

## II

---

# BAVLI TRACTATE YOMA CHAPTER TWO

## FOLIOS 22A-28A

2:1-2

2:1

- A. At first whoever wants to take up the ashes from the altar does so.
- B. And when they are many [who wanted to do so], they run up the ramp.
- C. And whoever gets there before his fellow, within four cubits of the altar, won the privilege.
- D. And if the two came at the same time, the one in charge says to them, “Choose up [by raising a finger].”
- E. And what do they put forth?
- F. One or two.
- G. But they did not put out the thumb in the Temple.

2:2

- A. M'SH S: There were two who got there at the same time, running up the ramp.
- B. And one shoved his fellow.
- C. And he [the other] fell and broke his foot.
- D. When the court saw that the matter was dangerous, they ordained that the right of clearing off the ashes from the altar should be apportioned only by lot.
- E. There were four lots, and this was the first of the four

- I.1. A. [At first whoever wants to take up the ashes from the altar does so:] *But lo, how come to begin with our rabbis did not ordain drawing by lot?*
- B. *They had the theory that, since it is a rite that is performed by night, it would not be so highly esteemed, so many priests would not come to perform it. But when they realized that a great many did show up and turned out to endanger themselves, they ordained the drawing by lots.*

- C. *But what about the burning on the altar of limbs and pieces of fat. That too is a rite that is performed by night, and yet our rabbis ordained a lot to distribute those tasks.*
- D. *It represents the completion of the rite that is performed by day.*
- E. *But taking up the ashes from the altar also represents the beginning of the rite that is performed by day, for* said R. Yohanan, *"If the priest has sanctified his hands and feet in connection with removing the ashes from the altar [before dawn], he does not have to sanctify them again on the next day [after dawn], because he has already done so at the beginning of his act of service."*
- F. *Say: "...because to begin with he has sanctified his hands for the rite."*

**I.2.** A. *Some say, "To begin with [sages] thought that, since many of them will be fast asleep, they will not come for the rite. But when they realized that a great many did show up and turned out to endanger themselves, they ordained the drawing by lots."*

- B. *But what about the burning on the altar of limbs and pieces of fat. That too requires priests to overcome the bonds of sleep, and yet our rabbis ordained a lot to distribute those tasks.*
- C. *There is a difference between going to sleep [after the rite] and getting up from a deep sleep [which is harder].*

**I.3.** A. *But as to the ordinance of the lot, is this the operative consideration? Surely it was made for a different operative consideration altogether, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. *He who got the privilege of clearing the altar of ashes also got the privilege of ordering the wood pile on the altar and of the two pieces of wood on top of the altar [and this was a prestigious rite].*
- C. *Said R. Ashi, "There were two distinct ordinances. To begin with, people supposed that large numbers of priests would not come for the rite. When they saw that they did come but also came into danger, they ordained the lottery. When they ordained the lottery, they saw that the priests did not come in any numbers. They said, "Who can tell whether or not the lot will come to me," and sages therefore ordained that whoever got the task of clearing the ashes from the altar also would enjoy the privilege of arranging the wood piles and the two pieces of wood, so that people would come and participate in the lottery."*

**II.1** A. **And when they are many [who wanted to do so], they run up the ramp. And whoever gets there before his fellow, within four cubits of the altar, won the privilege:**

- B. *Said R. Pappa, "It is obvious to me that the language, **within four cubits of the altar**, does not refer to the four cubits on the floor, since we have learned in the Mishnah, **they run up the ramp**. But it also does not refer to the first four cubits at the foot of the ramp, since we have learned in the Mishnah, **they run up the ramp**. And then: **And whoever gets there before his fellow, within four cubits of the altar**. Nor can the reference be to the four cubits in the middle, since that is not clearly defined. So it is obvious that reference is made to four cubits off the altar."*

- C. *But, asked R. Pappa, “As to the four cubits to which they have made reference, does that include the one cubit of the projecting base and the one cubit of the gallery around the altar [Jung: so that the real distance in a straight line from the main structure of the altar would be six cubits]? [22B] Or perhaps that excludes the one cubit of the projecting base and the one cubit of the gallery around the altar?”*
- D. *The question stands.*
- III.1** A. **And if the two came at the same time, the one in charge says to them, “Choose up [by raising a finger]:”**
- B. *A Tannaite statement:*
- C. *“Put forth your fingers for the count.”*
- D. *But let him count them by heads?*
- E. *The fact before us supports the view of R. Isaac, for said R. Isaac, “It is forbidden to count out Israelites by number, even for the purpose of carrying out a religious duty. For it is written, ‘And he numbered them with pebbles [bezeq]’ (1Sa. 11: 8).”*
- F. *Objected R. Ashi, “On what basis do you insist that the language, ‘with pebbles’ refers to something that is broken, maybe it is a place name, in line with the usage, ‘And they found Adoni-Bezeq in Bezeq’ (Jud. 1: 5)?”*
- G. *Rather, proof for the stated proposition derives from the following verse” “And Saul summoned the people and numbered them with sheep” (1Sa. 15: 4).”*
- H. *Said R. Eleazar, “Whoever counts out Israelites violates a negative commandment, as it is said, ‘Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured’ (Hos. 2: 1).”*
- I. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “He violates two negative commandments: ‘Which cannot be measured nor numbered.’”*
- J. *Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani, “R. Jonathan contrasted verses of Scripture in the following way: ‘It is written, “Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea” (Hos. 2: 1), and it is written, “Which cannot be numbered” (Hos. 2: 1). How so? There is in fact no conflict. The one speaks of the time at which Israel carries out the will of the Omnipresent, the other speaks of a time in which they do not carry out the will of the Omnipresent.”*
- K. *Rab said in the name of Abba Yosé b. Dosetai, “There is no conflict. The one speaks of counting them by mortal man, the other, counting them by Heaven.”*

### **A Topical Appendix on Saul**

The prior reference to Saul accounts for the insertion of the following topical appendix.

- III.2.** A. **Said R. Nehilai bar Idi said Samuel, “When a man is appointed as governor over the community, he gets rich. [Take the case of Saul, for instance.] To begin with it is written, ‘And he counted them with pebbles’ (1Sa. 11: 8), but in the end, ‘And he counted them by means of sheep’ (1Sa. 15: 4).”**
- B. *But maybe the sheep were theirs, not his?*
- C. *If so, what’s the big deal?*

### III.3. A. “And he strove in the valley” (1Sa. 15: 5)]:

- B. Said R. Mani, “This had to do with what went on in the valley.” [Jung: Saul was striving because of what happens in the valley, he argued from that ceremony against the slaying of the Amalekites.]
- C. When the Holy One, blessed be he, said to Saul, “Now go and smite Amalek,” (1Sa. 15: 3), he said to him, “he said to him, “Now if in the case of a single individual [in the case of a neglected corpse], the Torah has said, ‘Present the heifer whose neck is to be broken [to expiate the sin of homicide that would otherwise go unpunished], for all of these souls of Amalek, how much the more so! And if human beings have sinned, well, what sin have the cows committed? And if adults have sinned, well, what sin have the children committed?’
- D. An echo came forth and said, “‘Do not be excessive in righteousness’ (Qoh. 7:16).”
- E. And when Saul said to Doeg, “‘Turn and fall upon the priests’ (1Sa. 22:18),” the echo came forth and said, “‘Do not be excessive in wickedness either’ (Qoh. 7:17).”

### III.4. A. Said R. Huna, “How little does a man whose Master sustains him have to grieve or trouble himself! Saul sinned only once, but it yielded weighty consequences, while David sinned twice, and it did not yield weighty consequences.”

- B. Saul sinned only once: *what was it?*
- C. It was in the matter involving Agag.
- D. But there also was the case of Nob, city of the priests!
- E. Concerning the case of Agag, it is written, “It repents me that I appointed Saul to be king” (1Sa. 15:11).
- F. David sinned twice: *what were they?*
- G. *They were in the matters of Uriah and of his being enticed to count the people* [2Sa. 11: 2-27, 2Sa. 24: 1].
- H. *But lo, there was the matter of Bath Sheba!*
- I. *For that matter he was in fact punished, for it is written, “And he shall restore the lamb fourfold” (2Sa. 12: 6) — the child, Amnon, Tamar and Absalom [whom he buried].*
- J. *But for the other matter he also was punished:* “So the Lord sent a pestilence upon Israel from the morning even to the appointed time” (2Sa. 24:15).
- K. *There he personally was not singled out for punishment.*
- L. *Well, in those other cases too, he personally was not singled out for punishment [since others died]!*
- M. *Now really! He was in fact punished personally, for said R. Judah said Rab, “‘For six months David was afflicted with the skin ailment and the Presence of God left him, and the sanhedrin abandoned him.*
- N. “He was afflicted with *the skin ailment*, as it is written, ‘Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean, wash me and I shall be whiter than snow. (Psa. 51: 9).

- O. "The Presence of God left him, as it is written, 'Restore to me the joy of your salvation and uphold me with your free spirit' (Psa. 51:14).
- P. "The sanhedrin abandoned him, as it is written, 'Let those who fear you turn to me and those who have known your testimonies' (Psa. 119:79)."
- Q. But lo, said Rab, "David listened to gossip [and that was a further sin]!"
- R. *The fact accords with Samuel, who said, "David did not listen to gossip."*
- S. *And from the perspective of Rab, who has said, "David did listen to gossip," wasn't he punished on that account anyhow? For* said R. Judah said Rab, "When David said to Mephibosheth, 'I say, you and Ziba divide the land' (2Sa. 19:30), an echo came forth and said to him, 'Rehoboam and Jeroboam will divide the monarchy.'"

**III.5.** A. "Saul was a year old when he began to reign" (1Sa. 13: 1):

- B. Said R. Huna, "He was in the condition of a one-year-old, in that he had never tasted the taste of sin."
- C. *Objected R. Nahman bar Isaac, "But might one say, he was in the condition of a one-year-old, in that he was filthy with mud and shit?"*
- D. *To R. Nahman was shown in his dream a frightening apparition, so he said, "I apologize to you, bones of Saul son of Qish" Then again he was shown another frightening apparition in a dream, and he said, "I apologize to you, bones of Saul son of Qish, King of Israel."*

**III.6.** A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, "Why did the kingdom of Saul not last? It was because there was not a single flaw in his genealogy."

- B. For said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yehosedeq, "An administrator over community affairs is appointed only if a bag of snakes is suspended from his back, so that, should he turn arrogant, people can say to him, 'So turn around.'"

**III.7.** A. Said R. Judah said Rab, "Why was Saul punished? It was because he forewent the dignity that was owing to him: 'But certain lowlives said, How is this man going to save us? And they despised him and brought him no present, but he was as one that held his peace' (1Sa. 10:27), followed by, 'Then Nahash the Ammonite came up and encamped against Jabesh-gilead' (1Sa. 11: 1)."

- B. And said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yehosedeq, "Any disciple of a sage [23A] who does not exact vengeance and pursue matters like a snake is no disciple of a sage."
- C. But is it not written, "You shall not take vengeance or bear a grudge" (Lev. 19:18)?
- D. *That pertains to monetary matters.*
  - E. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
  - F. **"You shall not take vengeance [or bear any grudge]":**
  - G. **To what extent is the force of vengeance?**
  - H. **If one says to him, "Lend me your sickle," and the other did not do so.**
  - I. **On the next day, the other says to him, "Lend me your spade."**

- J. The one then replies, "I am not going to lend it to, because you didn't lend me your sickle."
- K. In that context, it is said, "You shall not take vengeance."
- L. "...or bear any grudge":
- M. To what extent is the force of a grudge?
- N. If one says to him, "Lend me your spade," but he did not do so.
- O. The next day the other one says to him, "Lend me your sickle,"
- P. and the other replies, "I am not like you, for you didn't lend me your spade [but here, take the sickle]!"
- Q. In that context, it is said, "or bear any grudge" [Sifra CC.iii.4-5].
- S. *But does it not refer to inflicting personal pain? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- T. Of those who are humiliated but don't humiliate others, hear themselves reviled but don't answer, act out of love and accept suffering with joy Scripture says, 'But those who love him are as the sun when he goes forth in his might' (Jud. 5:30)."
- U. *What it means is, he keeps it in his heart [and doesn't actually do anything].*
- V. But has not Raba said, "He who overlooks insult done to him has the insults that he has done overlooked"?
- W. *That speaks of a case in which the other sought reconciliation and he accorded it.*

**IV.1 A. And what do they put forth? One or two. But they did not put out the thumb in the Temple:**

- B. *Well, if they put out two, is there any need to specify that they put out one?*
- C. *Said R. Hisda, No problem, the one speaks of healthy, the other sick people. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. "One do people put out, but two they do not put out. Under what circumstances? In the case of healthy men, but in the case of sick ones, even two do they put out. But truly singular persons put out two fingers, while one counts only one of them."
- E. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. **They do not put out three fingers or the thumb, because of deceivers. And if one put out the third finger, they count it, but if he put out the thumb, they do not count it. And not only so, but he is struck by the officer with the wick [T. Kip. 1:10E-G].**

**IV.2. A. What is the meaning of, "they count it"?**

- B. They count it only as one.
- C. *What is the meaning of "the wick"?*
- D. *Said Rab, "It is a chastising whip."*
- E. *What is "a chastising whip"?*

- F. *Said R. Pappa, "It is a whip such as the Tai-Arabs use, the head-sting of which is removed."*
- G. *Said Abbaye, "In the beginning, I believed that that which we have learned in the Mishnah, **Ben Bibai was in charge of the wick [M. Sheq. 5:1]** meant, in charge of the wicks, in line with that which we have learned in the Mishnah: **Out of the worn-out trousers and belts of the priests they would make wicks and light them [M. Suk. 5:3A].** But now that I have heard that which has been taught on Tannaite authority, **And not only so, but he is struck by the officer with the wick, I grasp that by the word in question, a whip is meant.**"*

**V.1 A. M'SH S:** There were two who got there at the same time, running up the ramp. And one shoved his fellow. And he [the other] fell and broke his foot. When the court saw that the matter was dangerous, they ordained that the right of clearing off the ashes from the altar should be apportioned only by lot:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **There was the case of two priests who got there at the same time, running up the ramp. One shoved the other [M. Yoma 2:2A-B], within four cubits [of the altar]. The other then took out a knife and stabbed him in the heart.**
- B. **R. Sadoq came and stood on the steps of the porch and said, "Hear me, O brethren of the house of Israel! Lo, Scripture says, 'If in the land which the Lord your God gives you to possess, any one is found slain, lying in the open country, and it is not known who killed him, then your elders and your judges shall come forth, and they shall measure the distance to the cities which are around him that is slain' (Deu. 21: 1-2). Come so let us measure to find out for what area it is appropriate to bring the calf, for the sanctuary, or for the courts!"**
- E. **All of them moaned after his speech.**
- F. **And afterward the father of the youngster came to them, finding him while he was still writhing, and said to them, "O brethren of ours! May I be your atonement. His [my] son is still writhing, so the knife has not yet been made unclean."**
- G. **This teaches you that the uncleanness of a knife [affected by corpse uncleanness] is more grievous to Israelites than murder. And so it says, "Moreover Manasseh shed very much innocent blood, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to the other" (2Ki. 21:16) [T. Kip. 1:12A-G].**

- V.2. A.** *Which took place first, the bloodshed or the breaking of the leg? If I should say that it was the bloodshed, then, if sages made no ordinance concerning a lottery by reason of blood shed, will they have done so merely for the breaking of a leg?*
- B. *So the breaking of the leg took place first. But then, if they had ordained a lottery, what is the point of the reference to the four cubits of the altar? [How could the incident have taken place there?]*
  - C. *In point of fact, the bloodshed is what took place first, but to begin with, sages supposed that it was a mere one-time accident. But when they saw that even without accidents, danger threatened, they ordained the lottery.*



**V.3.** A. R. Sadoq came and stood on the steps of the porch and said, “Hear me, O brethren of the house of Israel! Lo, Scripture says, ‘If in the land which the Lord your God gives you to possess, any one is found slain, lying in the open country, and it is not known who killed him, then your elders and your judges shall come forth, and they shall measure the distance to the cities which are around him that is slain’ (Deu. 21: 1-2). Come so let us measure to find out for what area it is appropriate to bring the calf, for the sanctuary, or for the courts!”

- B. *But is Jerusalem subject to the presentation of the heifer on the occasion of the discovery of the neglected corpse? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. There were ten rulings stated with regard to Jerusalem, and this is one of them: **[23B]** Jerusalem does not have to bring a heifer whose neck is to be broken.
- D. And, moreover, “And it is not known who has smitten him” (Deu. 21: 1) — but in this case it is known precisely who hit the boy.
- E. Rather, he said so in order to increase the general lamentations.

**V.4.** A. And afterward the father of the youngster came to them, finding him while he was still writhing, and said to them, “O brethren of ours! May I be your atonement. His [my] son is still writhing, so the knife has not yet been made unclean.” This teaches you that the uncleanness of a knife [affected by corpse uncleanness] is more grievous to Israelites than murder. And so it says, “Moreover Manasseh shed very much innocent blood, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to the other” (2Ki. 21:16):

- B. *The question was raised: is the sense that the bloodshed had become cheap in their eyes, while the matter of the cultic cleanness of utensils retained its original importance, or did bloodshed concern them as it had, but the cultic cleanness of utensils had assumed much greater importance?*
- C. *Come and take note of what the exegetical unfolding of the passage adduces in evidence: “Moreover Manasseh shed very much innocent blood, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to the other.” That proves that bloodshed had become cheap in their eyes, while the matter of the cultic cleanness of utensils retained its original importance.*

**VI.1** A. [Clearing off the ashes from the altar:] *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “And he shall put off his garments and put on other garments and carry forth the ashes” (Lev. 6: 4) —
- C. Might I draw the inference that, just as on the Day of Atonement, he takes off the consecrated garments and puts on the secular garments, [the high priest changes clothing at every different act of service], [so he should do the same on this occasion as well]?
- D. Scripture states, “And he shall put off his garments and put on other garments,” treating as comparable the clothing he puts on and the clothing that he takes off. Just as the former is consecrated, so the latter is consecrated.
- E. If so, what is the point of Scripture’s saying, “other”?
- F. They are garments that are inferior to the other garments.



- G. R. Eliezer says, “...other..., and he will carry forth’ bear the message: priests that are blemished have the right to carry forth the ashes.”

**VI.2.** A. The master has said, If so, what is the point of Scripture’s saying, “other”? They are garments that are inferior to the other garments:

- B. *That is in line with the Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael, for a Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [stated], “In the garments in which one has cooked for one’s master he should not mix the cup of wine for his master.”*

**VI.3.** A. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “As is the dispute concerning carrying forth the ashes, so there is a dispute about clearing them off the altar.” [May blemished priests remove the ashes; if we regard the removal of the ashes as part of the service, they may not, if we do not, then they may (Jung)].

- B. And R. Yohanan said, “There is a dispute as to removing the ashes, but as to clearing them off the altar, all parties concur that this is a part of the service [and blemished priests may not participate; the priests put on four garments and the blemished ones may not do so].”

C. *What is operative consideration behind the position of R. Simeon b. Laqish?*

- D. *He will say to you, If you should imagine that clearing the ashes off the altar is regarded as part of the regular service, then you would have an act of service that may be legitimately performed in two garments.” [Jung: “He shall put on his linen garments and his linen breeches shall he put upon his flesh” (Lev. 6: 3). If the removal of the ashes were a service, how could Scripture demand only the linen garment and the linen breeches, two garments, when a service requires four? Since only two garments are required, the removal of the ashes is not considered an act of service and therefore may be performed by blemished priests.]*

E. And R. Yohanan?

- F. *The All-Merciful has set forth the rule governing the tunic and breeches, but in fact it means to encompass also wearing the miter and girdle. And why are these two items singled out and the others not? “Linen garments” is written here to indicate the proper measure [fitting the priest who wears it], and linen breeches are mentioned to set forth the lesson that has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

G. How on the basis of Scripture do we know that nothing is to be put on prior to the trousers?

H. “And he shall have the linen breeches upon his flesh” (Lev. 6: 3).

I. And R. Simeon b. Laqish?

- J. *He derives the rule that the garment has to fit properly from the fact that the All-Merciful has used the word “garment”, and that nothing may be put on before the breeches he infers from the words, “on his flesh.”*

**VI.4.** A. *May we say that the following Tannaite dispute concerns the same principle as is at stake in the foregoing?*

B. “...upon his flesh’ (Lev. 6: 3):

- C. “Why does Scripture say, ‘he shall put on’? That encompasses the requirement of wearing the miter and girdle when the priest clears the ashes from the altar,” the words of R. Judah.

- D. R. Dosa says, "It serves to encompass the four white garments that are worn by the high priest on the Day of Atonement, indicating that they may be worn by an ordinary priest during the rest of the year."
- E. Said Rabbi, "There are two replies to be made. First, the girdle of the high priest is not the same as the girdle of the ordinary priest; and second, is it conceivable that garments that are used on an occasion of the most weighty sanctification should be used on occasions of less sanctification?"
- F. "Rather: Why does Scripture say, 'he shall put on'? [24A] That serves to encompass worn-out garments."
- G. "And shall leave them there" (Lev. 16:23) — this teaches that they have to be hidden away [to protect them from reuse or use for a rite of lesser sanctification].
- J. R. Dosa says, "They may be used by an ordinary priest. And why does Scripture say, 'And shall leave them there'? It is so that they should not be used for another Day of Atonement."
- K. *Now is this not what is subject to dispute between these Tannaite authorities: the one authority maintains that removing the ashes is a valid act of service, and the other authority holds that it is not a valid act of service?*
- L. *Not at all, all parties concur that it is a valid act of service, but this is what is subject to dispute between them: one authority maintains that another verse of Scripture is required to make it explicit that four garments are required for the rite, and the other authority takes the view that another verse of Scripture is not required for that purpose.*

**VI.5.** A. R. Abin raised the question: "As to removing the ashes from the altar, how much is to be removed? *[In order to answer the question,] do we draw an analogy from the rule governing taking off the tithe, or from what was removed from the spoil of Midian?*"

- B. *Come and take note of that which R. Hiyya taught on Tannaite authority:* "Here we find the word 'herim' [he shall take up] and the same expression is used there [at Lev.. 6:3, 6:8]. Just as in the latter case, a handful is meant, so in the former case, use of the word refers to taking up a handful. {

**VI.6.** A. Said Rab, "As to four acts of service, if a non-priest performs them, he is liable to the death penalty: [there are] sprinkling the blood, smoking the fat, pouring out the water libation and pouring out the wine libation."

- B. Levi says, "Also removing the ashes.
- C. *And so did Levi present a Tannaite formulation of the matter:* "Also removing the ashes."
- D. *What is the Scriptural basis for the position of Rab?*
- E. It is written, "And you and your sons with you shall keep the priesthood in everything that pertains to the altar and to that within the veil, and you shall serve; I give you the priesthood as a service of gift, and the common man that draws near shall be put together" (Num. 18: 7):
- F. "...as a service of gift:" not the service of removing [the ashes].

- G. “and you shall serve.” this refers to a completed act of service, and not one that is followed by yet another act of service.
- H. *And what about the view of Levi?*
- I. *[By using inclusive language, “everything that pertains”], the All-Merciful has encompassed within the law every matter having to do with the altar.*
- J. *And Rab?*
- K. *That serves to encompass the seven sprinklings of blood that are performed on the inner altar [Lev. 4: 6] and the rites of purification for the person afflicted with the skin ailment.*
- L. *And Levi?*
- K. *He derives that lesson from the formulation “everything” while “the thing” would have served equally well.*
- L. *And Rab?*
- M. *He derives no lesson from the formulation “everything” in place of “the thing.”*
- N. *But why not interpret the matter in this way: “everything that pertains to the altar” constitutes an encompassing generalization; then the phrase, “as a service of gift” forms a limitation articulation of what is subject to the generalization, and it must follow that nothing is covered by the encompassing generalization except what is articulated in the specific statement of the detail. It follows, “as a service of gift” falls under the law, but removing the ashes does not.*
- O. But Scripture’s **[24B]** phrase, “and to that within the veil, and you shall serve” then should be taken into account [separating the encompassing generalization from the following articulated specific detail].
- P. *It follows, only within the veil is “the service of gift” covered, but not the service of removing the ashes; outside the Temple veil, by contrast, even a service of removal would then be covered by the admonition at hand.*
- Q. *If that were the sense of matters, then “you shall service” would yield, only within the veil is a complete service covered by the law, but one service followed by another service would not be included within the law; and then, outside of the veil, even one service followed by another act of service would be covered by the law.*
- R. *When Scripture said, “And you shall serve,” Scripture has once more formed a union of the clauses that are under discussion [the encompassing generalization, the particularization].*
- S. *Raba raised the question, “What is the law concerning the act of service of removing the ashes that is performed in the Temple proper [the ashes of the golden altar and the candlestick]? Do we invoke the analogy provided by the rite of removal of the ashes within the veil or we do form our governing analogy on the basis of the law that governs outside? [Jung: according to Rab there is no difference between service within the veil or outside; a common man becomes guilty of death only if he performs a service of gift, not of removal; but according to Levi, he becomes guilty also in case of a service of removal; hence Raba’s question addresses itself to Levi: do we compare it to the service within the veil, so that the common man performing it would not incur penalty or death, or to service without, when he would incur it?]*

- T. *He then went and solved the problem: "The governing analogy derives from an act of service done within the veil, for Scripture did not say merely 'within' but 'and to that within the veil'" [extending the rule to the Temple, so in the case of a gift service, the common person would incur the penalty there too, and with a removal service he would be exempt, as he would be if he did it within the veil (Jung)].*
- U. *Well, then, what about the following proposition: a non-priest who laid out the showbread on the table should be guilty?*
- V. *There is the arrangement of the censer of frankincense [a service of gift].*
- W. *Then for arranging the censer of frankincense he should incur guilt.*
- X. *There is the removal of the ashes and that is following by smoking the incense.*
- Y. *Let a non-priest who put the candlestick in order incur guilt.*
- Z. *That is followed by putting in the wick.*
- AA. *If he put in the wick, let him incur guilt.*
- BB. *There is the putting in of the oil.*
- CC. *If he put in the oil, let him incur guilt.*
- DD. *There is the lighting of the light.*
- EE. *If he lit the light, let him incur guilt.*
- FF. *Lighting is not regarded as an act of service.*
- GG. *Well, now, is it the fact that lighting is not regarded as an act of service? But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- HH. *"And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire on the altar and lay wood in order upon the fire" (Lev. 1: 7) — This teaches in regard to the kindling of the wood of the fig tree that it must be performed only by a priest who is fit for service and wearing the garments of priestly service.*
- II. *True enough, kindling the fig wood is an act of service, but lighting the candlestick is not.*
- JJ. *Well, then, let a non-priest who arranged the wood on the wood pile incur guilt!*
- KK. *There is still the arrangement of the two logs of wood.*
- LL. *Well, if he arranged the two laws of wood, let him incur guilt.*
- MM. *That is followed by the arranging of the limbs on the fire.*
- NN. *But lo, said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, "A non-priest who arranged the two logs of wood is liable to the death penalty"!*
- OO. *There is a dispute as to the following matter: the one authority maintains that arranging the two logs of wood is a complete act of service in itself, the other takes the position that it is not.*
- VI.7.** A. *There is a Tannaite formulation of matters that accords with the view of Rab, and there is a Tannaite formulation of matters that accords with the view of Levi.*
- B. *There is a Tannaite formulation of matters that accords with the view of Rab: The acts of service on account of the performing of which a non-priest incurs the death penalty are these: tossing the blood, whether within the Temple or within the holy of holies; sprinkling the blood of a bird in the case of one presented as a sin*

offering, wringing out the blood and smoking the bird in the case of one presented as a burnt offering, making a libation of three logs of water or of wine.

- C. *And there is a Tannaite formulation of matters that accords with the view of Levi:*
- D. The acts of service on account of the performing of which a non-priest incurs the death penalty are these: He who removes the ashes, the seven sprinklings within the Holy of Holies, and he who offers up on the altar a sacrifice, whether it is fit or unfit.

**VII.1 A. There were four lots, and this was the first of the four:**

- B. Why do they draw lots?
- C. Why do they draw lots? *It is as we have explained.* Rather, the right question is: why do they draw lots and then go and draw lots again?
- D. Said R. Yohanan, "It is so that the entire Temple court will be enthused with the process: 'We took sweet counsel together, in the house of God we walked with enthusiasm' (Psa. 55:15)."

**VII.2. A. When they draw lots, what garments do they wear?**

- B. R. Nahman said, "They wear secular garments."
- C. R. Sheshet said, "They wear consecrated garments."
- D. R. Nahman said, "They wear secular garments" — *for if you maintain that they wore consecrated garments, there are the strong-arm priests who grab for themselves the right to perform the rites [and if they were wearing the proper garments, they could do so unimpeded].*
- E. R. Sheshet said, "They wear consecrated garments" — *for if you maintain that they were secular garments, out of sheer adoration of the rite, they would leap to perform the rite wearing secular clothing.*
- F. Said R. Nahman, "On what basis do I take the position that I do? *It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority: They handed them [who had no assignment] to the ministers. They did remove their clothing from them. And they left them only their underpants alone. And there were wall niches there, on which were written [the names] of the various pieces of clothing [M. Tam. 5:3A-C]. [25A] Does this not mean, those who had attained the merit of participating by means of the lottery?* [These then were stripped of their secular clothes, which proves that the lottery was done by priests wearing unconsecrated garments.]
- G. Said R. Huna bar Judah said R. Sheshet, "No, this refers to those who had not participated in the lottery, and that stands to reason. For if you should maintain that it refers to those who had acquired the right to participate through the lottery, then would it make sense to say, **And they left them only their underpants alone?** And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:
- H. How do we know that nothing should come before the breeches?
- I. As it is said, "He shall put on the holy linen tunic, and the linen breeches shall be upon his flesh" (Lev. 16: 4).
- J. *And the other party?*

- K. *That is no problem, for this is the sense of the statement: while they had on the unconsecrated clothing, they put on the holy trousers, and then they removed the secular clothing and left them with the trousers.*
- L. *Said R. Sheshet, "On what basis do I take the position that I do? It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority: **The Hewn-Stone Chamber was built like a large basilica. The lottery took place on the eastern side, with the elder setting at the west and the priests standing around in a circle in the form of a spiral figure. The supervisor comes and takes the miter of one of them. And then they know that from him the lot begins. [They did not put forth two by two, but one by one. And individuals among them put out two by two But they did not count the extra [cf. T. Yoma 1:10].** Now, if it should enter your mind that they were clothed in secular garments, is a miter classified as a secular garment?"*
- M. *Well, as a matter of fact, it is! For it has been taught on Tannaite authority by R. Judah, and some say, by R. Samuel bar Judah, "A priest whose mother made for him a tunic might officiate wearing that at a private service, but not at one performed for the community."*
- N. *Said Abbaye, "That statement yields the inference, the hewn stone chamber was half in the consecrated area, half in the secular area; and it yields the inference that it had two doors, one open toward the consecrated area and the other open toward the secular area. For if you should suppose that the whole of it was consecrated, could it be said **with the elder setting at the west?** And did not a master say, 'Sitting down is not done in the courtyard except by the kings of the House of David alone'? Now, if it should enter your mind that the whole of it was unconsecrated, how could the lottery be done in the eastern side? And lo, we require fulfillment of the verse, 'We took sweet counsel together, in the house of God we walked with enthusiasm' (Psa. 55:15), and under those conditions that requirement could not be met. So the required inference is, the hewn stone chamber was half in the consecrated area, half in the secular area; and if it should enter your mind that it had only a single entry, and that was open toward the consecrated area, then how could it be said, **with the elder setting at the west?** And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: **The [Temple] chambers built in the holy [precinct] and open to the unsanctified [area] — their inner space is [deemed to be unsanctified and their roofs are [deemed to be sanctified] [M. M.S. 3:8A-C].** Now if it should enter your mind that it opened onto unconsecrated ground, how could the lottery take place in the eastern part of the chamber, for have we not learned in the Mishnah, **The [Temple] chambers built in the holy [precinct] and open to the unsanctified [area] — their inner space is [deemed to be unsanctified?** So does that not yield the inference that there were two gates, one open to the consecrated side, the other to the unconsecrated side?"*

I:1-3 variously explain the rule of the Mishnah. II:1, III:1 clarify details of the Mishnah's statement. III:2-7 form a topical appendix. I do not detect that the composite has any bearing upon the presentation of our Mishnah-tractate and the allegations that are before us. The remainder of the Talmud constitutes a



systematic reading and amplification of the Mishnah's statements, with some secondary theoretical questions precipitated by those statements.

## 2:3

- A. The second lot: (1) Who slaughters the animal, (2) who tosses the blood, (3) who clears the ashes off the inner altar, (4) who clears the ashes off the candelabrum, and who brings the limbs up the ramp;
  - B. (5) the head, (6) right hind leg, (7) two forelegs, (8) rump, (9) left hind leg, (10) breast, (11) neck, (12) two flanks, and (13) innards;
  - C. the fine flour, the Baked Cakes (Lev. 6:21), and the wine.
  - D. Thirteen priests acquired the right to participate in the service.
  - E. Said Ben Azzai before R. Aqiba in the name of R. Joshua, "In the way in which it walked it was offered."
- I.1.** A. *The question was raised:* When they draw the lottery, is it for a single act of service or perhaps it is for all of the acts of service that they take the lottery?
- B. *Come and take note: There were four lots. But if you maintain that they took a lot for each act of service, surely there were a great many more!*
  - C. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "This is the sense of that statement: Four times do they go in for the lottery, and on each occasion there were many lotteries."*
  - D. **[25B]** *Come and take note of the following: . Judah says, "They did not cast lots for the privilege of carrying the fire pan. But whoever won the right to care for the incense-offering says to the one who is with him, 'You too — for the fire pan'" [T. Kip. 1:11A-B]. [So not every act of service was subject to the lottery.]*
  - E. *That case involving the fire pan and the burning of the incense is exceptional, for these represent a single act of service. But all of the other acts of service do require singular lotteries, one for each act.*
  - F. *[Not at all!] In the case of the fire pan it is necessary to indicate that no singular lottery is called for, since one might have imagined that, because it is done only uncommonly and it brings riches, a lottery for it should be arranged on its own, and so we are informed that that is not the case.*
  - G. *Come and take note of that which R. Hiyya set forth as a Tannaite ruling: Not for each and every act of service do they arrange a lottery, but the priest who acquired the merit of offering the daily whole offering — twelve of his brothers, the priests, come along with him.*
  - H. *Well, then, that settles the question.*
- II.1.** A. The second lot: (1) Who slaughters the animal, (2) who tosses the blood, (3) who clears the ashes off the inner altar, (4) who clears the ashes off the candelabrum, and who brings the limbs up the ramp; (5) the head, (6) right hind leg, (7) two forelegs, (8) rump, (9) left hind leg, (10) breast, (11) neck, (12) two flanks, and (13) innards; the fine flour, the Baked Cakes (Lev. 6:21), and the wine. Thirteen priests acquired the right to participate in the service:
- B. *The question was raised: who receives the blood [collecting it and sprinkling it on the altar]? Is it the one who slaughters the beast who receives the blood, on the argument that, if you maintain that it is the one who tosses the blood who receives*



*it from the animal's vein, then, out of enthusiasm to get on with the work, he will not receive the entirety of the animal's blood? Or perhaps it is the one who tosses the blood that receives it, on the argument that, if you say the one who slaughters it receives it, then there may be occasions on which the one who slaughters the animal is a non-priest!*

- C. *Come and take note: 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]. [Jung: there were thirteen tasks; the slaughtering may be done by a non-priest; it did not require washing of hands and feet even if performed by a priest; if he who slaughtered also received the blood, he would have to wash his hands as well, because of the receiving of the blood.] Now, if it should enter your mind that the one who slaughters the animal is the one that tosses the blood, then there would have to be thirteen spouts! So does that not prove that the one who tosses the blood is the one who receives it?*
- D. *Yes, that settles the question.*
- E. *Said R. Aha b. Raba to R. Ashi, "So too we also have learned on Tannaite authority: The slaughterer slaughtered. The one who receives the blood received the blood [M. Tam. 4:1H-A]."*
- F. *That proves it.*

### **III.1 A. Said Ben Azzai before R. Aqiba in the name of R. Joshua, "In the way in which it walked it was offered:"**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *What is the definition of "the way in which it walked"? The head, right hind-leg, breast, neck, two fore-legs, two flanks, tail and left hind-leg.*
- D. *R. Yosé says, "It was offered in the order in which it was flayed. What is the definition of 'the way in which it was flayed'? The head, right hind-leg, tail, left hind-leg, two flanks, two fore-legs, breast, and neck."*
- E. *R. Aqiba says, "It was offered in the order in which it was cut up. What is the definition of 'the way in which it was cut up'? The head, right hind-leg, two fore-legs, breast, neck, two flanks, tail, and left hind-leg."*
- F. *R. Yosé the Galilean says, "It was offered up in the sequence of the best parts. What is 'the sequence of its best parts'? The head, right hind-leg, breast, neck, two flanks, tail, left hind-leg, and two forelegs."*
- G. *But doesn't Scripture say, "Even every good piece, specifically, the thigh and the shoulder" (Eze. 24: 4) [so why are they mentioned at the end]?*
- H. *That refers to a scrawny beast.*
- I. *Said Raba, "Both the Tannaite authority behind our Mishnah-statement and R. Yosé the Galilean follow the criterion of the excellence of the meat. The one master takes into consideration the side of the limbs, the other master, the fatness thereof."*

### **III.2. A. How come the head goes together with the right hind-leg?**

- B. *It is because, in the head, there are many bones, one of which attaches the hind-leg to it.*

**III.3.** A. *All concur that the head is offered up first. How on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?*

- B. *It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *How on the basis of Scripture do we know that the head and suet come before all other parts of the beast?*
- D. *Scripture states, “He shall lay it in order with its head and its suet” (Lev. 1:12).*
- E. *And as to the other reference to suet, Lev. 1: 8, [26A] what purpose does it serve?*
- F. *It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- G. *How did he do it? He put the suet on the open throat and offered it up, as a mark of respect to Heaven [covering over some of the excess blood on the throat].*

I:1 asks a general question, not connected to the exegesis of a specific clause of the Mishnah-paragraph. II:1 and III:1ff. provide Mishnah-commentary, with secondary expansion.

## 2:4

**A. The third lot: “Those who are new to the burning of the incense, come and draw lots.”**

**B. The fourth: “Those who are new and those who are experienced — who will bring up the limbs from the ramp to the altar itself?”**

**I.1. A. [The third lot: “Those who are new to the burning of the incense, come and draw lots:”]**

- B. *A Tannaite statement:*
- C. *Never did anyone get to repeat the burning of the incense.*
- D. *How come?*
- E. *Said R. Hanina, “Because doing so enriches the one who does it.”*
- F. *Said R. Pappa to Abbaye, “On the basis of what verse of Scripture? Should I say, ‘They shall put incense before you’ (Deu. 33:10), followed by, ‘Bless, Lord, his substance’ (Deu. 33:11)? If so, the same should be the case for the burnt offering, since it is written, ‘And whole burnt offering upon your altar’ (Deu. 33:10).”*
- G. *He said to him, “The one comes frequently, the other not.”*

**I.2. A. Said Raba, “You will never find a neophyte rabbi who gives a concrete decision on law unless he derives from either the tribe of Levi or the tribe of Issachar. In the case of Levi it is written, ‘They shall teach Jacob your ordinances’ (Deu. 33:10), and Issachar, ‘And of the children of Issachar, men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do’ (1Ch. 12:33).”**

- B. *Say Judah too, since it is written, “Judah is my law giver” (Psa. 60: 7).*
- C. *“I deal only with those who make decisions along the lines of practical law.”*

- I.3.** A. Said R. Yohanan, “They do not draw lots for the daily whole offering presented at twilight, but the priest who had the merit of performing the right at dawn is the one who has the merit of doing so at twilight.”
- B. *An objection was raised:* Just as they draw lots at dawn, so they draw lots at twilight.
- C. *When that Tannaite statement was set forth, it concerned the incense offering.*
- D. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:* Just as they draw lots for it [in the masculine, hence excluding the incense drawing] at dawn, so they draw lots at twilight?
- E. *Use the feminine form.*
- F. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:* Just as they draw lots for it [in the masculine, hence excluding the incense drawing] at dawn, so they draw lots at twilight. Just as they draw lots for it [in the feminine] at dawn, so they draw lots at twilight?
- G. *Said R. Samuel bar R. Isaac, “Here we deal with the rite for the Sabbath, when the priestly watches are changed [requiring an evening lottery].”*
- H. *But working from the original premise that there was a still larger number of lotteries?*
- I. *Everyone showed up in the morning for the lottery; to some the lot fell for the morning rite, to others, for the one at twilight.*

**II.1** A. **The fourth: “Those who are new and those who are experienced — who will bring up the limbs from the ramp to the altar itself?”**

- B. *Our Mishnah-rule does not accord with the position of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for we have learned in the Mishnah: R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “He who brings up the limbs to the ramp [without another lottery] is the one who brings them up onto the altar” [M. Tam. 5:2E].*
- C. *What is at stake between our Mishnah’s rule and the position of R. Eliezer b. Jacob?*
- D. *The one authority cites as the operative guide, “In the multitude of the people is the glory of the king” (Pro. 14:28), while the other maintains that in the place where God’s presence abides, it is not really fitting [to have lots of lotteries].*

**II.2.** A. *Raba said, “R. Eliezer b. Jacob does not concur with the position of R. Judah, and R. Judah does not concur with the position of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for if it were the case that they did, there would be too few lotteries.” [Jung: Judah omits the lottery for the coal pan; Eliezer says there was no lottery for carrying the limbs up to the altar; had each accepted the view of the other, there would be three lotteries, not four; he who holds there were five rejects the position of both authorities, each of whom omits one, but not the same one.] For if that were not the case, there would be too few counts, and if you find a Tannaite authority who registers five lotteries, [26A] he accords with neither R. Eliezer b. Jacob nor R. Judah.*

I:1, II:1-2, all amplify the Mishnah-rule. I:2 is tacked on for reasons internal to the composition, which are obvious.

- A. The daily whole offering was offered by nine, ten, eleven, or twelve [priests], no less, no more.
- B. How so?
- C. It itself was offered by nine [priests].
- D. On the Festival [of Tabernacles], in the hand of one [additional priest] was a flask of water — thus ten.
- E. At dusk, by eleven: it itself by nine, and two, with the two pieces of wood in their hands.
- F. And on the Sabbath, by eleven: it itself by nine, and two priests, with two dishes of frankincense for the Show Bread in their hands.
- G. And on the Sabbath that coincides with the Feast of Tabernacles, in the hand of yet another priest was a flask of water.

- I.1.** A. [And on the Sabbath which coincides with the Feast [of Tabernacles], in the hand of yet another priest was a flask of water:] Said R. Abba, and some say, R. Ammi bar Hama, and some say, R. Yohanan, “On the Festival of Tabernacles, the water libation is offered up only at the time of the morning whole offering. *On what basis is that statement made? It is because the Tannaite formulation states, And on the Sabbath that coincides with the Feast of Tabernacles, in the hand of yet another priest was a flask of water. Now if you should imagine that at the daily whole offering presented at twilight, the water libation also is made, then it would turn out that another such case would emerge on an ordinary day [not only the Sabbath].*” [Twelve priests also would serve on a weekday, not only on the Sabbath.]
- B. Said R. Ashi, “So too we also have framed a Mishnah-statement: To the one who is to pour out the water libation he says, ‘Raise your hands [so we can see what is in them]. **For there was the case of the Boethusian who poured out the water on his feet, and all the people stoned him with their citrons [M. 4:9N-O].**”
- C. *That proves the point.*

- II.1** A. [At dusk, by eleven: it itself by nine, and two, with the two pieces of wood in their hands:] *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. R. Simeon b. Yohai says, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that the daily whole offering presented at twilight requires the presentation of two logs of wood through two priests? As it is said, ‘And the sons of Aaron shall lay wood in order upon the fire’ (Lev. 1: 7). Now if, in context, that statement has no bearing on the daily whole offering presented at dawn, since it is written in that connection, ‘And the priest shall kindle wood on it every morning and he shall lay the burnt offering in order upon it’ (Lev. 6: 5), assign the statement to the context of the daily whole offering that was presented at twilight.”
- C. *Sure, but why not say that both verses pertain to the daily whole offering presented at dawn, so that the statement of the All-Merciful was meant to be, do it and then go and do it again?*
- D. *If that were the intent of the statements before us, Scripture ought to have said, “And the priest shall kindle wood...And the priest shall kindle wood.”*

- E. *But if the All-Merciful had written, "And the priest shall kindle wood...And the priest shall kindle wood," I might have supposed that it may be done by one priest only, not by two, and therefore we are informed that both one priest and two priests shall carry out the rite.*
- F. *If so, the All-Merciful should have said, "And the priest shall kindle wood...And the priests shall kindle wood." Or it might as well have said, "And he shall lay wood in order upon the fire... "And they shall lay wood in order upon the fire..." What is the point of saying, "And the priest shall kindle the wood...And they shall lay wood in order upon the fire..."? The upshot is as we have stated.*
- I.2.** A. *R. Hiyya repeated as a Tannaite statement: "The lottery was taken on occasion to identify assignments for thirteen priests, at times for fourteen, at times for fifteen, and at times for sixteen."*
- B. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: "...seventeen...?"*
- C. *That is formulated not in accord with R. Eliezer b. Jacob but in accord with R. Judah.*
- I:1 and II:1 amplify statements of the Mishnah.

**2:6-7**

**2:6**

- A. **A ram was offered by eleven: the meat by five, the innards, flour, and wine by two each.**

**2:7**

- A. **An ox was offered by twenty-four:**
- B. **the head and the right hind leg — the head by one, and the right hind leg by two;**
- C. **the rump and the left hind leg — the rump by two, and the left hind leg by two;**
- D. **the breast and the neck — the breast by one, and the neck by three;**
- E. **the two forelegs by two;**
- F. **the two flanks by two;**
- G. **the innards, the fine flour, and the wine by three each.**
- H. **Under what circumstances?**
- I. **In the case of public offerings.**
- J. **But in the case of an individual's offering,**
- K. **if [one priest] wanted to offer it up [all by himself], he offered it up.**
- L. **Flaying and cutting up both these and those [offerings] are subject to the same rules.**

- I.1.** A. **[Flaying and cutting up both these and those [offerings] are subject to the same rules:] A Tannaite statement:**
- B. **Cutting them up and flaying them are subject to the same rule for both public and private offerings: both may be done by a non-priest.**
- C. **Said R. Hezekiah, "How on the basis of Scripture do we know that cutting them up and flaying them are subject to the same rule for both public and private**

offerings: both may be done by a non-priest.? As it is said, ‘And the sons of Aaron the high priest shall put fire upon the altar’ (Lev. 1: 7) — *it is specifically putting fire on the altar that requires participation of the priesthood, but cutting up and flaying the offerings do not require the priesthood.*”

- D. **[27A]** *But that verse of Scripture is required solely to make its own point [and yields no inferential point, having been exhausted for its own purpose]!*
- E. *Said R. Shimi bar Ashi, “I came across Abbayye, who was at that moment explaining to his son: ‘One shall kill’ (Lev. 1: 5) — an act of slaughter performed by a non-priest is valid. But what is it that requires the formulation of such an argument [whence the premise that a non-priest might not be able to do so, provoking the necessity of discovering in Scripture the basis for the contrary rule]? Because it is said, ‘And you and your sons with you shall keep your priesthood in everything that pertains to the altar’ (Num. 18: 7). I might therefore infer that that covers even the act of slaughter itself. So Scripture states, ‘One shall kill the bullock before the Lord, and Aaron’s sons the priests, shall present the blood’ (Lev. 1: 5) — from the point of receiving the blood forward in the rite, the religious duty pertains only to the priesthood. ‘And he shall lay his hand...and he shall kill...’ (Lev. 1: 4, 5) — this teaches in reference to an act of slaughter that if it is performed by a non-priest, it is valid.”*
- F. *“Now, since it is an established fact that from the point of receiving the blood forward in the rite, the religious duty pertains only to the priesthood, what need do I have for the clause, ‘And the sons of Aaron shall put the fire...’? That serves to eliminate cutting up and flaying the offering.*
- G. *“Nonetheless, it might be thought to be required. For it might enter your mind to maintain that since this is not an aspect of the rite that is essential for attaining atonement, it should not require the participation of the priesthood at all. So we are informed that it requires the participation of the priesthood.*
- H. *“Rather, we infer the fact from the following: ‘And Aaron’s sons the priests shall lay the pieces in order, the head and the suet’ (Lev. 1: 8). Now, since it is an established fact that from the point of receiving the blood forward in the rite, the religious duty pertains only to the priesthood, what need do I have for the clause, That serves to eliminate cutting up and flaying the offering.*
- I. *“But might one not say that it serves to exclude the arrangement of the two logs of wood?*
- J. *“It stands to reason that the passage excludes an act of service that pertains to the sacrifice itself that falls into the classification that is subject to discussion.*
- K. *“To the contrary, it stands to reason that the passage excludes ‘putting the wood in order,’ which is comparable to ‘laying the pieces in order.’”*
- L. *“Perish the thought! For a master has said, “And the priest shall offer the whole..upon the altar” (Lev. 1: 8). This speaks of bringing the limbs up the ramp. Now it is only the bringing of the limbs up the ramp that requires a priest, but not bringing the logs of wood, and that bears the implication that putting the two logs in order on the altar requires a priest. Then why was it necessary for Scripture to specify, “and the priests shall lay the pieces in order”? It is to exclude flaying and cutting up the offering.’*



- M. *"But say, the verse was necessary to make its own point?"*
- N. *"Rather, what is the purpose of the statement, 'And the priest shall make the whole smoke upon the altar. (Lev. 1: 9)? It is to exclude flaying and cutting up."*
- O. *"'And the priest shall offer the whole..upon the altar' (Lev. 1: 8). This speaks of bringing the limbs up the ramp. Now it is only the bringing of the limbs up the ramp that requires a priest, but not bringing the logs of wood."*
- P. *"That leaves the implication that putting the two logs of wood in order on the altar does not require a priest, and 'they shall put' is required to make its own point, thus 'and they shall lay in order the pieces' proves that there must be two, and 'the sons of Aaron' also indicate that two must be involved, and 'the priests' means two must be involved, in which case, all of them put together, we learn that offering up the lamb requires the involvement of six priests."*

**I.2.** A. Said R. Hamnuna, *"R. Eleazar found difficult the proof at hand, since, after all, the context [of Lev. 1: 8) is defined by the offering of a young bullock, and the rite for the young bullock requires twenty-four priests. But he straightened matters out when he noted that Scripture says, '...upon the wood that is on the fire that is on the altar' (Lev. 1: 8) — and what is that in connection with which 'wood,' 'fire,' and 'altar,' all are mentioned? [27B] You must say, it is the offering of the lamb."*

- I.3.** A. Said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, *"A non-priest who laid out the pile of wood in order on the altar is subject to the death penalty."*
- B. *"What should the priest do to correct the situation? He should break up the pile and order it again."*
  - C. *So what good does that do? Rather: the non-priest should break up the pile, and a priest should go and order it again."*
  - D. *Objected R. Zira, "But can you think of another example of an act of service that is validly done by night and yet invalidly done by non-priest?"*
  - E. *Well, then, is there none? Lo, there is the case of the smoking of the limbs and fat pieces."*
  - F. *But that is simply the completion of a rite of service that has begun by day."*
  - G. *Well, then, there is the case of the taking up of the ashes from the altar."*
  - H. *But that is simply the commencement of a rite of service that takes place by day."*
  - I. *For said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, "If the priest has sanctified his hands and feet in connection with removing the ashes from the altar [before dawn], he does not have to sanctify them again on the next day [after dawn], because he has already done so at the beginning of his act of service."*
  - J. *Then it is a problem [to identify another example of an act of service that is validly done by night and yet invalidly done by non-priest]. Rather, when the statement was made, this is what was said:*
  - K. *Said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, "A non-priest who laid out the two logs of wood in order on the altar is subject to the death penalty, because that is an act of service that takes place by day."*
  - L. *Objected Raba, "Then what about the following possibility: the rite also should require a lottery."*



- M. *But does this constitute a refutation? Lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: He who got the privilege of clearing the altar of ashes also got the privilege of ordering the wood pile on the altar and of the two pieces of wood on top of the altar [and this was a prestigious rite]. That bears the implication, the rites that are performed by day require a lottery, but the rites that are performed by night do not require a lottery.*
- N. *Lo, there is the case of the smoking of the limbs and fat pieces.*
- O. *But that is simply the completion of a rite of service that has begun by day.*
- P. *Well, then, there is the case of the taking up of the ashes from the altar.*
- Q. *The lottery for that act of service is because of a specific case that took place.*
- S. *Is that then to suggest that in the case of a rite of service that is performed by day, on account of the performance of which a non-priest is liable to the death penalty, requires a lottery, but if a non-priest is not liable on account of performing such a rite, it does not require a lottery? But lo, there is the case of the act of slaughter itself! [It is done by day, a non-priest may do it, and yet it does require a lottery.]*
- T. *The case of the act of slaughter is exceptional, because it marks the commencement of a rite [that only a priest may carry out].*
- U. *Said Mar Zutra, and some say, R. Ashi, “And lo, this is what we have learned in the Mishnah: **The supervisor said to them, “Go and see whether the time for slaughtering the sacrifice has come** [And this is a rite that may be done by a non-priest but that does require a lottery]” [M. **Yoma 3:1A**] — and the Tannaite formulation makes no mention of “the time for laying out in order the two logs of wood!”*
- V. *As to things for which there is a remedy, the Tannaite formulation does not encompass such matters, but those that have a remedy he has not included in his formulation. [Jung: if the logs of wood had been put in order before daybreak, one could break them up and put them back in order again after daybreak].*

**I.4.** A. *And there are those who say:*

- B. *Objected R Zira, “But can you think of another example of an act of service that is followed by yet another act of service and that is invalid if done by a non-priest?”*
- C. **[28A]** *Well, then, is there none? Lo, there is the case of the smoking of the limbs and fat pieces.*
- D. *But that is simply the completion of a rite of service that has begun by day.*
- E. *Well, then, there is the case of the taking up of the ashes from the altar.*
- F. *For said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, “If the priest has sanctified his hands and feet in connection with removing the ashes from the altar [before dawn], he does not have to sanctify them again on the next day [after dawn], because he has already done so at the beginning of his act of service.”*
- G. *Then it is a problem [to identify another example of an act of service that is followed by yet another act of service and that is invalid if done by a non-priest].*
- H. *Rather, if such a statement was made, this is how it was formulated:*

- I. Said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, “A non-priest who laid out the two logs of wood in order on the altar is subject to the death penalty, because that is an act of service that is complete in and of itself.”
- J. *Objected Raba*, “Then what about the following possibility: the rite also should require a lottery.”
- K. *But does it not require a lottery? Lo*, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: He who got the privilege of clearing the altar of ashes also got the privilege of ordering the wood pile on the altar and of the two pieces of wood on top of the altar [and this was a prestigious rite].
- L. *This is the sense of the statement*: It should have a lottery for itself.
- M. *The contrary consideration is as we have already stated*.
- N. *Does that bear the inference that in the case of an act of service that is complete in and of itself, on account of the performance of which a non-priest is liable to the death penalty, requires a lottery, but if a non-priest is not liable on account of the performance of that act of service, there is no requirement of a lottery? And lo*, there is the case of the act of slaughter.
- O. *The case of the act of slaughter is exceptional, because it marks the commencement of a rite that is done by day*.
- P. *Does that then bear the inference that an act of service that is complete in and of itself requires a lottery, while an act of service that is followed by another act of service does not require a lottery? But lo*, there is the case of the smoking of the limbs and fat pieces.
- Q. *But that is simply the completion of a rite of service that has begun by day*.
- R. Well, then, there is the case of the taking up of the ashes from the altar.
- S. That is on account of a very specific incident.
- T. *Said Mar Zutra, and some say, R. Ashi*, “And lo, this is what we have learned in the Mishnah: **The supervisor said to them, “Go and see whether the time for slaughtering the sacrifice has come** [And this is a rite that may be done by a non-priest but that does require a lottery]” [M. **Yoma 3:1A**] — and the Tannaite formulation makes no mention of “the time for laying out in order the two logs of wood!”
- U. *As to things for which there is a remedy, the Tannaite formulation does not encompass such matters, but those that have a remedy he has not included in his formulation*. [Jung: if the logs of wood had been put in order before daybreak, one could break them up and put them back in order again after daybreak].

In the context of ritual-argument, I present the shank of I:1 as Abbayye’s laying out for his son of the components of the dialectical argument, rather than as a dialogue between unnamed disputants. Thus Abbayye tells his son each of the propositions and counter-propositions that are to be introduced for the topic at hand, and the son will be able to compose the steps in the logic and argument out of the data that are fully exposed by the father. It is equally plausible to treat the bulk of the passage as a systematic presentation, with Abbayye’s part concluding at the very start, with E. The practical difference affects only punctuation for the American language, on the one side, and also our understanding of the standing of

the presentation before us, on the other. I:3 moves on to the consideration of the non-priest in other rites, a suitable topical supplement.