IV:3, amplifies the subject of how the families of the high priests would gussy up the office.

3:8

- A. **He came over to his bullock.**
- B. **Now his bullock was set between the Porch and the Altar.**

- C. Its head was to the south and its face to the west.
- D. And the priest stands at the east, with his face to the west.
- E. And he puts his two hands on it and states the confession.
- F. And thus did he say, “O Lord, I have committed iniquity, transgressed, and sinned before you, I and my house. O Lord, forgive the iniquities, transgressions, and sins, which I have done by committing iniquity, transgression, and sin before you, I and my house.
- G. “As it is written in the Torah of Moses, your servant, For on this day shall atonement be made for you to clean you. From all of your sins shall you be clean before the Lord (Lev. 16:30).”
- H. And they respond to him, “Blessed is the name of the glory of his kingdom forever and ever.”

- I.1 A. [36A] [He came over to his bullock. Now his bullock was set between the Porch and the Altar:]** *From what authority have you heard the statement that the area between the hall and the altar was classified as “north”?* [Jung: For the purposes of slaughtering the the sacrifice of the high priest, which, as belonging to the highest grade of sanctity, had to be slaughtered on the north side; such must be the view of the Mishnah, which states that the bullock was placed between the hall and the altar for confession as well as for slaughtering purposes, thus ‘at the place here the confession was made there it was slaughtered’].
- B. *It is R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - C. “What constitutes the northern space? It is from the northern wall of the altar to the northern wall of the Temple court and the entire space opposite the altar,” the words of R. Yosé b. R. Judah.
 - D. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon added the space between the porch and the altar.
 - E. Rabbi adds the space where the priests and Israelites walk.
 - F. But all concur that the place on the inside of the chamber that holds the knives it is unfit.
 - G. *But do you think that the first formulation represents the view only of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon and not Rabbi? You may even say that it encompasses the view of Rabbi. But Rabbi goes beyond the position of R. Yosé b. R. Judah, so will he also not go beyond the position of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon?*
 - H. *This is what we mean to say: if you think that the passage concurs with Rabbi, then let him locate it in the place where the feet of the priests and Israelites go.*
 - I. *What then — is it in accord with the position of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon? Then let him locate it in the area from the northern wall of the altar to the northern wall of the Temple court!*
 - J. *Then this is what you have to say: it was located in the position indicated to take account of the exhaustion of the high priest; and on this view too, it was located in the position indicated to take account of the exhaustion of the high priest.*

II.1 A. Its head was to the south and its face to the west:

- B. *How is this to be imagined?*
- C. Said Rab, “The priest turns its head.”

- D. *But why not set it up straight* [Jung: with its back to the altar and its head to the court]?
- E. Said Abbaye, "It is a decree, lest it drop shits."
- III.1 A.** [Supply: **And he puts his two hands on it:**] *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. **How does one place hands on the head of an offering** [Jung: of the highest grade of sanctity]?
- C. **The animal to be sacrificed stands at the north with its face to the west. The one who lays on hands is in the west, with his face to the west.**
- D. **He puts his two hands onto the horns of the animal.**
- E. [T.'s version:] **But he did not put his hands on the shoulder, and he did not put his hands on top of one another, and] nothing intervened between his hands and the horns.**
- F. **He made confession of sin or transgression over it: over a sin-offering, [he confessed] the particular sin he had committed, over the guilt-offering, the particular transgression of which he was guilty.**
- G. **"Over a burnt-offering, [he confessed] the particular sin concerning transgression of the rules of gleaning, the forgotten sheaf, and the corner of the field [of which he was guilty], to which confession does not apply," the words of R. Yosé the Galilean.**
- H. Said to him R. Aqiba, **"For what sins does the burnt-offering effect atonement? Only for those things which incur a specific punishment. Lo, a punishment is stated [and the punishment atones for the deed]. For a negative precept, their own modes of punishment are stated. For what does the burnt-offering effect atonement? For transgression of a positive commandment and for transgression of a negative commandment which involves positive action."**
- I. *What is at issue between the named authorities?*
- J. Said R. Jeremiah, **[36B]** *"At issue between them is the negative commandment concerning carrion. R. Aqiba takes the position that it is a perfectly valid negative commandment [subject to a flogging, one for which a burnt offering does not atone], and R. Yosé the Galilean maintains that it is not a perfectly valid negative commandment."* [Jung: That is because once one has eaten the carrion, it is no longer possible to sell it to the stranger as prescribed at Deu. 14:21. Aqiba maintains it is a valid prohibition, for the transgression of which one is penalized with a flogging; the fact that one cannot repair the damage is irrelevant. Yosé does not admit that such a punishment is inflicted, so it is not a valid prohibition.]
- K. *Abbaye said, "All parties concur that the negative commandment covering carrion is a perfectly valid negative commandment. But here, what is subject to dispute is the commandment, 'you shall leave' ['You shall not glean your vineyard, nor gather the fallen part of the vineyard, you shall leave them for the poor and for the stranger' (Lev. 19: 9).] R. Aqiba takes the view that 'you shall leave' means, from the beginning* [Jung: here is another instance of a prohibition transformed into a commandment. 'You shall not glean...you shall leave them,' Aqiba holds the positive commandment is enjoined from the very first, so, do not

glean but leave, hence this is not a prohibition transformed into a commandment, but a commandment to begin with], while *R. Yosé maintains that* ‘you shall leave’ means, now [Jung: a de facto commandment, don’t glean, but, having gleaned, undo your transgression by leaving...].”

- IV.1 A.** [Supply:...and states the confession. And thus did he say, “O Lord, I have committed iniquity, transgressed, and sinned before you, I and my house. O Lord, forgive the iniquities, transgressions, and sins, which I have done by committing iniquity, transgression, and sin before you, I and my house. As it is written in the Torah of Moses, your servant, For on this day shall atonement be made for you to clean you. From all of your sins shall you be clean before the Lord (Lev. 16:30):”]
- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. [In Tosefta’s version:] How does he state the confession?
- D. “‘O Lord, I have committed iniquity, transgressed and sinned before you, I and my house. O Lord, forgive the iniquities, transgressions, and sins, which I have done in committing iniquity, transgression, and sin before you, I and my house, as it is written in the Torah of Moses, your servant. For on this day shall atonement be made for you to clean you. From all your sins shall you be clean before the Lord’ (Lev. 16:30) [M. [Yoma 3:8F-G](#)].
- E. “And the high priest further says, ‘And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the people of Israel and all their transgressions, all their sins’ (Lev. 16:21),” the words of R. Meir.
- F. And sages say, “‘Iniquities’ — these are those done deliberately.
- G. “‘Their transgressions’ — these are acts of rebellion. And so Scripture says, ‘The king of Moab has transgressed against me’ (2Ki. 3: 7). And so too, ‘Then did Libnah transgress at the same time’ (2Ki. 8:22).
- H. “‘Their sins’ — these are the misdeeds done inadvertently. And so Scripture says, ‘If any one shall sin through error’ (Lev. 4: 2).
- I. “Now after he has confessed the deliberate iniquities and the acts of rebellion, shall he go back and confess their inadvertent misdeeds as well?
- J. “But how does he say the confession?
- K. “‘O Lord, I have committed iniquity, transgressed, and sinned before you...’
- L. “And they respond to him, ‘Blessed is the name of the glory of his kingdom forever and ever’ [M. [Yoma 3:8F-H](#)].
- M. “For we see that all who confess make confession thus.
- N. “David said, ‘Both we and our fathers have sinned, we have committed iniquity, we have done wickedly’ (Psa. 106: 6).
- O. “Solomon said, ‘We have sinned, we have transgressed, we have done wickedly’ (1Ki. 8:47).
- P. “Daniel said, ‘we have sinned, we have transgressed, we have done wickedly’ (Dan. 9: 5).
- Q. “Now what is it that Moses said, ‘Forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin’ (Exo. 34: 7)? Moses said before the Holy One, blessed be he, ‘Lord of the

Universe, when Israel sins before you and then repent, treat their deliberate sins as though they were inadvertent.'

R. [Tosefta concludes:] "But since he was making confession for deliberate violations of the law and acts of rebellion, it is as if they are deeds done inadvertently before him.

S. "And thus did he confess, 'I have sinned, I have transgressed, I have done wickedly before you'" [T. Kip. 2:1].

T. Said Rabbah bar Samuel said Rab, "The decided law is in accord with sages."

U. *That is self-evident!* Where you have an individual and the collectivity of sages, the law is always in accord with sages!

V. *What might you otherwise have supposed? The reasoning of R. Meir is more logical, since Scripture supports him in the case of Moses? So we are informed to the contrary.*

IV.2. A. *There was a prayer-leader who took up the leadership of the prayers in the presence of Rabbah and conducted them in accord with the position of R. Meir. He said to him, "Have you abandoned the position of sages and acted in accord with R. Meir?"*

B. *He said to him, "The position of R. Meir is more logical, since it enjoys the support of the book of the Torah of Moses."*

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

B. "And he shall make atonement" (Lev. 16:11) — it is concerning atonement expressed in words that Scripture speaks.

C. You say that it is concerning atonement expressed in words that Scripture speaks. But perhaps Scripture refers only to atonement attained through the blood rite.

D. Lo, in this manner do I reason: here we find a reference to "atonement," and elsewhere we find a reference to atonement. Just as the atonement stated in connection with the he goat is one that comes about through words, namely, the confession, so atonement with the bullock is atonement that is attained through words.

E. And if you should wish to argue [to the contrary, there is yet stronger proof, for], lo, Scripture says, "And Aaron shall present the bullock for the sin offering which is for himself and shall make atonement for himself and for his house" (Lev. 16:11). Yet at that point, the bullock will not have been slaughtered at all [so it is the confession, not the blood rite, that effects atonement].

F. *What is the consideration behind the cautionary phrase, And if you should wish to argue to the contrary, there is yet stronger proof?*

G. *Now should you say, let us derive the governing analogy from the he-goat that is prepared inside, in which case the atonement is attained through the blood rite, [then by way of reply:] ...and shall make atonement for himself and for his house" (Lev. 16:11). Yet at that point, the bullock will not have been slaughtered at all.*

IV.4. A. And how do we know that the confession commences with the word, "O"?

B. Here we find a reference to "atonement," and elsewhere, at Horeb, we find a reference to atonement. Just as the process of atonement in the latter passage

commences with the word, “O,” so the process of atonement in the latter passage commences with the word, “O.”

IV.5. A. And how do we know that the confession makes use of the name of God?

- B. Here we find a reference to “atonement,” and elsewhere, at the occasion of the heifer the neck of which is to be broken on the occasion of finding a neglected corpse, we find reference to atonement. Just as the process of atonement in the latter passage makes use of the name of God, so the process of atonement here makes use of the name of God.

IV.6. A. *Said Abbaye, “Now there is no problem understanding by we do not derive the rule governing Horeb from the case of the heifer the neck of which is to be broken, since what was was [and the analogy of the latter case is simply irrelevant]. But should not the procedure governing the sacrifice of the heifer the neck of which is to be broken not be conducted in accord with the analogy provided by the conduct of atonement at Horeb? And should you say that that is indeed the case, have we not learned in the Mishnah: **And [it is] the priests [who] say, Forgive, O Lord, your people Israel, whom you have redeemed, and do not allow innocent blood in the midst of your people, Israel (Deu. 21: 8) [M. Sot. 9:6F]?**”*

- B. *That’s a problem.*

V.1 A. And they respond to him, “Blessed is the name of the glory of his kingdom forever and ever:”

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Rabbi says, “‘For I will praise the name of the Lord, ascribe greatness to our God’ (Deu. 32: 3) — said Moses to Israel, ‘When I mention the name of the Holy One, blessed be he, you ‘ascribe greatness to our God.’”
- D. Hananiah, nephew of R. Joshua, says, “‘The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing’ (Pro. 10: 7) — said the prophet to Israel, ‘When I mention the Righteous of the Ages, you say a blessing.’”

I:1 asks about the authority behind the Mishnah’s rule, and II:1 provides a light gloss. III:1 takes up a detail of the Mishnah but focuses upon the exposition of Tosefta’s treatment of the topic. Units IV and V provide large Tannaite complements to the theme of the Mishnah.

3:9-10

3:9

- A. **He came to the east side of the courtyard, to the north of the altar, with the prefect at his right hand and the head of the father’s house at the left.**
- B. **There were two goats.**
- C. **There also was a box with two lots.**
- D. **They used to be a boxwood, but Ben Gamla made them of gold.**
- E. **Consequently he was remembered with honor.**

- A. Ben Qatin made twelve stopcocks for the laver, which had had only two.
- B. And he too made a mechanism for the laver, so its water should not be invalidated by being kept overnight.
- C. King Monobases had handles made of gold for all the vessels used on the Day of Atonement.
- D. Helene, his mother, set a golden candlestick over the door of the sanctuary.
- E. She also made a golden tablet, on which was written the pericope of the accused wife.
- F. As to Nicanor, miracles were done at his doors.
- G. And they remembered him with honor,

I.1 A. [...to the north of the altar:] *since the passage refers to “the north of the altar,” it must follow that the altar does not stand in the northern area of the courtyard [so no part of the altar extended into the northern half of the court]. Then who is the authority behind this passage? It is R. Eleazar b. Jacob, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Eleazar b. Jacob says, “‘Northward’ means that the north must be free of everything, even of the altar itself.”
- C. *But the first part of the passage accords with R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon [who maintains that part of the altar extended to the north, whence he permitted the bullock to be slaughtered between the hall and the altar (Jung)]!*
- D. *The whole of it speaks for R. Eleazar b. Jacob, and it has been taught as the Tannaite formulation, “In the space between the hall and the altar.”*

II.1 A. ...with the prefect at his right hand and the head of the father’s house at the left:

- B. Said R. Judah, “He who walks at the right hand of his master is a boor.”
- C. *But we have learned in the Mishnah: with the prefect at his right hand and the head of the father’s house at the left. And furthermore, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Three who are going along the way — the master is in the middle, and the more distinguished at the right, the less distinguished on the left. And so we find in the case of the three ministering angels who came to Abraham, Michael was in the middle, Gabriel on his right, Raphael on his left.*
- D. *Interpreted R. Samuel bar Papa before R. Adda, “It is wrong if the teacher is hidden by him.”*
- E. *But has it not been taught as a Tannaite statement: he who walks in front of his teacher is a boor, he who walks behind him is arrogant?*
- F. *He turns sideways as he walks.*

III.1 A. There also was a box with two lots. They used to be a boxwood, but Ben Gamla made them of gold. Consequently he was remembered with honor:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “And Aaron shall cast lots upon the goats” (Lev. 16: 8):
- D. lots for each matter.
- E. Might one suppose that two are cast for this one and two for that one?

- F. Scripture says, “one lot for the Lord and the other lot for Azazel.” There is here only one for the Lord and one for Azazel.
- G. Might one suppose that one for the Lord and one for Azazel will be on this one, and one for the Lord and one for Azazel will be on that one?
- H. Scripture says, “one lot for the Lord and the other lot for Azazel.”
- I. There is only one here for Azazel.
- J. If so, why does Scripture refers to “lots” in the plural?
- K. To indicate that the lots should be of the same size, so that one should not make one lot large and the other small, one of silver and the other of gold, one of marble and the other of boxwood [Sifra CXLXXVII:1.3-5].
- L. “Lots:” they may be made of any material.
- M. *That is obvious.*
- N. *No, it was necessary to make that point in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- O. Since we find that the high priest’s front plate had the name of the Lord inscribed on it and that it was made of gold, I might have surmised that this too must be made of gold. Therefore Scripture says, “lot...lot...,” to encompass olive wood, nut wood, or box wood.

IV.1 A. Ben Qatin made twelve stopcocks for the laver, which had had only two:

- B. *A Tannaite statement:*
- C. Ben Qattin made twelve spouts for the laver; [Bavli adds:] so that his twelve brothers, the priests, who are taken up with the daily whole offering, may at simultaneously wash their hands and feet [Bavli omits: he also made pulleys for the laver, so the water should not become unfit through the passage of the night] [T. Yoma 2: G]
- D. *A Tannaite statement:*
- E. In the morning, when the laver was filled, he would sanctify his hands and feet from the spigot on top, in the evening, when the water level was low, he sanctified hands and feet from the one on the bottom.

V.1 A. And he too made a mechanism for the laver, so its water should not be invalidated by being kept overnight:

- B. *What sort of mechanism was it?*
- C. Said Abbaye, “It was a water wheel that let it go down into the pit.”

VI.1 A. King Monobases had handles made of gold for all the vessels used on the Day of Atonement:

- B. *Why didn’t he make the utensils themselves out of gold?*
- C. [37B] Said Abbaye, “It was the handles of the knives.
- D. *By way of objection:* He also made out of gold the base of the utensils, rims of the utensils, handles of the utensils, and handles of the knives used for the Day of Atonement.
- E. *Explained Abbaye, “This refers to the helms of axes and adzes” [Jung].*

VII.1 A. Helene, his mother, set a golden candlestick over the door of the sanctuary:

- B. *A Tannaite statement:*
- C. **Helene, his mother, set a gold candlestick over the door to the sanctuary. She also made a golden tablet on which was written the pericope of the accused wife [M. Yoma 3:10D-E], so that when the sun rises, sparks of golden light sparkle forth from it, so people know that the sun is rising [at which point they were to recite the Shema] [T. Kip. 2:3].**
- D. *By way of objection:* He who recites the Shema in the morning along with the men of the priestly platoon of that week or the lay members of the priestly watch has not carried out his obligation, because the former read it too early and the latter too late.
- E. *Said Abbaye, "It was for the information of the rest of the people of Jerusalem."*

VIII.1 A. She also made a golden tablet, on which was written the pericope of the accused wife:

- B. *That fact yields the inference that one may write a scroll for a child for purposes of instructional exercise.*
- C. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish in the name of R. Yannai, "It was written only with the first letters of the words."*
- D. *An objection was raised:* As the priest writes [the passage on the accused wife] he looks at the tablet and writes what is written in the tablet.
- E. *Say:* he writes as though it were written in the tablet.
- F. *An objection was raised:* As he writes, he looks at the tablet and writes what is written in the tablet, e.g., "if one lay...if one did not lie..." (Num. 5:19, 20).
- G. *There it was written [38A] by sections.*

IX.1 A. As to Nicanor, miracles were done at his doors. And they remembered him with honor:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **Now what is the miracle which was done with them?**
- D. **They say: When Nicanor was bringing them from Alexandria, in Egypt, a gale rose in the sea and threatened to drown them. They took one of them and tossed it into the sea, and they wanted to throw in the other but Nicanor would not let them. He said to them, "If you throw in the second one, throw me in with it." He was distressed all the way to the wharf at Jaffa. Once they reached the wharf at Jaffa, the other door popped up from underneath the boat.**
- E. **And there are those who say one of the beasts of the sea swallowed it, and when Nicanor came to the wharf at Jaffa, it brought it up and tossed it onto land.**
- F. **And concerning it, it is explicitly stated in tradition, "The beams of our house are cedar, our rafters are pine" (Son. 1:17) [T. Kip. 2:4C-H].**
- G. *Do not read the letters that spell "pine" in that way but rather as though they yielded "covenant of the sea."*
- H. **All the gates which were there were changed [and covered] with gold, except for Nicanor's gate, because a miracle was done with them. And there are those who say, "Because their bronze shone like gold" [M. Mid. 2:3].**

I. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, "It was Corinthian bronze, which glistened like gold."

The glosses are routine and consistent in character.

3:11

- A. **But these [were remembered] dishonorably:**
- B. **the members of the household of Garmu did not want to teach others how to make the Show Bread.**
- C. **The members of the household of Abtinah did not want to teach others how to make the incense.**
- D. **Hygras b. Levi knew a lesson of singing but did not want to teach it to anyone else.**
- E. **Ben Qamsar did not want to teach others how to write.**
- F. **Concerning the first ones listed is stated the following verse: "The memory of the just is blessed" (Pro. 10: 7).**
- G. **And concerning these [latter ones] is stated the following verse: "But the name of the wicked shall rot."**

- I.1 A. But these [were remembered] dishonorably: the members of the household of Garmu did not want to teach others how to make the Show Bread**
- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. [Given in Tosefta's wording] **The members of the household of Garmu were experts in making Show Bread, and they did not want to teach others [how to make it].**
- D. **Sages sent and brought experts from Alexandria, in Egypt, who were expert in similar matters, but were not experts in removing it from the oven.**
- E. **The members of the house of Garmu would heat the oven on the outside, and it [the loaf of bread] would be removed [on its own] on the inside.**
- F. **The experts from Alexandria did not do so.**
- G. **And some say this made it get moldy.**
- H. **And when the sages learned of the matter, they said, "The Holy One, blessed be he, created the world only for his own glory, as it is said, 'Everyone that is called by my name and whom I have created for my glory' (Isa. 43: 7), [so we might as well pay the tariff]."**
- I. **They sent for them, and they did not come until they doubled their former salary.**
- J. **"They used to take a fee of twelve manehs every day, and now they went and took a fee of twenty-four," the words of R. Meir.**
- K. **R. Judah says, "Twenty-four did they take every day, and now they went and took forty-eight manehs."**
- L. **Said to them sages, "Now why were you unwilling to teach?"**
- M. **They said, "The members of father's house knew that the Temple is destined for destruction, and they did not want to teach others how to do it, so that they should not be able to do it before an idol in the way in which they do it before the Omnipresent."**

- N. And on account of this next matter they are remembered with honor:
- O. For a piece of clean bread was never found in the hands of their sons and daughters under any circumstances, so that people might not say about them, "They are nourished from the Show Bread."
- P. This was meant to carry out the following verse: "You shall be clean before the Lord and before Israel" (Num. 32:22) [T. **Kip. 2:5**].

II.1 A. The members of the household of Abtinās did not want to teach others how to make the incense:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. [Given in Tosefta's wording] The members of the house of Abtinās were experts in preparing the incense for producing smoke [cf. M. **Yoma 3:1 IC**], and they did not want to teach others how to do so.
- D. Sages sent and brought experts from Alexandria, in Egypt, who knew how to concoct spices in much the same way.
- E. But they were not experts in making the smoke ascend [as well as the others].
- F. The smoke coming from the incense of the house of Abtinās would ascend straight as a stick up to the beams, and afterward it scattered in all directions as it came down.
- G. That of the Alexandrians would scatter as it came down forthwith [not rising properly].
- H. Now when the sages realized this, they said, "The Omnipresent has created the world only for his own glory, as it is said, 'The Lord has made everything for his own purpose' (Pro. 16: 4)."
- I. Sages sent to them [the members of the house of Abtinās], but they declined to come until the sages doubled their wages.
- J. "They had been receiving twelve manehs every day, and now they went and got twenty-four," the words of R. Meir.
- K. R. Judah says, "They had been getting twenty-four every day. Now they went and got forty-eight manehs."
- L. Sages said to them, "Now why were you unwilling to teach [others]?"
- M. They said to them, "The members of father's house knew that the Temple is destined for destruction, and they did not want to teach others their art, so that people would not burn incense before an idol in the same way in which they burn incense before the Omnipresent."
- N. And in this [next] matter, they are remembered for good:
- O. A woman of their household never went out wearing perfume at any time,
- P. and not only so, but when they would marry into their household a woman from some other place, they made an agreement that she not put on perfume,
- Q. so that people should not say, "Their women are putting on perfume made up from the preparation of the incense for the Temple."
- R. This they did to carry out the following verse, "And you shall be clear before the Lord and before Israel" (Num. 32:22) [T. **Kip. 2:5**].

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

B. Said R. Ishmael, "Once I was talking on the way and I came across one of the children of their children. I said to him, 'Your forefathers wanted to aggrandize their own glory and wanted to diminish the glory of the Omnipresent. Now the glory of the Omnipresent stands secure, but their honor is diminished.'"

II.3. A. Said R. Aqiba, "Simeon [Bavli: R. Ishmael] b. Luga told me, 'A certain child of the sons of their sons and I were gathering grass in the field. Then I saw him laugh and cry.

B. "I said to him, 'Why did you cry?'

C. "He said to me, 'Because of the glory of father's house, which has gone into exile.'

D. "I said to him, 'Then why did you laugh?'

E. "He said, 'At the end of it all, in time to come, the Holy One, blessed be He, is going to make his descendants rejoice.'

F. "I said to him, 'Why? [What did you see to make you think of this?]'

G. "He said to me, 'A smoke-raiser' in front of me [made me laugh].'

H. "I said to him, 'Show it to me.'

I. "He said to me, "We are subject to an oath not to show it to anyone at all.'"

J. Said R. Yohanan b. Nuri, "One time I was going along the way and an old man came across me [Bavli: I said to him, Who are you,] and said to me, 'I am a member of the house of Abtinias.

K. "At the beginning, when the house of father was discreet, they would give their scrolls [containing the prescriptions for frankincense only] to one another.

L. "Now take it, but be careful about it, since it is a scroll containing a recipe for spices.'

M. "And when I came and reported the matter before R. Aqiba, he said to me, 'From now on it is forbidden to speak ill of these people again.'

N. On the basis of this story, Ben Azzai said, "Yours will they give you,

O. "by your own name will they call you,

P. "[38B] in your place will they seat you.

Q. "There is no forgetfulness before the Omnipresent.

R. "No man can touch what is designated for his fellow" [T. [Kip. 2:7](#)].

III.1 A. Hygras b. Levi knew a lesson of singing but did not want to teach it to anyone else:

B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. When he [Jung:] tuned his voice to a trill, he would put his thumb into his mouth and place his finger between the two parts of the moustache, so that his brothers, the priests, were startled."

IV.1 A. [Supply:] Ben Qamsar did not want to teach others how to write:

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

C. Ben Qamsar knew [the art] of writing, and did not want to teach anyone else [M. [Yoma 3:11 E](#)].

- D. They said about him that he could take four pens between his fingers, and, if there was a word containing four letters, he could write the word at once.
- E. **They said to him, “Why do you not want to teach anyone else?”**
- F. **He remained silent.**
- G. **These others found an answer to what they said, but Ben Qamsar did not find an answer to what he said.**
- H. **These others sought to increase their own glory and to diminish the glory owing to Heaven.**
- I. **Therefore their own glory was diminished, while the glory of Heaven was increased.**
- J. **And a good name and a good memorial were not theirs ever [T. [Kip. 2:8](#)].**
- L. **Concerning the first ones listed is stated the following verse: “The memory of the just is blessed” (Pro. 10: 7). And concerning Ben Qamsar and his fellows is stated the following verse: “But the name of the wicked shall rot.”**
- V.1** A. [Supply:] **Concerning the first ones listed is stated the following verse: “The memory of the just is blessed” (Pro. 10: 7). And concerning these [latter ones] is stated the following verse: “But the name of the wicked shall rot:”**
- B. *What is the meaning of the phrase, “But the name of the wicked shall rot”?*
- C. Said R. Eleazar, “Rottenness takes over their names, *so that later on people do not make use of their names in naming their children.*”
- D. *Objected Rabina, “There is the case of Doeg [named for Doeg of 1Sa. 21: 8] b. Joseph, whose father [died and] left him to his mother when he was a young child. Every day his mother would take his measure by handbreadths and contribute to the house of the sanctuary his weight in gold. When he grew up, the enemy slaughtered him and ate him, and concerning him, Jeremiah laments, ‘Shall the women eat their fruit, their children that are dandled in the hands’ (Lam. 2:20), to which the Holy Spirit replied, ‘Shall the priest and prophet be slain in the sanctuary of the Lord.’”*
- E. *See what happened to him [who was named after the first Doeg]!”*

An Appendix on the Righteous and the Wicked

- V.2.** A. Said R. Eleazar, “A righteous man is remembered on his own account, but a wicked one, on account of his buddies.
- B. “A righteous man is remembered on his own account: for it is written, ‘The memory of the just is blessed.’
- C. “but a wicked one, on account of his buddies: for it is written, ‘But the name of the wicked shall rot.’”
- V.3.** A. *Said Rabina to one of the rabbis who set forth narrative traditions in his presence, “What is the source of this statement that rabbis say, ‘The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing?’”*
- B. *He said to him, “Lo, it is written as a verse of Scripture, “The memory of the just is blessed’ (Pro. 10: 7).”*
- C. *“How do we know that same teaching out of the resources of the Torah?”*

- D. “‘Shall I hide from Abraham that which I am doing’ (Gen. 18:17), followed by, ‘Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation’ (Gen. 18:18).”
- E. *“And what is the source of this statement that rabbis say, ‘But the name of the wicked shall rot’?”*
- F. *He said to him, “Lo, it is written as a verse of Scripture, ‘But the name of the wicked shall rot.’”*
- G. *“How do we know that same teaching out of the resources of the Torah?”*
- H. “‘And he moved his tent as far as Sodom’ (Gen. 13:12), ‘Now the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners against the Lord exceedingly’ (Gen. 13:13).”

- V.4.** A. Said R. Eleazar, “There was a righteous man who lived between two wicked men and did not learn from their example, and a wicked man who lived between two righteous men and did not learn from their example.
- B. “...a righteous man who lived between two wicked men and did not learn from their example: this is Obadiah.
- C. “...a wicked man who lived between two righteous men and did not learn from their example: this was Esau.”

- V.5.** A. And said R. Eleazar, “Out of the blessing that a righteous man gives you can infer the curse for the wicked, and from the curse that a wicked man gives you may infer the blessing for the righteous.
- B. “Out of the blessing that a righteous man gives you can infer the curse for the wicked: For I have known him to the end that he may command’ (Gen. 18:19), and then, ‘And the Lord said, Verily the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great’ (Gen. 13:15).
- C. “‘... and from the curse that a wicked man gives you may infer the blessing for the righteous: Now the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners against the Lord exceedingly’ (Gen. 13:20), ‘And the Lord said to Abram, after Lot was separated from him...all the land that you see, to you will I give it’ (Gen. 13:15).”

- V.6.** A. And said R. Eleazar, “Even on account of a single righteous man is the world created, ‘And God saw the light that it was for one who is good’ (Gen. 1: 4), and good refers only to the righteous, ‘Say you of the righteous that he is the good one’ (Isa. 3:10).”

- V.7.** A. And said R. Eleazar, “Whoever forgets a single matter of what he has learned brings about exile for his children: ‘Seeing that you have forgotten the Torah of your God, I also will forget your children’ (Hos. 4: 6).”
- B. R. Abbahu said, “They bring him down from his greatness: ‘Because you have rejected knowledge, I also will reject you, that you shall be no priest to me’ (Hos. 4: 6).”

- V.8.** A. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “A righteous man does not take his leave from the world before another righteous man like him is created: ‘The sun rises, and the sun goes down’ (Qoh. 1: 5).
- B. “Before Eli’s sun set, Samuel of Ramah’s sun shone: ‘and the lamp of God was not yet gone out, and Samuel was laid down’ (1Sa. 3: 3).”

- V.9.** A. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “The Holy One, blessed be he, saw that the righteous are few. He went and planted some of them in every generation: ‘For the pillars of the earth are the Lord’s, and he has set the world upon them’ (1Sa. 2: 8).”
- V.10.** A. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “Even for the sake of a single righteous man the world endures: ‘The righteous man is the foundation of the world’ (Pro. 10:25).”
- B. *R. Hiyya in his own derives the same from the following:* “‘He will keep the feet of his holy ones’ (1Sa. 2: 8).”
- C. But “Holy ones” *means many*.
- D. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “The letters that are used, however, speak only of the singular, ‘his holy one.’”
- V.11.** A. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “When a man has lived out the better part of his years and has not sin, he will not likely sin again: “‘He will keep the feet of his holy ones’ (1Sa. 2: 8).”
- B. A member of the household of R. Shila said, “If the occasion to transgress came to hand once, or twice, and one does not sin, he is not likely to sin ever: “‘He will keep the feet of his holy ones’ (1Sa. 2: 8).”
- V.12.** A. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “What is the meaning of the verse, ‘If it concerns the scorners he scorns them but to the humble he gives grace’ (Pro. 3:34)? If someone comes to make himself unclean, they open the way to him, but if he comes to purify himself, they assist him.”
- B. *A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael*, “It may be compared to the case of someone who sells naphtha and balm. **[39A]** If someone comes to buy a measure of naphtha, he says to him, ‘Measure it for yourself.’ But if someone comes to buy a measure of balm, he says to him, ‘Wait for me, so that I may make the measure with you, so that both I and you may benefit from the fragrance of the balm.’”
- V.13.** A. *A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael*, “Transgression dulls the heart of man: ‘Neither shall you make yourselves unclean with them, that you should be made unclean thereby’ (Lev. 11:43). Do not read the letters for ‘that you should be made unclean’ in that way but as though they bore vowels to yield, ‘that you should become dull-hearted’ [Jung].”
- V.14.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. “‘Neither shall you make yourselves unclean with them, that you should be made unclean thereby’ (Lev. 11:43) — if a person makes himself a bit unclean, he is made very unclean; if he makes himself unclean below, he is made unclean above; if he makes himself unclean in this world, he is made unclean in the world to come.

V.15. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “Sanctify yourselves therefore and be you holy.” (Lev. 16:44) — if someone sanctifies himself a bit, he is made abundantly sanctified, if he does it below, he is sanctified above, if he does it in this world, he is made sanctified in the world to come.

The complements to the Mishnah-statements out of Tannaite formulations provide the bulk of our Talmud, with a large topical appendix at the end.