

II.

BABYLONIAN TALMUD

ARAKHIN

CHAPTER TWO

FOLIOS 7B-13B

2:1A-H

- A. In paying a Valuation one may not pay less than a sela, or more than fifty selas.
- B. How so?
- C. [If] one [pledged a Valuation as a poor man and paid the minimum due, a sela,] but [then] got rich, he gives nothing [more].
- D. [If he gave] less than a sela but [then before paying what was owing of the remainder of the sela] got rich, he gives fifty selas. [Since he did not pay the minimum to begin with he has not discharged his obligation.]
- E. [If] he had five selas —
- F. R. Meir says, “He gives only one [of them].”
- G. And sages say, “He gives all of them.”
- H. In paying a Valuation, one may not pay less than a sela, or more than fifty selas.

I.1 A. *How do we know [on the basis of Scripture] that in paying a Valuation one may not pay less than a sela or more than fifty selas [M. 2:1A]?*

- B. *As it is written [in Scripture], “All your Valuations will be in the shekel of the sanctuary” (Lev. 27: 8).*
- C. [The meaning of the verse is this:] All Valuations that you may pledge will be no less than a sheqel [that is, a sela].

II.1 A. **Or more than fifty selas [M. 2:1A]:**

- E. As it is written [in Scripture], “...fifty...” (Lev. 27: 3).

III.1 A. **[If] one had five... [M. 2:1E]:**

- B. *What is the Scriptural basis for the view of R. Meir?*
- C. *It is written [in Scripture], “...fifty...,” and also it is written, “...shekel....” This means the payment must be] either fifty or a sheqel. [There is no intervening number].*

- D. *And as to the view of rabbis [of the same passage]? [In their view the cited passages] serve to indicate that all valuations that you may pledge will be no less than a sheqel. In a case in which one has [more], [however,] Scripture has stated, "...in accord with the means of the one who takes the vow" (Lev. 27: 8), [so one takes more, up to fifty].*
- E. *And as to R. Meir, [how does he interpret the cited verse]?*
- F. *[The cited passage] serves [to indicate that we assess] the resources of the one who takes the vow, not of the one concerning whom the vow is made.*
- G. *And as to rabbis [who concur in the stated principle]? Does it not follow [in their view] that in a case in which one's resources suffice, one takes from him [everything he can pay toward the requisite sum].*

- III.2.** A. Said R. Ada bar Ahbah, "[If] someone had five selas and said, 'My Valuation is incumbent on me,' and then he went and said, 'My Valuation is incumbent on me,' and he first paid off four in connection with the second [vow of Valuation] and one in connection with the first, he has fulfilled his obligation in regard to both [vows].
- B. *"What is the reason [for the rule just now stated]?"*
 - C. *"[We invoke the principle that] if a creditor [whose debt was incurred by the debtor] later [in order of time] went ahead and collected [what was owing to him, prior to the collection of some prior debt that the man incurred to an earlier creditor], what he has collected is validly collected.*
 - D. *"Here [in the case at hand], at the moment at which he paid off the second vow of Valuation, he was already obligated for the first. When he paid off the first, he had no more [to give than what he gave].*
 - E. **[8A]** *"But if he paid four in connection with the first [vow of Valuation] and one in connection with the second while he has carried out his obligation in respect to the second [vow since he has paid all he owns], he has not carried out his obligation in respect to the first [for he is obligated to pay five].*
 - F. *"[Why not?] All [the funds that he had] were obligated [for the payment of] the first [vow. The man, however, did not pay off all of the money that he had in that connection, so he has not paid off what he owed for the first vow. Why not? He was obligated to pay off all five in connection with the first vow. This he did not do. The principle stated at C of course cannot be invoked in the present case.]"*
 - G. *R. Adda bar Ahbah raised the following question, "[If a person] had five selas, and he said, 'Two Valuations of my person are incumbent on me simultaneously,' what is the law? [Perhaps we rule in this way:]*
 - H. *"Since it was simultaneously that he made the vows, so that the two of them took effect at the same moment, he gives two and a half in connection with this vow, and two and a half in connection with that one.*
 - I. *"Or perhaps all of the money [that he has] is owing for this vow and for that?"*
 - J. *The question stands over [and cannot be resolved].*

- IV.1** A. **In paying Valuations, one cannot pay less than a sela or more than fifty selas [M. 2:1H]:**
- B. *What need had I for the repetition of the rule [since it occurs at M. 2:1A]?*

- C. *Lo, [by restating the matter, the framer of the passage] informs us (1) that [a Valuation involving] less than a sela will never occur. But, there can be a case in which there is more than a sela [but less than fifty required to pay off a Valuation].*
- D. *[And, along these same lines], a case in which more than fifty selas [required to pay off a Valuation] is what we shall never confront. But, there can be cases in which less than fifty selas [are required to pay off a valuation]. [All then accords with rabbis.]*
- E. *[By phrasing the matter without attribution to a specified authority but rather] anonymously, [the framer of the passage has accorded with] the view of rabbis. [That then is the decided law.]*

A is repeated at H to form the head of the triplet. A tells us that in cases of Valuations, there is no payment of less than a sela or of more than fifty. Lev. 27:8 specifies that the poor give only a sheqel (= sela). The exemplifications, C, D-F, are not quite to the point, for they raise a secondary matter. What happens if a poor man paid the expected amount, but then got rich? C specifies that he has paid his Valuation. But, D adds, if the man when poor does not pay the complete Valuation, then, when he gets rich, he pays not merely the rest of what he owed as a poor man, but the whole fixed sum. E-G present a nicely matched dispute, which does pertain to A. The man owes fifty selas as a Valuation. He has five. Meir says the man gives only one of the five, as a poor man. Sages take the whole amount toward fulfillment of his Valuation. Meir's view is explained to rest upon the Scripture which specifies one gives fifty sheqels, meaning, he holds, one gives either fifty or one sheqel, but no figure in between. Sages' position rests upon A/H, that there is a whole range of amounts of money which may be paid over for the Valuation. Unit I provides a proof-text for the position of rabbis, M. 2:1A/H. Unit II carries out the same procedure for Meir, reviewing, also, the proof-texts in support for rabbis' view. III.2 then introduced secondary cases, in which, in line with M. 2:1Cff., we need to know whether or not one has paid off his original obligation. If he has not done so and then acquires a sizable sum of money, he remains liable to carry out the obligation incurred through the vow of Valuation. But if we rule that, as a poor man, he has done so, then the advent of riches in no way imposes a fresh obligation to pay off what he did not pay off when he was poor. That is what lies behind Adda's conundrum. The reason that unit IV is where it is is that the framers wish systematically to work their way through the passage of the Mishnah. Only after Adda's question, pertinent as it is to M. 2:1C-G, do we reach M. 2:1H. The obvious question therefore is suspended until we do: why has H repeated A? The answer is given in accord with rabbis, not Meir's principle.

2:1I

- I. **There is no [re]opening for a woman who misses count [of her period] less than seven days, or more than seventeen days.**

At issue is the status of a woman's flow of blood, perceived at diverse points in the cycle. The basis rules are two. First, a woman's regular menstrual flow produces uncleanness for seven days, so Lev. 15:19-30. However, if a woman perceives a

flow of blood not during the seven days of menstrual uncleanness, that blood is in a different status, namely, that of flux, zibah, such as is specified at Lev. 15:25. The woman is unclean not as a menstruant but as a Zabah. Accordingly, what flows for the seven days of menstruation falls into the category of menstrual blood. What continues beyond those days, specifically, for three further days, imposes the uncleanness of zibah or flux. All blood that is produced during the menstrual period of seven days falls into the former category. The following eleven days are zibah-days, during which a flow of blood falls into the classification of flux. The entire cycle — menstrual-blood, then zibah-blood — adds up to eighteen days. What happens if a woman perceives a flow of blood on three successive days in the eleven of the zibah-period? She becomes unclean and remains so for seven days beyond the last day on which she produced a flow of blood. What happens if during the eleven zibah-days there is no flow of blood, or no flow for three consecutive days? Then for the twelfth (zibah-)day onward, she becomes eligible to enter her menstrual period. At any point from the twelfth day a flow of blood then places her into the category of menstrual uncleanness. What, finally, happens if the woman does become unclean with a zibah-uncleanness during the eleven zibah-days? Then she must count off seven days on which there is no flow of blood beyond the last flow in the zibah-period. Then she becomes eligible to enter into the routine menstrual uncleanness, as before. When she actually produces a flow of blood, it is in the category of menstrual blood. Then the cycle starts all over again — seven days on which a flow of blood falls into the classification of menstrual blood, eleven during which it falls into the category of flux or zibah-blood, thus seven days of (potential) menstrual uncleanness and eleven of (potential) zibah-uncleanness. The cycle commences on the day on which the woman reenters the state of menstrual uncleanness. At that point the woman counts seven days during which blood that flows falls into the menstrual classification, and eleven for the other. That day, on which the cycle starts, bears the name of “reopening,” in that we “reopen” the count at hand. We deal at M. 2:1I with a woman who has lost count. She has experienced a flow of blood but does not recall whether she is in the seven days of menstrual uncleanness or the eleven of the zibah-uncleanness. Now we realize that she has to resume a valid reckoning. Only when she has a second flow of blood — beyond the present one, the status of which is unclear — will a valid count begin. The Mishnah’s framer has stated that that certain status can follow only seven days, on the one side, but must come within seventeen days, on the other. If she has no flow of blood in seven days, she reenters the pattern in which any blood that comes is menstrual blood. If she has no flow of blood for seventeen days, she reenters that same status. So we deal with a gray period of ten days.

- I.1** A. *Our rabbis have repeated on Tannaite authority [the following statement, amplifying the law at hand].*
- B. [If a woman] who misses count said, “I saw uncleanness one day, [that is, on which I had a flow of blood], then her reentry [into the cycle, at which point she begins a fresh count of menstrual, then zibah-days] will come in seventeen days [encompassing seven menstrual days and eleven zibah-days. That is, she has had a flow of blood for one day. Then she counted seventeen days free of any flow of

blood. From that point on, a new flow of blood marks the beginning of her menstrual days. Why? The day on which she had the first flow — the one the status of which she did not know — was either a menstrual day or a zibah-day. If it was a zibah-day, then her menstrual period would begin ten clean days later, no matter what, and that would mean that blood produced on the eighteenth day is menstrual blood. If the original day was a menstrual day then the woman would have been menstruating for six days and in the natural course of events the next eleven would be zibah-days. Her menstrual period thus recommences eleven days later, the eighteenth (or any later) day. The same reasoning prevails throughout.]

- B. “I saw uncleanness two days” — her reentry will come in seventeen days.
- C. “I saw uncleanness three days” — her reentry will come in seventeen days.
- D. “I saw uncleanness four days” — her reentry will come in sixteen days.
- E. “I saw uncleanness five days” — her reentry will come in fifteen days.
- F. “I saw uncleanness six days” — her reentry will come in fourteen days.
- G. “I saw uncleanness seven days” — her reentry will come in thirteen days.
- H. “I saw uncleanness eight days” — her reentry will come in twelve days.
- I. “I saw uncleanness nine days” — her reentry will come in eleven days.
- J. “I saw uncleanness ten days” — her reentry will come in ten days.
- K. “I saw uncleanness eleven days” — her reentry will come in nine days.
- L. “I saw uncleanness twelve days” **[8B]** — her reentry will come in eight days.
- M. “I saw uncleanness thirteen days” — her reentry will come in seven days.
- N. *[Commenting on the foregoing formulation,] R. Adda b. Ahbah said to Rabbah, “What need do I have for all this? Let the woman merely count seven [clean days, producing no flow at all] and be permitted [as in a state of cleanness, to have sexual relations, until the next flow of blood].” [Adda assumes that the purpose of the reckoning under discussion is simply to discover the point at which the woman reenters a state of cleanness so as to have sexual relations.]*
- O. *He said to him, “[The purpose of the reckoning] is to set [the woman] right in regard to the woman’s menstrual count and the reentry into the menstrual cycle [and not merely to discover the point at which she is clean. For this purpose, the full count is needed, not merely the count that signifies cleanness.]”*

I.2. A. *Our rabbis have repeated the following statement:*

- B. All women who lose count in their reckoning while possibly in the zibah-days [the eleven following the seven of the menstrual period, and who then attain a state of cultic cleanness having counted out the requisite clean days] bring an offering [as they would if they knew for sure that they were in the status of a zabah, a woman unclean in the zibah-days who had then attained cleanness. Such a period brings a pair of birds. One is a burnt-offering, that is, a bird that is killed and burned up on the altar. The other is in the status of a sin-offering. Such an offering produces some meat for the use of the priests. But in the present case, because we are not sure that the woman in fact had been in the status of a zabah and had become clean of that particular status, the sin-offering] is not eaten [by the priests, by reason of doubt as to the status of the offering.]

- C. The exception [to the foregoing rule] is the woman whose point of reentry [into the cycle] started after the seventh or eighth day [I 1L, M, above. In such a case, the woman certainly must have been a zabah. Why? She produced blood for twelve or more days. Even if we assume that the first two days were the last days of zibah-uncleanness, after ten or eleven days, there was a flow of blood, and that flow of blood was, once more, zibah-blood. So there is no doubt about the status of the two women at hand. Such women must] bring an offering, which is to be eaten, [since there is no doubt as to its status].
- D. *But is it really the case that women who lose count of their reckoning must be deemed [in any instance] to be in the status of zibah-uncleanness? [We do not know for sure that the women in question in fact fell into the category of zibah-uncleanness anyhow.] Furthermore, [Is a woman who produces blood] for one day or two days liable to bring an offering at all? [An offering must be brought upon the attainment of cleanness only in the case of a woman who to begin with produced blood on three successive zibah-days. But these women, by definition, have not done so.]*
- E. Rather [this is how to formulate the rule:] All woman actually unclean with a zibah-uncleanness, who lose count in their reckoning while in the zibah-days bring an offering, which is not eaten, except for the ones whose point of reentry is on the seventh or the eighth day, and these women bring an offering which is eaten. [The revision is simply to make clear that the women in question have been confirmed, to begin with, as unclean with zibah-uncleanness. Then the question of C no longer applies, but the reasoning at A-B stands.]

The problem is this: We have a woman who has lost count. She has had a flow of blood and has purified herself. But she does not know whether the flow of blood was in the seven days of niddah, or in the eleven days of zibah. If for a period of no less than seven days and no more than seventeen, she experiences no flow of blood at all, then she may be certain that the next flow of blood is that of niddah. What the Talmud contributes at unit I is an extensive amplification of the rule stated by the author of the Mishnah. This amplification is subjected to some brief comment. Then, at unit II, there is a secondary development of the same materials, now with specific reference to I L, M, at which point, as I have explained, we may be sure that the woman is in the status of zabah.

2:1J

- J. In the case of [a person with] skin ailments [he must be confined] no less than one week, but no more than three weeks.**

If a person produces the marks of the presence of the skin-ailment described at Lev. 13:1ff., the priest shuts up that person for one week. If a house produces equivalent signs, as at Lev. 14:33ff., the priest shuts it up for three weeks. If the signs persist, the man after a week and the house after three weeks will be declared afflicted with the specified skin-ailment and unclean.

- I.1 A. “No less than one week”** refers to afflictions affecting a human being.

- B. “No more than three weeks”** refers to afflictions affecting houses. [That is, signs of the disease penetrate the walls of the house.]

- I.2.** A. [Citing Psa. 36: 6: “Your righteousness is like the mighty mountains, your judgments are like the great deep”,] said R. Papa, ““Your righteousness is like the mighty mountains’ refers to skin ailments that affect a human being.
- B. ““Your judgments are like the great deep’ refers to skin ailments that affect houses. [A human being does not have to wait three weeks to know the status of affliction at hand.]”
- C. *What is the ordinary [and not figurative] sense of the verse at hand?*
- D. Said Rab Judah, “If it were not for ‘your righteousness, which is like the mighty mountains,’ who could stand before ‘your judgments, which are like the great deep.’”
- E. Rabbah said, ““Your righteousness is like the mighty mountains’ because ‘your judgments are like the great deep.’”
- F. *In what matter do they differ?*
- G. *It concerns the matter of R. Eleazar and R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, for it has been reported as follows:*
- H. R. Eleazar said, “[When a person stands in judgment, God] suppresses [the record of sin, burying it in the depths, and so makes it possible it forgive that person].”
- I. R. Yosé b. R. Hanina said, “He forebears [and then forgives the sin].”
- J. Rabbah accords with the view of R. Eleazar [and holds that God suppresses sins and hides them away in the great deep.]
- K. Rab Judah accepts the view of R. Yosé b. R. Hanina [maintaining that God in his righteousness forgives the sins and so receives the person into heaven. That is the sense of D.]

Unit I amplifies what is clear at M. 2:1J. Unit II provides a homiletical comment on the same rule, indicating that God is concerned that human beings not suffer. The verse at hand then is subjected to a quite separate and autonomous exegesis, II C-K.

2:2

- A. They do not count less than four full months in the year, and [to sages] it has never appeared [appropriate to declare] more than eight.** [Jung, p. 48, n. 3, states, “A full month [lit., ‘a prolonged one’] is one of thirty days, a defective one is one of twenty-nine days. The average year has six months of thirty days each, and six of twenty-nine each. For there are about twenty-nine and one half days between one new moon and the other, whence a month of thirty days, to restore the balance, must be followed by one of twenty-nine days. However, there are more than twenty-nine and one half days between one new moon and the other, approximately twenty-nine days, twelve hours and forty minutes; furthermore, there are other causes influencing the fixing of the calendar, as the result of which the arrangement of six full and defective months undergoes certain variations, so that one year might have a larger number of full, the other more than the half of defective months. In the time of the Mishnah the Sanhedrin decreed the beginning of the new months on the basis of the testimony of witnesses who had actually seen the new moon. But even then conditions would arise (such as non-visibility

of the new moon, due to cloudy weather) when the Sanhedrin would be guided by its own astronomical calculations. For such a degree the principle was adopted that no year may have more than eight, nor less than four full months.”]

- B. The two loaves of bread which are eaten:**
- C. there are no less than two, and no more than three.**
- D. Show-bread which is eaten [in the Temple]:**
- E. there are no less than nine, and no more than eleven [loaves] [M. Men. 11:9A].**
- F. An infant may not be circumcised**
- G. prior to the eighth day [of his life], and not beyond the twelfth.**

- I.1 A.** *What is the meaning of the statement, It has never appeared [appropriate to declare] more than eight [M. 2:2A]?*
- B. Said R. Huna, “It never appeared appropriate to sages to intercalate more than eight months [adding a day so that a month would have thirty, rather than twenty-nine, days].”
 - C. *What is the difference in the case of nine [months, that sages did] not [deem it appropriate to intercalate yet a ninth month]?*
 - D. *If [9A] [they did not stop at eight], the new moon [of Tishré, marking the beginning of the new month of Tishré and also the new year] might come three days early [so that while the new moon would appear on Wednesday, the new year would actually commence on Saturday. This is because there are nine months of 30 days and only 3 months of 29 days. The result is that there are 3 extra days.]*
 - E. *But in the present case, too, [where only eight months have 30 days] the [new moon of the New Year at Tishré] still will come two days early [since, for matters to work out properly, six months should have thirty days, but we have now agreed to add an extra day to two further months].*
 - F. *[The formulation accords] with that which R. Mesharsheya said, “It is a case in which the outgoing year had been intercalated [and had a full extra month].” Here too we deal with a case in which the outgoing year had been intercalated, and the intercalation of a year involves one month, [Jung (p. 50, n. 3): which may be either full or defective, and having made the intercalation of the preceding year defective, we have regained one day, which is counter-balanced by one day of the eight full months this year].*
 - G. *Nonetheless, there still be one [half of an] extra day [for even if we have one full thirty-day month and one month of the preceding year incomplete, we account for one day. There is still a full day intervening between the new moon of Tishré and the New Year].*
 - H. *People do not pay attention to one day[’s difference].*
 - I. [Differing from Huna at B.] Ulla said, “[The meaning of M. 2:2A is that] it never appeared to sages appropriate to declare more than eight months defective, [that is, to have only twenty-nine days rather than thirty].
 - J. “[The purpose of the framer of the passage at hand] is then to state the reason for the rule. That is, what is the reason that **they do not count less than four**

months in the year? Because to sages it has never appeared appropriate to declare more than eight to be incomplete [by one day].”

- K. *[The framer now reviews the same discussion of above in reference to Ulla's position:] What is the difference in the case of nine [months, that sages did] not [deem it appropriate to treat as less yet a ninth month]?*
- L. *If so, the new moon [of Tishré] would come three days too late.*
- M. *But in the present case, too, the [new moon of the New Year at Tishré] still will come two days late.*
- N. *That is in accord with what R. Mesharshayya said, “It is a case in which the outgoing year had been intercalated.” Here too we deal with a case in which the outgoing year had been intercalated. Take off one incomplete month against one full month.*
- O. *Nonetheless, there still will be one extra day.*
- P. *[People] will think that someone had actually witnessed the sighting of the moon, while they had not paid any mind to it [so the decision of sages will not appear to be arbitrary].*
- Q. **[9B]** *In what matter do [Huna, B, and Ulla, I] differ? In regard to the intercalated year, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- R. *How much is the intercalation of a year [when a month is added]? Thirty days [only]. [Ulla agrees.]*
- S. *Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “A month [of twenty-nine days].” [Huna concurs.]*
- T. *An objection was raised [on the basis of the following]: **The Festival of Weeks may fall only on the same day [of the week] as the day of the waving [of the sheaf of new grain at Passover. [Thus the day of waving, which marked the second day of Passover, fell on a Monday, then the Festival of Weeks also must fall on a Monday].***
- U. ***The New Year may coincide only with the same day of the week as the day on which the day of waving fell [that is, the second day of Passover], or the day following the night of the last day of the full month [of Nisan]. [T. Ar. 1:110].***
- V. *[We now compare the cited teaching, S-T, with the positions taken by Huna and Ulla above.] Now the cited teaching poses no problems to Ulla, for we may declare eight defective [twenty-nine day] months, but not eight full [thirty day] months. We may find an appropriate case. [How so?]? If both [months] are defective, [the New Year] will coincide with the same day of the week as that on which the day of waving fell. If one of the months was full and one defective, it will full on the same day as the one in which fell the day following the night of the last day of the full month of Nisan.*
- W. *But in the view of R. Huna, who has stated that one may arrange eight full [thirty-day] months, it may fall [on the same day of the week] as the day following the day after the night of the last day of the full month [Jung, p. 51]. [Jung, p. 51, n. 6: On the view of R. Huna that we make eight full months, the two months Heshwan (in winter) and Iyyar (in summer), normally defective, are made full, with the result that one extra day of the week is added as interval between the thirtieth*

day of Nisan and the first day of Tishré, making New Year to fall two week-days after the thirtieth of Nisan.]

- X. *R. Huna may reply to you [as follows:] Now in the view of Ulla, do matters work out anyhow? It is eight months that we do not treat as full, but we do treat seven months as full [thirty-day] months a month not in the winter but in the summer, with the result that it would possibly fall upon the day following the day after the last day of the full month [so Jung, p. 52].*
- Y. *Rather, in accord with whom [is the statement at hand]? It is in accord with the position of “others,” in the following teaching: **Others say, “Between one Feast of Weeks and the next, or between one New Year and the next, there can be a difference of only four days of the week, or, in an intercalated year [bearing an extra month], five. [T. Ar. 1:11]** [Jung, p. 52, n. 2.: Others hold that all months are full and defective in strict rotation, making a total of 354, which is four days over fifty weeks, leaving four days of the week as interval between one new year and the other in a normal year and five in a prolonged year].*
- Z. *In any event in the view of “Others,” you do not find a case in which [the Feast of Weeks will fall on the same day of the week as] the day of waving [that is, the sixteenth of Nisan].*
- AA. *Said R. Mesharsheya, “It would involve a case in which there is an intercalated year, and the intercalation of the year involved thirty days. Take off one month against the other and you will find that it indeed does fall on the same day of the week as the day of waving.” [Jung, p. 52, n. 3: Having added in winter an extra full month, Nisan is made defective, with the result that we have four defective months during the summer, making new year fall on the same day of the week as) the day of waving.]*
- BB. *Said R. Adda bar Ahba to Raba, “Is it the intent of Others to inform us how to count [the four days’ difference between the New Years?]? ”*
- CC. *“This is what they propose to tell us, that it is not a religious duty to proclaim the new moon solely on the basis of actually having seen it. [Without visual evidence, it is permitted to rely upon proper calculations, as “Others” have done.]”*
- DD. *To this statement Rabina objected, “But there are days made up of hours and days made up of thirty years.” [Jung, p. 52, n. 6: In a simple (not prolonged) year five days may intervene between one Passover and the other. For the forty minutes above twenty-nine days and twelve hours, between one moon and the other, make in one year an additional eight hours, in three years an additional day. Jung, n. 7: And even when that is accounted for, there remain minutes, which added to one another amount in every thirty years to one complete day. The exact duration is twenty-nine days, twelve and 793/1080 hours, which time fragments combined add one day in every three, and one additional one every thirty years.]*
- EE. *Since they do not take place year by year, he does not take them into account.*
- FF. *And Samuel too concurred with the principle of R. Huna [that eight full months are the limit], for Samuel said, “A lunar year is no less than three hundred fifty-two days or more than three hundred fifty-six days. How so? If two [months] are full [thirty days, then the figure of 35]6 will be reached, and if both of them are diminished, [then the figure will be 35]2. If one is full and one lacking, then it will be [35]4.”*

- GG. *They objected:* [If someone said,] “Lo, I shall be a Nazirite for the number of days that there are in a solar year,” he counts as the days of his Naziriteship three hundred and sixty-five days, in accord with the number of days of the solar year.
- HH. [If he said that he would serve out a Naziriteship for] the number of days in a lunar year, he counts out as the days of his Naziriteship three hundred fifty-four days, in accord with the number of days in the lunar year.”
- II. *Now if, in fact, it were the case that there might be times in which there would be a lunar year of 356 days, [why should he serve out only 354]?*
- JJ. In matters of vows, we follow the ordinary usage of people as well as the ordinary count in the average year [which is 354 days in a lunar year].
- KK. *Also Rabbi takes the principle of R. Huna.*
- LL. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* There was a case in which Rabbi treated nine months as defective, and the new moon at Tishré [nonetheless] made its appearance at the right time.
- MM. And Rabbi was astonished and stated, “We treated nine months as defective, and yet the new moon of Tishré has made its appearance at the proper time!”
- NN. Said before him R. Simeon b. Rabbi, “Perhaps it was an intercalated year [bearing an extra month], **[10A]** and the intercalation of the year involves adding thirty days. Now last year we treated both months [Heshwan and Iyyar] as full. *Weigh three full [months] against three defective ones, and it comes out even [in the proper place].*” [Jung, p. 53, n. 3: Rabbi also held that eight full months are the limit, hence his astonishment when the new moon of Tishré came at the proper time in spite of the additional incomplete months. Last year the two normally defective months (Heshwan and Iyyar) were made full and the intercalated month was full. If the three defective ones of this year are placed against the three full ones of last year, a normal situation is achieved, hence the new moon of Tishré appeared at the moment when it was fixed.]
- OO. He said to him, “Light of Israel! That is just how it was.”

M. 2:2A’s point is that a given year will have no fewer than four months of thirty days, and sages have never in any event added to more than eight to yield months of thirty days. B-E refer to the number of days in which the bread is eaten (M. Men. 11: 9). An infant is circumcised at the earliest on the eighth day, and, in cases of doubt, e.g., as to the time of birth, no later than on the twelfth day (M. Shab. 19: 5). The Talmud presents a sustained effort at explaining the meaning of M. 2:2A, with the positions of Huna and Ulla fully exposed, then tested and compared to the views of other authorities. The sustained construction seems to me seamless. I have followed Jung’s text and notes, as indicated.

2:3-4

- A. They do not [blow the ram’s horn] less than twenty-one teqiah-[blasts] in the sanctuary, and not more than forty-eight [M. Suk. 5:5A].**
- B. They do not play less than two harps, and not more than six.**
- C. They do not play less than six flutes, and not count more than twelve.**
- D. And on twelve days in the year the flute is played before the altar:**

- (1) on the day of the slaughter of the first Passover-offering,
- (2) and on the day of the slaughtering of the second Passover-offering;
- (3) and on the first festival day of Passover;
- (4) and on the festival day of Aseret [Weeks];
- (5-12) on the eight days of the Festival [of Sukkot].

- E. And one did not play on a pipe of bronze but on a pipe made of reed, because its [the reed-pipe's] sound is sweet.
- F. And one ended [the playing] with one reed only, because it ends well. — M. 2:4
- A. “And they were the servants of the priests [who played the instruments],” the words of R. Meir.
- B. R. Yosé says, “They were of the families of Bet Happegarim and of Bet Sipperayyah. And they came from Emmaus. And they married [their daughters] into the priesthood.”
- C. R. Haninah b. Antigonus says, “They were Levites.”

- I.1 A. *[The framer of the passage of] the Mishnah before us [at M. 2:3A] does not concur with the position of R. Judah [for the framer of the passage regards each note of the ram's horn, teqiah, teruah, teqiah, as a sound counted by itself, while Judah counts each set of three sounds as one blast, as we shall now see.]*
- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, “He who makes fewer [sounds on the ram's horn] should sound no fewer than seven [= 21], and he who adds should add no more than sixteen [= 48].”*
- C. *In what regard do [Judah and the framer of the passage at hand] differ?*
- D. *R. Judah takes the view that the teqiah-sound, the teruah-sound, and the teqiah-sound constitute a single sound, while rabbis [at M. 2:3A] maintain the position that a teqiah-sound counts as one, a teruah-sound as another, and a teqiah-sound as yet another.*
- E. *What is the basis in Scripture for the view of R. Judah? It is written [in Scripture], “And when you shall blow an alarm [teruah]” (Num. 10: 5) and it is written, “They should sound (teqa) an alarm [a teruah-sound]” (Num. 10: 6). Therefore the teqiah-sound, the teruah-sound and the teqiah-sound constitute a single sound. [That formulation using the two words as equivalents then indicates that the teqiah-sound is not distinct from the teruah-sound.*
- F. *And [how do] sages [read the same verses]? The purpose of the cited verses is only to indicate that there should be a teqiah-sound before and after a teruah-sound.*
- G. *And as to rabbis [represented at M. 2:3A], what Scriptural verses do they adduce as evidence [that the two types of sounds are distinctive]? As it is written [in Scripture], “And when the assembly is gathered, you shall sound a teqiah-sound but you shall not sound a teruah-sound” (Num. 10: 7). Now if it should enter your mind that the teqiah-sound, the teruah-sound, and the teqiah-sound count as a single note, would the All-Merciful have said [in instructing us to sound a teqiah-sound but not a teruah-sound] to perform only half of a religious duty [sounding only half of the allegedly-required complete sound, that is, teqiah-teruah-teqiah*

as Judah has maintained]? [Of course not! Therefore, it is obvious that each sound is independent.]

- H. *And [how does] R. Judah [interpret the same passage]? It is merely a signal [and not a religious duty that is involved, so there is no reason to require the sounding of the entire sequence, as he maintains would be the case if it were a religious duty].*
- I. *In accord with which [of the foregoing positions] is the following statement that R. Kahana made, “Between a teqiah-sound and a teruah-sound there may be no [interruption whatsoever]”?*
- J. *That self-evidently accords with the position of R. Judah [who deems the three sounds to constitute a single note].*
- K. *That is self-evident [and why did it require specification]? What might you otherwise have maintained? [Kahana’s statement] also accords with the view of the rabbis.*
- L. *And that has to be specified so as to exclude the position of R. Yohanan, who has said, “If one has heard nine teqiah-sounds spread over nine hours on the day [of the New Year], he has carried out his obligation [to hear the ram’s horn].”*
- M. *Accordingly, we are informed that that is not the rule.*
- N. *And may I maintain that that is indeed the case, [that Kahana’s statement accords with the view of rabbis]?*
- O. *If that were true, then what is the force of the statement that there may be no interruption whatsoever? [Obviously, one cannot hear the sounds separated over a period of nine hours.]*

II.1. A. On twelve days in the year the flute is played [M. 2:3C]:

- B. *Why are these days singled out?*
- C. *It is because on these days the individual completes [on his own, not part of a quorum] the recitation of the Hallel-psalms.*
- D. *That is in line with what R. Yohanan said in the name of R. Simeon b. Yehosedeq, “There are eighteen days on which the individual completes the recitation of the Hallel-psalms [by himself]: the eight days of the Festival [of Tabernacles], the eight days of Hanukkah, the first festival day of Passover, and the festival day of Weeks.*
- E. *“And in the Diaspora, there are twenty one: the nine days of the Festival [of Tabernacles], and the eight days of Hanukkah, and the two festival days of Passover and the two festival days of Weeks.”*

II.2. A. What differentiates the Festival [of Tabernacles], on which we recite [the entire] Hallel-psalms every day, from Passover, on which we do not recite [the entire Hallel-psalms] [10B] every day?

- B. *Each day of the Festival [of Tabernacles] is differentiated from the others by the [distinctive number of] offerings that are brought on that day, while in the case of Passover, each day is not differentiated from the others as to [the volume of] its offerings [since the same number of animals are offered every day of Passover].*
- C. *[The governing criterion, therefore, is evidently that the Hallel-psalms are to be recited on a day on which special sacrifices, apart from the normal ones, are*

offered. In that case,] as to the Sabbath, which is distinguished as to the offerings made on it, [one should recite the Hallel-psalms also on that day].

- D. *But the Sabbath is not called an “appointed time [and for that reason the Hallel-psalms are not recited].”*
- E. *Then the celebration of the new moon, which is called an “appointed time,” should include the recitation of the Hallel-psalms.*
- F. *[But the celebration of the new moon] is not sanctified through the prohibition of doing servile labor [and for that reason the Hallel-psalms are not recited].*
- G. *For it is written [in Scripture], “You shall have a song as in the night when a feast is sanctified” (Isa. 30:29).*
- H. *[The meaning is this:] A night which is sanctified as a festival requires the recitation of songs [such as the Hallel-psalms], and one which is not sanctified as a festival does not require the recitation of song.*
- I. *The New Year and the Day of Atonement, which indeed are called “appointed times” and which are sanctified through a prohibition against doing servile labor should also involve the recitation of the Hallel-psalms [for they satisfy both conditions].*
- J. *[The reason that that is not the case is] on account of what R. Abbahu said.*
- K. *For R. Abbahu said, “The ministering angels said before the Holy One, blessed be he, ‘Lord of the universe, on what account do the Israelites not recite a song [the Hallel-psalms] before you on the New Year and the Day of Atonement?’*
- L. *“He said to them, ‘Surely it is not possible that when the King sits on the throne of judgment, with the books of those [destined to] live and those [destined to] die open before him, the Israelites should recite a song before me! [Since God judges Israel on the New Year and the Day of Atonement, therefore, Israel is not required to recite the Hallel-psalms.]*
- M. *Now there is the case of Hanukkah, on which none of the requisite conditions applies, and yet [the Israelites do] recite [the Hallel-psalms on that holiday].*
- N. *It is because of the miracle [commemorated on that day].*
- O. *And there is then the case of Purim, which also celebrates a miracle, so that, on that day, [the Hallel-psalms] should be said. [But the Hallel-psalms are not recited on Purim.]*
- P. *Said R. Isaac, “It is because [people may not] recite a song concerning a miracle that took place outside of the Land [of Israel].”*
- Q. *Objecting to this reason, R. Nahman bar Isaac [said], “Lo, there is the very matter of the Exodus from Egypt, which surely is a miracle that took place outside of the Land [of Israel], and yet we recite the Hallel-psalms [in commemoration of that miracle]!”*
- R. *The reason [that that exception to the rule stated at P is made] is in accord with that which has been taught:*
- S. *Before the Israelites entered the Land, all lands were treated as appropriate for the recitation of song. Once they entered the Land, no longer were all lands regarded as valid for recitation of song.*

- T. [Providing a different answer to the question raised at O,] R. Nahman said, “The reading [of the Esther-scroll, mandated for Purim,] constitutes the Hallel-psalms [equivalent for that day].”
- U. *Raba said, “Indeed, there is good reason [not to recite the Hallel-psalms on Purim]. [The verse states], ‘Praise, O servants of the Lord’ (Psa. 113: 1) — and not the servants of Pharaoh. [Hence the opening verse of the Hallel-psalms fits the occasion of Passover] here. But [can the Israelites truly say], ‘Praise, O servants of the Lord’ — and not the servants of Ahasuerus? We still remain servants of Ahasuerus [through his descendants, the Sasanian Persian rulers of Babylonia]! [And that is why it would be inappropriate to say Hallel-psalms on Purim.]”*
- V. *And in the view of R. Nahman, who has maintained, “The reading [of the Esther-scroll] constitutes the Hallel-psalms [‘ equivalent for that day, from which it would follow that, in his view, it is proper to recite the Hallel-psalms on account of a miracle that took place outside of the Land of Israel,] [how does he square that view with] that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: “Before the Israelites entered the Land, all lands were treated as appropriate for the recitation of song. Once they entered the Land, no longer were all lands regarded as valid for recitation of song”?*
- W. Once the Israelites went into exile [from the Land of Israel], the original remission [permitting celebration of miracles done for Israelites even outside of the Land of Israel] was reinstated.

III.1 A. And one did not play on a pipe of bronze [M. 2:3E]:

- B. [The framer of the passage] begins by speaking of a flute and then concludes by speaking of a pipe. [Why?]
- C. Said R. Papa, “A flute is the same thing as a pipe. *But why do they call it a flute? It is because its tone is fluty [and sweet].*”

III.2. A. Our rabbis have taught:

- B. **The pipe [that] was in the sanctuary was smooth, thin, made of reed, and came from the time of Moses. The king commanded that they overlay it with gold. [When they did so], its sound was no longer pleasant. When they removed the covering, its sound was as pleasant as it had always been.**
- C. **There was a cymbal in the sanctuary made of copper, with a pleasant sound. It was damaged. Sages sent and imported craftsmen from Alexandria in Egypt, who repaired it. But its sound was no longer pleasant. They removed the repair, and its sound was as pleasant as it had been.**
- D. **There was a mortar in the sanctuary made of copper, which came from the time of Moses, in which the incense-spices would be mixed. It was damaged, and they brought craftsmen from Alexandria in Egypt, who repaired it. But it would not produce the mixture as it had in the past. They removed the repair, and it then made the mixture as it had in the past.**
- E. **These two utensils survived from the first Temple, and they were damaged, and there was no remedy for them, and concerning them said David, “They were of burnished brass (1Ki. 7:45) and “bright brass” (2Ch. 4:16).**
- F. **And concerning them it says, “And two vessels of fine bright brass, precious as gold” (Ezr. 8:27) [T. Ar. 2:3-5, in Bavli’s version].**

- G. [Commenting on the cited verse of Ezra], Rab and Samuel — one of them said, “Each one of them weighed as much as two of gold,” and the other said, “The two of them together weighed as much as one of gold.”
- H. *R. Joseph repeated the matter as follows:* “The two of them weighed as much as one of gold.”
- I. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:* **R. Nathan** says, “**There were two utensils each [that is, two cymbals, two mortars], as it is said, ‘Two’ (Ezr. 8:27). Do not read ‘two (snym)’ but ‘seconds (snyym)’ [meaning that there were two of each kind]**” [T. **Ar. 2:5C**].
- J. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:* **Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel** says, “**Siloah gushed forth water through [a mouth the size of] an issar. The king gave orders to ‘make it wider, so that its water may gush forth more abundantly.’ So they widened it. But its water became sparse. Then they stopped it up, and it returned to its original condition.**” [T. **Ar. 2:6**].
- K. That story serves to illustrate the following statement: “Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, nor the mighty man in his strength” (Jer. 9:22).

IV.1. A. [Expanding on M. **2:3F**, **And one ended [the playing] with one reed only, because it ends well:**] and so did R. Simeon b. Gamaliel say, “There was no hirdolim in the sanctuary.”

- B. *What is a hirdolim? Said Abayye, “A water organ.”*
- C. **“because it confuses the voices of singing and spoils the sweetness of the singing”** [T. **Ar. 1:13E**. T’s version.].
- D. Said Raba bar Shila said R. Mattenah said Samuel, “There was a magrefa-instrument in the Temple, [11A] with ten stops, each of which could produce ten different sounds. The entire instrument therefore could produce a hundred different sounds.”
- E. *In a Tanna’s teaching it was taught:* It was a cubit long and a cubit high, and a handle projected from it with ten stops. Each one of them could produce a hundred different sounds. The entire instrument therefore could produce a thousand different sounds.
- F. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “Your mnemonic [for remembering the two versions] is that the Tanna’s verse exaggerates, [while Samuel’s does not].”*

V.1 A. **“And they were the servants of the priests...[M. 2:4A]:**

- B. *[Regarding the difference of opinion among Meir, who holds the instrumentalists were servants of the priests, Yosé, who says they were of distinguished families, and Hananiah, who regards them as Levites], may I say that it is concerning the following principle that the sages differed?*
- C. *He who holds that they were slaves maintains the view that the essential factor in [the Temple] music is singing and the instrument [is less essential for it only] serves to sweeten the sound of the voice [so the identity of whoever played the instrument hardly matters].*
- D. *He who maintains that they were Levites [who played the instruments, as much as the other musicians, who sang had to be Levites] maintains that the essential factor in [the Temple] music is the playing of the instrument [so the musicians who*

played the instruments had to be Levites who were responsible for the Temple service].

- E. *But then what do you think can be the reasoning of R. Yosé [in the same matter]?*
- F. *If he maintained that the essence of the music is the singing, then the use of servants [would have] sufficed. If, by contrast, he maintained the view that the essence of the music is the [part played by] the instruments, we should require the participation of Levites. [Why does he take the middle position that the instrumentalists were distinguished families but were not Levites?]*
- G. *[Indeed, there is no issue. Yosé] assuredly took the position that the essence of the music is the singing. [Why then does he want people of good family, not merely slaves?]*
- H. *In the present instance, at issue is whether or not we promote those who stand on the platform [and make music with the Levites] in regard to their genealogy and to their participation in the tithes. [If we see someone on the platform along with the Levites, does that constitute adequate evidence that that person derives from a distinguished family and indeed is one of the Levites and so permitted to take a certain portion of the tithes?]*
- I. *He who maintains that the instrumentalists were mere servants holds the view that we do not promote people from the platform either to an equivalent status in genealogy [to that of the Levites] or to [such a position that they may make use of portions of] tithes. [Therefore they may be servants.]*
- J. *One who maintains that they were Levites [as much as were the singers] takes the view that [merely because a person has appeared on the platform with the Levites constitutes adequate evidence for] promotion both in regard to genealogy and in regard to tithe. [Hence they must be Levites.]*
- K. *He who takes the view that they were Israelites [of distinguished family] takes the view that we do promote a person from the platform [once he has appeared with the Levites and participated in the music] as regards genealogy but not as regards tithing. [So the genealogy matters, but caste-status does not.]*

- V.2.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “[Omission of] singing invalidates an offering,” the words of R. Meir.*
- B. And sages say, “It does not invalidate [the offering.]”
 - C. *What Scriptural verse supports the opinion of R. Meir?* “And I have given the Levites — they are given to Aaron and to his sons from among the children of Israel...and to make atonement for the children of Israel” (Num. 8:19).
 - D. Just as [omission of] the act of making atonement [through the sprinkling of the blood on the altar] invalidates an offering, so [omission of] singing invalidates an offering.
 - E. *And as to rabbis, [how do they interpret the same verse]? It pertains to an additional teaching of R. Eleazar, for R. Eleazar has said, “Just as the act of atonement is carried out by day, so the singing is carried out by day” [and that is the burden of proof carried by the reference to Levites and atonement as parallel categories in the cited verse].”*

- V.3.** A. Said Rab Judah said Samuel, “How [on the basis of Scriptural evidence] do we know that the principle that singing [is required] derives from the authority of the Torah?
- B. “As it is said [in Scripture], ‘Then he shall minister (SRT) in the name of the Lord his God’ (Deu. 18: 7). What is the form of service (SYRT) that is in the Name? One must respond that it is the service of song (SYRH).”
- C. *And might I say that it is the raising of the hands [and the blessing of the community by the priests]?*
- D. *For it is written [in Scripture], “To serve him and to say a blessing in his Name” (Deu. 10: 8). Is it possible that the blessing of the priest does not fall into the category of service? [Of course it does. Therefore, we must find a more adequate proof that singing is required by the authority of Torah.]*
- E. *R. Mattenah derives proof from the following verse, ““Because you did not serve the Lord your God in rejoicing and in a good heart’ (Deu. 28:47). Now what form of service involves rejoicing and a good heart? One must say that this refers to singing.”*
- F. *And might I say [that the specified form of service involves] [studying] words of Torah, for it is written [in Scripture], “The precepts of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart” (Psa. 19: 9)? [Hence the reference of Deu. 28:47 need not involve singing but could refer to the joy of study of Torah].*
- G. *[The teachings of the Lord] are described as “rejoicing the heart” but are not described as “goodness [of heart]. ”*
- H. *And might I say [that the service referred to above is the bringing off] first fruits, for it is written [in Scripture] “And you shall rejoice in all the good [which the Lord your God has given you]” (Deu. 26:11)?*
- I. *[No, the service mentioned above does not refer to the bringing of the first fruit because] that is described as “good” but not “good for the heart. ”*
- V.4.** A. Said R. Mattenah, “How do we know [on the basis of Scriptural evidence] that the [bringing of] first fruits involves singing?
- B. *“I derive the requisite proof from the use of the word ‘good’ as it appears in the present context [and in reference to bringing the first fruits]. [In regard to the latter, the word ‘goodness’ occurs in the commandment to bring the first fruits. Hence just as ‘goodness’ involves singing, so the use of the word ‘goodness’ in reference to bringing the first fruits would indicate that singing accompanies the rite.]”*
- C. *Can this [= A] be true? Now lo, [to the contrary,] said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, “How do we know [on the basis of Scripture] that people recite [in the Temple rites] only in connection with wine? As it is said [in Scripture], ‘And the vine said to them, Should I leave my wine, which cheers God and man’ (Jud. 9:13). Now if the wine makes man happy, how does wine make God happy? [It is through the singing that goes with the libation.] On the basis of the foregoing verse we conclude that people [minister through] song only in connection with wine [used in the sanctuary].”*
- D. *[No, it indeed] is entirely possible, in accord with that which R. Yosé repeated as a Tannaite tradition: ““[You shall bring of the fruit of the ground’ (Deu. 26: 2)*

means] that you may bring fruit, but not juice. If [nonetheless] one brought grapes but then pressed them, how do we know [that he has carried out his obligation]? Scripture states, ‘Which you will bring,’ [implying that you need only bring the fruit, but once you have brought it, you may press it into wine] (Deu. 26: 2).

- V.5.** A. [How do we know that singing is part of the ministry of the sanctuary,] *Hezekiah said, “[Proof derives] from the following verse: ‘And Chenaniah, chief of the Levites, was in charge of the song; he was master [yasor] in the song, because he was skillful’ (1Ch. 15:22). Do not read yasor but yashir, [that is, he sang, being in charge of the song. This would prove that singing was integral to the service of the sanctuary.]”*
- B. Balvati [sic! said R. Yohanan [said], “[Proof for the same proposition is] from the following: ‘To do the work of service’ (Num. 4:47). What is the service that requires yet more acts of work? One must say it is the singing. [That is, one must do the work, singing, that involves yet more work, that is, acts of service, specifically, those involving the offering of the sacrifice.]”
- C. R. Isaac said, “[Proof for the same proposition is] from the following: ‘Take up the melody and sound the timbrel, the sweet harp with the psaltery’ (Psa. 81: 3).”
- D. R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “[The proof derives] from here, ‘Those yonder lift up their voice, they sing for joy; for the majesty of the Lord they shout from the sea’ (Isa. 24:14).”
- E. *One Tanna derived proof from the following verse, “But to the sons of Kohath he gave none, because the service of the holy things belonged to them; they lifted them up upon their shoulders’ (Num. 7: 9). Now from the statement, ‘...upon their shoulders,’ would I not have known that they lifted them up? When then does Scripture say, ‘They lifted them up’? The language of ‘lifting up’ bears the meaning only of singing.*
- F. “And so too [in this same sense of the word], [Scripture] says, ‘Take up the melody and sound the timbrel’ (Psa. 81: 3), and it further says, ‘They take up their voices, they sing for joy’ (Isa. 24:14).”
- G. Hananiah, nephew of R. Joshua, said, “[The proof derives] from the following verse: ‘Moses [a Levite] spoke and God answered him by a voice’ (Exo. 19:19), that is to say, **[11B]** concerning matters dealing with the voice [that is, singing].”
- H. *R. Ashi said, “[The proof derives] from the following verse: ‘It came to pass when the trumpeters and singers were as one to make one sound to be heard’ (2Ch. 5:13).”*
- I. *R. Jonathan said, “[The proof derives] from the following verse: ‘That they not die, neither they nor you’ (Num. 18: 3). [The context involves priests and Levites, and the only form of service done by Levites was singing.] Just as you [the priests] are subject to carrying out work at the altar, so they are subject to carrying out work at the altar [and the work they do is the singing].”*
- J. *There is a teaching under Tannaitic authority to the same effect: “They not die, neither they nor you” (Num. 18: 3). When you [get involved] in their [assigned tasks], or they [get involved] in your [assigned tasks], the death penalty is incurred.*

- K. When they are involved in their tasks [other than those specifically assigned to them, though within their category], they are not subject to the death penalty but are subject to admonition.

V.6. A. *[Commenting on the foregoing teaching], Abayye said, “We hold [the position that] a singer [who was a Levite] who kept the gate [which was the task of] his fellow [Levite] he is subject to the death penalty, as it is said, ‘And those who were to pitch before the tabernacle eastward before the tent of meeting [toward the sunrise were Moses and Aaron...and the stranger who came near was to be put to death]’ (Num. 3:38).*

B. *“Now what does ‘the stranger who came near shall be put to death’ mean? If we say it is an actual stranger [to all the cultic castes], has that not been written another time [at Num. 3:10: ‘The stranger who comes near shall be put to death’]? Rather, does it not mean a ‘stranger’ to that particular form of service?”*

C. *[An authority who concurred in the view of J] raised an objection [to Abayye’s position] from the following: “A singer [of the Levitical caste] who guarded the gate [of the Temple] and a gate keeper [of the Levitical caste] who participated in the ministry of song are subject not to the death penalty but to an admonition.”*

D. *In fact, the matter is subject to dispute among Tannaite authorities, for we have the following Tannaite teaching:*

E. *There was the case in which R. Joshua bar Hananiah went to assist in the fastening of the Temple gates along with R. Yohanan b. Gudeguda [since both Joshua and Yohanan were Levites]. He said to him, “Go back, my son, because you are in the classification of singers and not in the classification of door-keepers.” [It would therefore appear that Joshua assumed he might participate in the closing of the gates, even though he was a Levite assigned to singing, and Yohanan took the view that, not falling into the stated category, Joshua should not do the labor of the door keepers. Hence we have a dispute among authorities of Tannaite status about the matter at hand.]*

F. *Is it not the case, then, that the dispute lay in the following matter: one master maintained the view that it was an infraction penalized by death, on which account rabbis made a decree [against violating the rule], while the other master maintained that it was an infraction subject only to an admonition, on which account rabbis made no such decree? [That would validate the view of D.]*

G. *[Now, that is not what is at issue]. All parties concur that it is a matter of admonition.*

H. *One authority took the view, however, that, so as to enforce the admonition, rabbis made a decree regarding the matter, while the other authority took the view that rabbis made no such decree.*

V.7. A. *R. Abin raised the following question: “Must a burnt-offering voluntarily brought by the community [that is, not an obligatory one brought in fulfillment of the community’s responsibility to bring a burnt-offering] be accompanied by song, or need it not be accompanied by song?*

B. *“[The reasoning is as follows for each of the two possibilities:] ‘Your burnt-offerings...’ (Num. 10:10) is what the All-Merciful has stated, imposing one rule*

both upon the burnt-offering brought in fulfillment of an obligation and one brought as a freewill-offering.

- C. *“Or perhaps [when Scripture refers to] ‘Your burnt-offerings,’ [it speaks only] of the burnt-offerings of the entire community of Israel [but not of a voluntary offering, whether brought by an individual or brought by the community at large]. [That then is the question at hand.]”*
- D. *Come and pay heed [to the evidence of Scripture and the following possible reply:] “And Hezekiah commanded to offer the burnt-offering upon the altar. And when the burnt-offering began, the song of the Lord began also, and the trumpets, together with the instruments of David, king of Israel” (2Ch. 29:27).*
- E. *Now in the present context what is this song doing? If I maintain that, in context, we speak of a burnt-offering brought in fulfillment of the communal obligation, what need do I have for reference to consultation [and then Hezekiah’s decision and instruction? Such an offering is brought automatically, every day. Why consult Hezekiah?] Rather, does the passage not speak of a burnt-offering brought voluntarily [and, we see, it was accompanied by song]?*
- F. *Said R. Joseph, “No, [that reasoning is not necessarily correct. For] it was the burnt-offering brought in connection with the celebration of the new moon. And this is what was troubling [those who consulted Hezekiah, even though it was indeed a communal obligation]: whether or not the new moon had been properly designated at the right time so that the offering in fact should be made.” [They consulted Hezekiah about whether the calendar was reliable.]*
- G. *[Rejecting this theory of the matter, that at hand was celebration of the new moon,] Abayye said, “And you can say this at all? And has it not been written, ‘And on the sixteenth day of the first month they made an end...then Hezekiah commanded to offer the burnt-offering upon the altar...’ (2Ch. 29:17). [Clearly this was not in celebration of the first day of the month.]”*
- H. *[Now that Joseph’s explanation has been dismissed, we proceed to explain the consultation in a different way.] But, said Rami son of R. Yeba, “The issue at hand concerns the lamb that is brought [as an obligatory burnt-offering] along with the offering of the sheaf of first grain.*
- I. *“[The consultation concerned] whether or not the new moon had been properly designated at the right time, so that the offering should be made.”*
- J. *[Pointing out the flaw in this interpretation], R. Awia objected, “But people should have paid attention to the matter of the Passover offering itself! How [if they were at all in doubt as to the accuracy of setting the calendar] could they have prepared it! And as to the unleavened bread, how could they have eaten it!”*
- L. *Rather, said R. Ashi, “[The case of the inquiry to Hezekiah may be compared] to the [courteous inquiry] of the [liturgical] messenger of the community, when he inquires [requesting whether it is time to start the prayer, even though he clearly knows it is proper to do so. Along these same lines, Hezekiah gave formal permission to do what in fact everyone knew should be done. Assuredly, there was no doubt about the timing of the new month. Then Joseph’s objection, F, is null, and the reasoning of E is validated. So a burnt-offering brought voluntarily is accompanied by song.]”*

- M. *Once you have come to that point, [however,] you may say that we speak even of a burnt-offering brought as an obligation of the community. Here too it may be compared to the case of the [liturgical] messenger of the community, who inquires [about whether it is time for the prayer, even though he knows that it is, with the inquiry a matter of mere courtesy. So nothing has been proved, D-M, and we revert to the basic issue again.]*
- N. *Come and pay heed [to proof that a burnt-offering voluntarily brought by the community is to be accompanied by song. The proof derives from a historical precedent, which is now spelled out.]*
- O. R. Yosé says, “[In Heaven] they center meritorious events for a day or merit, and guilt-ridden events for a day of guilt.
- P. “They say: The very day on which the first temple was destroyed was the ninth of Ab, after the Sabbath [Sunday] and after the Sabbatical year [the first year of a new seven-year cycle], in the priestly watch of Jehoiarib. The priests and Levites were standing on their platform and reciting a song. What was the song that they sang? ‘And he has brought upon them their iniquity and will cut them off in their evil’ (Psa. 94:23). Even before they could complete [the singing, with the words,] ‘The Lord our God will cut them off,’ the enemies came and overcame them.
- Q. “And so it happened the second time [in 70].”
- R. *[We now revert to the issue at hand, which is whether or not a song accompanies a burnt-offering brought voluntarily.] Now what was the song doing here? If we wish to hypothesize that it was a burnt-offering brought as an obligation of the community, was there any such thing [on the ninth of Ab]? On the seventeenth of Tammuz, [earlier that summer] the daily burnt-offering had been annulled [so, lacking sacrificial animals, there was no communal burnt-offering brought as an obligation]. Accordingly, was it not a burnt-offering brought voluntarily? [And we therefore see that, for such an offering as well, a song is to be sung].*
- S. *And is this your theory of the matter? What difference can there have been between the burnt-offering brought as a communal obligation, which was not carried out, and a burnt-offering brought voluntarily, which [in accord with your reading of the matter], was carried out? [Surely if they could not get an animal for the one purpose, they could not have gotten one for the other.]*
- T. *No, there is no problem. A young ox may have fortuitously come to hand [and served as an extraordinary, voluntary burnt-offering, even though a regular, an animal for everyday communal offering was not available].*
- U. *Said Raba, and some say, R. Ashi, “But do you maintain the view that it was the psalm regularly assigned to that day of the week? [Surely not,] for the song assigned to the day of the week [Sunday] was, ‘The earth is the Lord’s, and the fulness thereof (Psa. 24: 1). But the song that they sang was, ‘And he brought upon them their iniquity’ (Psa. 94:23), which belongs to Wednesday [and not to Sunday, on which the events took place]!*
- V. *“Accordingly, it was merely a lamentation that happened to come to their lips [and not a regularly scheduled psalm].”*
- W. *But lo, it is stated, “They were standing on their platform,” [which would indicate that it was a regularly-scheduled psalm].*

- X. *The rule [that they followed] accords with R. Simeon b. Laqish, who said, “One may say [a song] even not in connection with an offering.”*
- Y. *Then may we apply that same principle to the question of the burnt-offering brought voluntarily [so that we should conclude a song may be said in that connection? But if so, why has the question been raised at all?]*
- Z. *But [if that were the case], confusion would result [in the matter of reciting psalms.]*
- AA. *What is the upshot of the matter [of Abin’s question, A]?*
- BB. *Come and hear: Rab Mari son of R. Kahana repeated [the following statement enjoying Tannaite authority]: “‘Over your burnt-offerings and your sacrifices of peace-offerings’ (Num. 10:10) — [treating the two within a single classification yields the following rules:] just as a burnt-offering falls into the category of Most Holy Things, so peace-offerings fall into the category of Most Holy Things. Just as peace-offerings are subject to a set time, so burnt-offerings are subject to a set time. [Burnt-offerings that come at a fixed time require a song, but burnt-offerings not at a fixed time do not require a song.]”*
- V.8.** A. **[12A]** *The question was raised: Do libations that are offered by themselves [without an accompanying sacrifice] require song or do they not require song?*
- B. *Since R. Samuel bar Nahman said R. Jonathan said [at 4.C], “How do we know [on the basis of Scripture] that people recite song [in the Temple rites] only in connection with wine?...” etc., may we rule that we do say a psalm in the present connection?*
- C. *Or perhaps in connection with [sacrifices producing both] eating and drinking, we say [psalms], but in connection with those in which there is drinking alone [libations without meat-offering], we do not do so?*
- D. *Come and hear: R. Yosé says, “[In Heaven] they center meritorious events for a day of merit and guilt-ridden events for a day of guilt” etc.*
- E. *Now what indeed was the song doing here? If we wish to hypothesize that it was a burnt-offering brought as an obligation of the community, was there any such thing [on the ninth of Ab]? On the seventeenth of Tammuz [earlier that summer] the daily burnt-offering was annulled. Accordingly, was it not a burnt-offering brought voluntarily?*
- F. *[We shall now show that it was not a burnt-offering brought voluntarily,] And lo, Rab Mari, son of R. Kahana, repeated..., so that it did not require a song. Thus must it not have been a song in connection with libations?*
- G. *Said Raba, and some say, R. Ashi, “But do you maintain the view that it was the psalm regularly assigned to that day of the week? [Surely not,] for the song of the day of the week was, ‘The earth is the Lord’s, and the fulness thereof’ (Psa. 24: 1). But the song that they sang belongs to Wednesday [and not to Sunday, on which the events took place].*
- H. *“Accordingly, it was not merely a lamentation that came to their lips [and not a regularly-scheduled psalm].”*
- I. *But lo, it is stated, “They were standing on their platform,” [which would indicate that it was a regularly-scheduled psalm].*

- J. *The rule [that they followed] accords with R. Simeon b. Laqish, who said, "One may say [a song] even not in connection with an offering."*
- K. *But [if that were not the case, may we not say that confusion would result in the matter of libations as well.*

We now work our way through an appendix to the foregoing.

- V.9.** A. *[Reverting to the] body [of above-cited materials,] R. Yosé says, "[In Heaven] they center meritorious events for a day of merit and guilt-ridden events for a day of guilt, etc... In the case of the first destruction, it was after the Sabbath and after the Sabbatical year."*
- B. *Is that really the case [that it was the first year of the seven-year cycle]?*
- C. *Has it not been written [in Scripture], "In the twenty-fifth year of our captivity, in the beginning of the year, in the tenth day of the month, in the fourteenth year after the city had been smitten" [Eze. 40: 1, the year the sanctuary was destroyed].*
- D. *Now what is the year, the first day of which falls on the tenth of the month [and not on the first of Tishré]? One must say that it is the Jubilee year [on which the new year coincides with the Day of Atonement, and thus it could not have been the first year of the seven-year cycle, as A has maintained].*
- E. *Now if you maintain that it was in the first year of the seven year cycle that the Temple was destroyed, from the first year of one cycle to the first year of the next cycle are eight years, and from the first year of the first cycle to the first year of the cycle thereafter, fifteen years. [But Ezekiel speaks of the fourteenth year after the city had been smitten, not the fifteenth. So there are two problems in A].*
- F. *Said Rabina, "[Ezekiel referred to] the fourteenth year after the year in which the city was smitten."*
- G. *If so, then rather than speaking of the twenty-fifth year of our captivity, he should speak of the twenty-sixth year [on the same principle].*
- H. *[The foregoing question — that it was the twenty-sixth year — is now reinforced,] for a master has said, "They were exiled in the seventh year, the eighth year, the eighteenth year, the nineteenth year. Now from the seventh to the eighteenth year are eleven years. Add fifteen, and you have twenty-six years."*
- I. *Rabina would say to you that, even according to your reckoning, there is no problem. They were exiled also in the nineteenth year. So from the seventh to the nineteenth are twelve years, to which you add fourteen, so you come up with twenty-six years. It follows that [to make sense of Ezekiel's statement] you have to conclude that [the reckoning] is exclusive of the year in which they actually were exiled.*
- J. *In my view also the reckoning excludes the year in which they were actually exiled.*
- K. *In any event the figure of nineteen poses a problem to Rabina [Jung: "For if he counts from seven to nineteen he finds twelve years, which with fourteen added again are twenty-six"].*
- L. *[No, that is no problem]. Do you take for granted there were three exiles? [There were two.] They were exiled in the seventh year after the conquest of Jehoiakim, which is the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar. They were exiled in the*

eighteenth year of the conquest of Jehoiakim, which is the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar.

- M. *For a master has taught on Tannaite authority: "In the first year [of his reign] [Nebuchadnezzar] conquered Nineveh, [12B] and in the second, he came up and conquered Jehoiakim."*

V.10. A. And so it was in the case of the second Temple:.

- B. *And do you find in fact that in the case of the destruction of the second Temple it was the first year of the sabbatical cycle ["after the Sabbatical year"]?*
- C. *[For this is the problem:] For how many years did the second Temple stand? It was for four hundred twenty-years. Now four hundred years constitute eight [fifty-year] jubilee [intervals], and fourteen years, an additional two spans of seven years, leaving six years over. [It must follow that the second Temple was destroyed] in the sixth year of the sabbatical cycle [and not in the first year].*
- D. *Lo, in accord with whose calculation does the afore-stated reckoning follow? It is that of R. Judah. For he has stated, "The fiftieth year [of a jubilee] counts on both sides [that is, as the last year of one jubilee-cycle and the first year of the next]."*
- E. *So you take together those eight years of the eight jubilee intervals and the six left over, and that produces fourteen years. Thus it turns out that the destruction of the second Temple took place in the first year of the sabbatical cycle.*
- F. *If, [however, the calculation at hand derives from the view of] R. Judah, then you cannot find [a calculation that will yield the date of the first year of the sabbatical cycle for the destruction] of the first [Temple].*
- G. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: "The Israelites counted seventeen septennates from the time that they entered the Land until they left it.*
- H. *"But you cannot maintain the position that they [actually] began counting from the moment at which they entered the Land, for, if you do so, it turns out that the Temple was destroyed at the beginning of a Jubilee cycle [not merely the first year of a sabbatical cycle, but the first year of a jubilee cycle,] in which case you cannot square matters with the statement [of Ezekiel], "In the fourteenth year, after the city was smitten" (Eze. 40: 1). [That is, the destruction took place fourteen years after a Jubilee had started]."*
- I. *Rather, [to find out when the count began] deduct from the total of years the seven in which the Israelites conquered the land and the seven further years in which they divided it up, so you come out with exactly the year specified by Ezekiel: "In the fourteenth year, after the city was smitten."*
- J. *[Now that the accurate count has been located, we return to Judah's view.] According to R. Judah [reckoning the status of the fiftieth year of one jubilee as the first of the next, as he does], you have to count the seventeen years of the seventeen jubilee cycles and add them to these. For him, therefore, it comes out that the destruction took place in the third year of a sabbatical cycle [and not in the first].*
- K. *[The following is the reply in Judah's behalf:] The years from the time that Sennacherib exiled them until the time of Jeremiah returned them are not taken into account. [Jung, p. 69, n. 3: According to tradition Jeremiah restored the ten tribes in the eighteenth year of King Josiah. With their return began the counting*

of a new jubilee cycle to mark the renewed observance of the laws of the year of release and jubilee which had fallen into disuse while the Northern Kingdom was in exile. The Temple was destroyed 36 years later so that “the fourteenth year after that the city was smitten” fell in the jubilee year.]

- L. *Alternatively, if you wish, I may posit that matters indeed follow the reckoning of rabbis. As to the statement [with which we began, “And so it was in the case of the second Temple,”], that refers [not to the matter of the Sabbatical year cycle, but only to the fact that it took place at the end of the Sabbath and on the ninth of Ab, thus,] the other matters.*
- M. *That thesis indeed is most reasonable, for if you do not maintain it, can we say that the priestly watch of Jehoiarib [when his priestly family took charge of the Temple service] took place in the second Temple? [It was limited to activity in the first Temple, but the watch was excluded from the second Temple.] For has it not been taught: Four priestly watches came up from the Exile: Jediah, Harim, Pashhur, and Immer [Ezr. 2:36-39]. The prophets who were in Jerusalem went and divided them into twenty-four watches, mixed up lots, and placed them in an urn. Jediah came and took five, in addition to himself, so, lo, there are six here. **[13A]** Harim came along and took five, in addition to himself, so, lo, there are six. Pashhur came along and took five, in addition to himself, so, lo, there are six. Immer came along and took five, in addition to himself, so, lo, there are six. And so the prophets stipulated with them, that even if Jehoiarib should come up from the Exile, not one of them would be removed on his account, but he would be made subordinate to him [T. Ta. 2:1].*
- N. *So [it must follow that the statement at hand, about the second Temple] refers to the remaining matters [but not to those under discussion up to this point].*
- O. *R. Ashi said, “The six years before Ezra came up and consecrated [the Temple] do not count, [since it was only when Ezra returned that the laws of the years of release and the jubilee were reinstated], for it is written, ‘Then the work of the house of God which is at Jerusalem ceased’ (Ezr. 4:24), and it also is written, ‘And this house was finished on the third day of the month of Adar, which was in the sixth year of the reign of king Darius’ (Ezr. 6:15).”*
- P. *“And a Tanna [repeated], ‘At that season in the coming year Ezra with the community of the exiles went up [to the Land], as it is said, “And he came to Jerusalem in the fifth month, which was in the seventh year of the king” (Ezra 7: 8).”’ [Jung, p. 70, n. 7: R. Ashi holds that the statement ‘the same happened with the second Temple’ refers also to the termination of the jubilee, and explains it by deducting six years from the total of 420.]*
- Q. *[Reverting to the] body [of the text cited above,] The Israelites counted seventeen septennates from the time that they entered the Land until they left it. But you cannot maintain the position that they began counting from the moment at which they entered the Land, for, if you do so, it turns out that the Temple was destroyed at the beginning of a Jubilee cycle, in which case you cannot square matters with the statement [of Ezekiel], “In the fourteenth year, after the city was smitten” (Eze. 40: 1).*
- R. How do we know that it took seven years to conquer the Land?

- S. Caleb said, "I was forty years old when Moses, the servant of the Lord, sent me from Kadesh-Barnea to spy out the land...(Jos. 14: 7), and now, lo, I am this day eighty-five years old" (Jos. 14:10).
- T. And a master said, "In the first year [after the exodus] Moses built the tabernacle, in the second, the tabernacle was raised up, and he sent out the spies. So when Caleb crossed the Jordan, how old was he? He was eighty less two years old since the Israelites were in the wilderness forty years].
- U. *When he gave out the inheritances, this is what he said:* "I am eighty-five years old."
- V. *It therefore comes out that* it took them seven years to conquer the Land.
- W. And how do we know that it took them seven years to divide it up?
- X. *If you wish, I may reply that,* since it took seven years to conquer [the Land], it should also take seven years to divide [it].
- Y. *If you like, I may say,* because otherwise how will you locate backing for the statement, "In the fourteenth year after the city was smitten."

The Talmud systematically works its way through the statements and themes of the Mishnah-paragraph at hand. Having completed the discussion of both the statement of the Mishnah and its associated Tosefta-materials, the framer proceeds to the next passage of the Mishnah-paragraph on which he wishes to comment, M. 2:4A. The discussion is systematic and logical. All of the units that follow carry on the theme of the ministry of song in the Temple service, constituting an anthology on that subject. It goes without saying that whatever is assembled here has been selected from ready-made materials.

2:5

- A. **They do not use less than six inspected lambs in the chamber of the lambs,**
- B. **sufficient for the Sabbath and for two festival days of the New Year.**
- C. **But they may use more than that number without limit.**
- D. **They do not use less than two trumpets.**
- E. **[B. lacks:] But they may use more than that number without limit.**
- F. **They do not use less than nine harps.**
- G. **But they use more than that number without limit.**
- H. **And as to the cymbals: one alone.**
- I.1. A. [With reference to M. **2:5B**, **sufficient for the Sabbath and for two festival days of the New Year**, we ask:] *But [the number of offerings required for] daily whole offerings and additional offerings [on the cited holy days] is greater [than the specified quantity of lambs].*
- B. *The Tanna[ite author of the passage] refers only to ordinary days and only to daily whole offerings.*
- C. *What then is the sense of **sufficient for the Sabbath and for two festival days of the New Year** [M. **2:5B**]?*
- D. *He meant to provide a mnemonic device, and this is his meaning: They do not use less than six [13B] inspected lambs in the chamber of the lambs [keeping them available] for four days prior to the actual slaughter [in the rite of the Temple].*

- E. *And in accord with whose view [is the statement at hand framed]?*
- F. *It accords with the opinion of Ben Bag Bag, for it has been taught in a Tannaite statement:*
- G. Ben Bag Bag says, “How do we know [upon the basis of Scripture] that an animal set aside as a daily whole offering is supposed to be inspected for four days prior to the actual slaughter [of the beast at the altar]? Scripture says, ‘You will observe to offer me in its due season’ (Num. 28: 2, speaking of the daily whole offering), and it further is said, ‘And you shall have it for yourself as an object of observance until the fourteenth day of the same month’ (Exo. 12: 6, in respect to the lamb set aside for a passover offering). Just as in the latter case the beast is supposed to be examined for four days prior to the actual slaughter, so in the present case [in which the beast is to be observed], the animal is supposed to be inspected for four days prior to the actual slaughter.”
- H. *From the language used in the Mishnah-passage itself, [we may draw the same conclusion] also, for it is stated [M. 2:5B]: sufficient for the Sabbath and not “for the Sabbath.”*
- I. *From that fact it certainly is to be inferred [that matters are as specified].*
The clause of the Mishnah is given a full clarification; nothing is extraneous.

2:6

- A. **They do not have less than twelve Levites standing on the platform.**
- B. **But they may have more than that number without limit.**
- C. **A [Levite]-child enters the courtyard for service only when the Levites are standing and singing.**
- D. **And they [the minors] did not say [the songs] with harp and lyre, but only a capella, so as to add spice to the music.**
- E. **R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “They were not included in the [requisite] number, and they did not stand on the platform.**
- F. **“But they stood on the ground, with their heads between the feet of the Levites [above them on the platform],**
- G. **“and they were called ‘Junior Levites’ [S’YRY ...; alt.: tormentors — SW’RY...].”**
- I.1 A.** [Referring to the twelve Levites, M. 2:6A, **They do not have less than twelve Levites standing on the platform**, we ask:] *To what do these [twelve] correspond?*
- B. Said R. Papa, “To the nine lyres, two harps, and one cymbal,
- C. “as it is said, ‘He and his brothers and sons were twelve’ (1Ch. 25: 9).”
- II.1 A.** **A Levite-child enters the courtyard for service only when the Levites are standing and singing [M. 2:6C]:**
- B. *What is the scriptural source for this view?*
- C. Said R. Yohanan, “It is in line with the following verse of Scripture: ‘Then stood Joshua with his sons and brothers, and Kadmiel and his sons, the sons of Judah together, to oversee the workmen in the house of God’ (Ezr. 3: 9).”

- III.1 A.** And the minors did not say the songs with harp and lyre, but only a capella, so as to add spice to the music [M. 2:6D]:
- B. *Does this then imply that the harp and the lyre are distinct instruments? [If so,] the formulation of the Mishnah-passage at hand does not accord with the view of R. Judah.*
 - C. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - D. **R. Judah says, “The harp of the sanctuary had seven cords, as it is said, ‘Fulness (SWB’) of joy is before you’ (Psa. 16:11). Read not ‘fulness (SWB’)’ but ‘seven (SB’)’.**
 - E. **“And the one to be used in the time of the messiah will have eight, as it is said, ‘For the leader on the Sheminith’ (Psa. 12: 1) — the eighth string.**
 - F. **“The one used in the time of the world to come will have ten, as it is said, ‘With an instrument of ten strings and with the psaltery, and with the sound upon the harp’ (Psa. 92: 4) [T. Ar. 2:7].**
 - G. *“And it is further said, ‘Give thanks to the Lord with a harp, sing praises to him with the psaltery of ten strings, sing to him a new song, play skillfully amid sounds of joy’ (Psa. 33:2-3).”*
 - H. *You may even maintain the view that R. Judah [accords with the present formulation]. [How so?] Since, in the world to come, when it will have more strings than it does now, so that its sound will be strong, it is called a harp, he even now calls it a harp.*

IV.1 A. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “They were not included in the requisite number [M. 2:6E]:

- B. *A Tanna repeated: And they were called the assisting (SW’RDY) Levites.*
- C. *But the Tanna who repeated the passage before us, because their voice is high, but [the Levites’ voices] were low, these could sing high, but these could not sing high, called them tormentors (S’RY)[of the Levites] [cf. T. Ar. 2:2B].*

The Talmud’s four units systematically work their way through selected statements of the Mishnah and comment episodically.