

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 2a

### CHAPTER I

MISHNAH. SEVEN DAYS BEFORE THE DAY OF ATONEMENT THE HIGH PRIEST WAS REMOVED FROM HIS HOUSE TO THE CELL OF THE COUNSELLORS<sup>1</sup> AND ANOTHER PRIEST WAS PREPARED TO TAKE HIS PLACE IN CASE ANYTHING<sup>2</sup> HAPPENED TO HIM [THE HIGH PRIEST] THAT WOULD UNFIT HIM [FOR THE SERVICE]. R. JUDAH SAID: ALSO ANOTHER WIFE WAS PREPARED FOR HIM IN CASE HIS WIFE SHOULD DIE. FOR IT IS WRITTEN,<sup>3</sup> AND HE SHALL MAKE ATONEMENT FOR HIMSELF AND FOR HIS HOUSE. 'HIS HOUSE THAT MEANS 'HIS WIFE'. THEY SAID TO HIM: IF SO THERE WOULD BE NO END TO THE MATTER.<sup>4</sup>

GEMARA. We learned elsewhere: Seven days before the burning of the [red] heifer<sup>5</sup> the priest who was to burn the heifer was removed from his house to the cell in the north-eastern corner before the Birah.<sup>6</sup> It was called the cell of the stone chamber.<sup>7</sup> And why was it called the cell of the stone chamber? Because all its functions [in connection with the red heifer] had to be performed only in vessels made of either cobble-stones,<sup>8</sup> stone or earthenware. What was the reason [for that restriction]? Since a tebul-yom<sup>9</sup> was permitted to [perform the ceremony of] the heifer, as we have learnt:<sup>10</sup> They [deliberately] rendered the priest ritually impure to remove [a false notion] from the minds of the Sadducees, who used to say: 'Only by those on whom the sun has set could it be performed', the Rabbis ordained that only vessels made of cobble-stones, stone, or earthenware which are immune to impurity — should be used in connection with the heifer, lest the ceremony thereof be treated slightly.<sup>11</sup>

Why [was the ceremony performed] in the north-eastern corner? — Since the heifer was a sin-offering<sup>12</sup> and a sin-offering had to be sacrificed in the northern corner, whereas, on the other hand, it is written about the heifer,<sup>13</sup> Towards the front of the tent of meeting,<sup>14</sup> the Rabbis ordained [for the heifer] a cell in the northeastern corner, so that [the special importance of this ceremony] be clearly recognized.

What is Birah? — Rabbah b. Bar Hana in the name of R. Johanan said: There was a place on the Temple mount called Birah. Resh Lakish said: The whole sanctuary is called Birah, as it is written, And to build the Birah for which I have made provision.<sup>15</sup>

Whence is it proved<sup>16</sup> that it is necessary to remove the priest [from his house]? — R. Minyumi b. Hilkiyah in the name of R. Mahsiah b. Idi, in the name of R. Johanan said: The text reads:<sup>17</sup> As hath been done this day, so the Lord hath commanded to do, to make atonement for you;<sup>18</sup> the work la'asoth [to do] refers to the matter of the [red] heifer, the words lekapper 'alekem [to make atonement for you] refer to the work of the Day of Atonement. It is obvious that the whole of this text could not be taken as referring to the heifer, because of the words 'to atone' and the heifer has nothing to do with atonement. But let us assume that the whole text<sup>19</sup> refers to the Day of Atonement? — They said [in answer to this suggestion]: One may infer from, the fact that the identical expression ziwvah [he commanded] is used.<sup>20</sup> Here<sup>21</sup> it is written: The Lord ziwvah [commanded] to do,<sup>22</sup> and there<sup>23</sup> it is written: This is the statute of the law which the Lord ziwvah [has commanded]:<sup>24</sup> just as in the latter [passage ziwvah] refers to the heifer, so does it in the former refer to the heifer, and just as the removal [of the priest is enjoined] in the one, so must the removal [of the priest apply] to the other.

---

(1) Parhedrin (Gr. \*\*), assessors, counselors. V. infra 8b. [According to Abba Saul (Mid. V, 4 cf. Bertinoro a.l.) it was identical with the wood chamber on the south of the Temple Court. It has also been identified with the Chamber of Hewn Stones, the seat of the Sanhedrin. V. Buchler, *Das Synedrion*, p. 23ff]

- (2) Impurity.
- (3) Lev. XVI, 6.
- (4) His second wife too might die.
- (5) Num. XIX, 2.
- (6) The Temple. V. I Chron. XXIX, 1. J. Pes. 35a; Zeb. 119a.
- (7) [Mishnah Parah omits 'cell'.]
- (8) Or 'vessels made of dung'.
- (9) Lit., 'one who has bathed in the daytime (but must wait for sunset to be perfectly clean)'. The Sadducees would exclude him from service at either ceremony until after sunset.
- (10) Parah III, 7.
- (11) Due to the feeling that since a tebul-yom was admitted, its degree of sanctity may not be too high.
- (12) It is a 'hattath', this word meaning here purification, may also be translated as 'sin-offering'. Num. XIX, 9
- (13) Ibid. XIX, 4.
- (14) Lying east.
- (15) I Chron. XXIX, 19.
- (16) Both for the service of the Day of Atonement and the red heifer ceremony.
- (17) With reference to the seven days of the consecration of the Tabernacle in the wilderness.
- (18) Lev. VIII, 34.
- (19) Ibid.
- (20) On the Rabbinic inference from analogy, gezerah shawah, v. Glos.
- (21) In connection with the consecration ceremonies.
- (22) Lev. VIII, 34.
- (23) In connection with the red heifer.
- (24) Num. XIX, 2.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 2b**

But perhaps say that [the word] *ziwwah*<sup>1</sup> [he commanded] has reference to [the word] *ziwwah* which occurs in connection with the Day of Atonement,<sup>2</sup> since the verse reads,<sup>3</sup> And he did as the Lord *ziwwah* [commanded] Moses?<sup>4</sup> — One may infer from [the word] *ziwwah* used before conformity<sup>5</sup> for another case in which *ziwwah* is used also before conformity,<sup>6</sup> but one may not infer *ziwwah* is used before conformity<sup>5</sup> for *ziwwah* used after conformity.<sup>7</sup> Perhaps *ziwwah*<sup>1</sup> has reference to sacrifices,<sup>8</sup> for it is written, On the day when the Lord *zawwotho*<sup>9</sup> [commanded] the children of Israel?<sup>10</sup> — One may fitly infer *ziwwah*<sup>6</sup> from *ziwwah*,<sup>5</sup> but one may not infer *zawwotho*<sup>11</sup> from *ziwwah*.<sup>12</sup> But what does it matter? Did not the school of R. Ishmael teach that [in the verse], The priest shall return or the priest shall come in,<sup>13</sup> 'returning' and 'coming in' mean one and the same thing?<sup>14</sup> — These words [of the school of R. Ishmael] apply only when there is no identical word,<sup>15</sup> but where such a similar word is used, the inference may be made only on the basis of absolute identity of expression. — [We stated above that the word] '*lekapper*' [to atone] has reference to the Day of Atonement. May it not refer [also]<sup>16</sup> to the atonement resulting from a sacrifice?<sup>17</sup> — How could we know which priest would happen to perform the sacrifice so that he would have to be removed [from his house]?<sup>18</sup> But why should we not really have to postulate such separation for the whole priestly division?<sup>19</sup> — It is proper to make inference from something for which a definite time is appointed<sup>20</sup> for something which similarly is fixed for a definite time.<sup>21</sup> That excludes any inference [from the consecration of the priest, an annual event] to sacrifices which are offered up every day.<sup>22</sup> Perhaps [the reference is to] the [three] festivals?<sup>23</sup> — One may infer something which takes place but once a year<sup>24</sup> from something else which took place but once a year, but inference for these festivals is excluded since they do not take place but once a year. Perhaps [the reference is] to one festival.<sup>25</sup> And if you would answer [by saying], We would not know to which [it has reference], [it would be] either the festival of Passover, which Scripture always mentions<sup>26</sup> [as the first of the three], or the feast of Sukkoth, because a great number of commandments apply to it!<sup>27</sup> -The point is, however, that you may infer the [law of the priest's] removal [from his house] for seven days before

the service which he is to perform on one day<sup>28</sup> from [another case in which the priest is] removed also for seven days for the service of one day;<sup>29</sup> but one may not fitly infer that [a priest must be] removed for seven days for the service of seven<sup>30</sup> days from the fact that a law exists obliging [the priest's] removal for seven days for the service of one day.<sup>29</sup> Yet perhaps [the reference is to] the Eighth Day<sup>31</sup> because there would be a service of only one day? — One may infer [laws concerning] a day which is not immediately preceded by another [festival] sanctity<sup>28</sup> from another day,<sup>29</sup> which similarly is not preceded by other [festival] sanctity,<sup>29</sup> but one may not infer for a day preceded by [festival] Sanctity<sup>32</sup> from a day unpreceded by such.

But [even if the inference by analogy be unjustified] is there no legitimate conclusion a *minori ad majus*, viz., if a day unpreceded by another [festival] sanctity requires [for the officiating priest] a seven day removal [from his family], how much more should a day preceded by another [festival] sanctity require it!<sup>33</sup> — R. Mesharsheya answered: Scripture expressly states this day,<sup>34</sup> that means on a day like this.<sup>35</sup> R. Ashi said:<sup>36</sup> Could there be any festival the major<sup>37</sup> part of which would require no removal [of the priest], while its attachment<sup>38</sup> would require it. And even according to the one who holds that the eighth day is [not a mere attachment to Sukkoth, but] an independent festival day, that applies only to

- 
- (1) Written in connection with the consecrations.
  - (2) So that the whole passage of Lev. VIII, 34 refers to that day.
  - (3) Lev. XVI, 34.
  - (4) To justify inference from identity of phrase or word, there must be in the two texts a certain identity of circumstance.
  - (5) As in Lev. VIII, 34 where the phrase is, 'He commanded to do'.
  - (6) As in the case of the red heifer where too it is, 'He commanded to do'.
  - (7) As in the case with the Day of Atonement, where the text is, 'and he did as the Lord commanded'.
  - (8) So that every priest should require separation before offering a public sacrifice.
  - (9) From the same root as *ziwwah*. Lit., 'His commanding'.
  - (10) Ibid. VII, 38.
  - (11) V. nn. 14 and 15.
  - (12) To justify inference by *gezerah shawah* there must be exact identity of expression.
  - (13) Ibid. Xlv, 39.
  - (14) For the purposes of inference v. Hor., Sonc. ed., p. 57, n. 11. So that such literalness as the insistence on differentiation between *ziwwah* and *zawwotho* is not justified.
  - (15) From the congruity of which an analogy may be inferred.
  - (16) V. Tosaf. Yesh.
  - (17) Offered by an individual for atonement (Rashi); so that every priest would need such removal before sacrificing.
  - (18) The priests were assigned their service by means of a lot. V. infra 22a.
  - (19) Because the task may come to anyone by the allotment. And thus the question remains, perhaps the word 'lekapper' applies also to the atonement of a sacrifice, cf. n. 3.
  - (20) The consecration of the priests.
  - (21) The Day of Atonement.
  - (22) There are many sacrifices offered up by the individuals.
  - (23) [Since the sacrifices offered on festivals serve for atonement, v. Shebu. 2a-b.]
  - (24) [The consecration of the priests 'once a year' is not to be taken literally; it means once in that particular year in which the consecration was held.]
  - (25) Which is an annual event.
  - (26) Ex. XXIII, 15; Lev. XXIII, 5; Num. XXVIII, 16; Deut. XVI, 1.
  - (27) The laws touching the booths, the citron, myrtle, palm-branch and willow of the brook; the ceremony of the libation, etc.
  - (28) The Day of Atonement.
  - (29) I.e., the eighth day of the Consecration, v. Lev. IX, 1ff.
  - (30) Passover or Sukkoth.

- (31) Shemini 'Azereth. The Eighth Day of the Solemn Assembly celebrated after the seventh day of the Festival of Booths (Sukkoth), in which case the inference would appear legitimate.
- (32) Shemini Azereth is preceded by the seven days of Sukkoth.
- (33) Shemini 'Azereth, which is preceded by the seven days of Sukkoth.
- (34) Lev. VIII, 34.
- (35) Confirming the earlier differentiation.
- (36) Countering the suggestion that the reference is to Shemini 'Azereth.
- (37) Sukkoth has seven days preceding the one day of 'Azereth.
- (38) Shemini 'Azereth.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 3a

Pe'Z'R'K'Sh'B,<sup>1</sup> but in matters of complementing the sacrifice of the festival, the eighth day is but a continuation of the first day, as we have learned: He who failed to offer up the festival sacrifice<sup>2</sup> on the first day of the feast [of Sukkoth], may do so during the entire festive season including the last day of the feast.<sup>3</sup>

[Perhaps] say [that the reference is to] Pentecost,<sup>4</sup> because that would also mean removal of the priest for seven days preceding a one-day service?<sup>5</sup> — R. Abba said: One may fitly infer a case<sup>6</sup> in which one ox and one ram are offered from another<sup>7</sup> case in which one ox and one ram are offered, this excludes, however, Pentecost, on which two<sup>8</sup> rams are to be sacrificed. This would be right according to the opinion that on the Day of Atonement only one ram is being offered up,<sup>9</sup> but what could be said according to the view that on the Day of Atonement too, two rams were to be offered up?<sup>10</sup> For it has been taught: Rabbi<sup>11</sup> said, The ram mentioned here [in Leviticus] is the same as the one mentioned in the Book of Numbers;<sup>12</sup> R. Eliezer son of R. Simeon said: Two rams are here [involved], the one mentioned here and the other mentioned in the Book of Numbers!<sup>13</sup> — It may be in accord even with the opinion of R. Eliezer son of R. Simeon. Because there<sup>14</sup> one [of the rams] is offered up in fulfilment of the regular sacrifices for that day, and the other as one of the additional sacrifices, whereas in the case of Pentecost both are the regular sacrifices of that day.<sup>15</sup> [Perhaps] say that [the reference is to] New Year<sup>16</sup> which should also imply the removal of the priest for seven days preceding a one-day service? — R. Abbahu said, One may infer a case in which the priest offers up an ox and a ram from his own means<sup>17</sup> from another case in which he offers up an ox and a ram from<sup>18</sup> his own means, that excludes Pentecost<sup>19</sup> and Rosh hashanah<sup>20</sup> on which both are offered up from public [congregational] funds. This would be right according to the opinion which holds that the words kah leka<sup>21</sup> ['take thee'] mean 'take from thy own means' and

---

(1) This is a mnemonical acrostic for: P (payyis allotment, by counting, of the work to be done by the priests in the sanctuary. No such counting took place during the Sukkoth festival, but it was the rule on Shemini 'Azereth); Z (zeman — the blessing on the entrance of a festival referring to the return of the festive season. This benediction was repeated on the eve of Shemini 'Azereth, thus constituting it an independent holy day); R (regel-festival with its own name); K (korban — having its own number of sacrifices); Sh (shir — song — Shemini 'Azereth having its own psalm in the liturgy); B (berakah-blessing — on Shemini 'Azereth a special prayer was offered up for the life of the king.) V. R.H. 4b. In all these respects Shemini 'Azereth might be considered an independent festival.

(2) זָבַח means (Jastrow): To turn, to celebrate an anniversary, to observe a festival, to make a periodical pilgrimage, to offer the pilgrim's festive sacrifice.

(3) The conclusion, i.e. , Shemini 'Azereth, v. Hag. 17a.

(4) 'Azereth means detention, gathering, concluding feast. 'Azereth in general designates 'Azereth Pesah', i.e., Shabuoth (the Feast of Weeks, Pentecost) to be distinguished from Shemini 'Azereth, the concluding festival of Sukkoth.

(5) The biblical Pentecost has one day only.

(6) The Day of Atonement, Lev. XVI, 5.

(7) The eighth day of the priest's consecration, Lev. IX, 2.

(8) Lev. XXIII, 18.

- (9) The question being whether the ram demanded in Lev. XVI, 5 is identical with the one mentioned in Num. XXIX, 8, or whether two different sacrifices are implied.
- (10) That would put the Day of Atonement into the same class as Pentecost and would thus preclude inference from the eighth day of the consecration of the priest for the former.
- (11) R. Judah ha-Nasi, the Prince, redactor of the Mishnah.
- (12) Lit., 'one fifth of (dealing with) Numbers'. Homesh applies to one of the five books of the Torah, as well as to one of the five books of the Psalms. 'Hamisha Homshe Torah' — the five books of the Torah.
- (13) V. infra 75b.
- (14) On the Day of Atonement, Lev. XVI,3 does not call the ram a 'musaf' or 'additional' sacrifice, as in all other cases, where the phrase 'apart from the morning burnt-offering' occurs, to indicate that the sacrifice in question is 'apart' or 'additional' as throughout Num. XXVIII and XXIX.
- (15) So that Pentecost, having different laws, may not fitly be inferred from the eighth day of the priest's consecration.
- (16) Rosh ha-Shanah, the Jewish New Year, originally one day only, v. Bez. 5a.
- (17) Lev. XVI, 3, Herewith shall Aaron come into the holy place, i.e., he shall bring it along from his own.
- (18) At the consecration, Lev. IX, 2, Take thee, i.e, from thy own means.
- (19) Lev. XXIII, 18, And ye shall present, i.e., the community.
- (20) 'And ye shall present' also occurs in connection with the Rosh ha-Shanah sacrifices, ibid. XXIII, 25.
- (21) Lev. IX, 2.

### Talmud - Mas. Yoma 3b

'aseh leka<sup>1</sup> ['make thee'] mean 'make from thy own means', but what could be said [in the argument above] according to the opinion [that kah leka<sup>2</sup> means 'take for thyself] from the community funds', for we have been taught:<sup>3</sup> The expression 'kah leka' means 'mi-sheleka [from thy own] and 'aseh leka means mi-sheleka [taken from thy own funds], but we-yikehu eleka<sup>4</sup> means [they shall take for them] from community funds; these are the words of R. Josiah; R. Jonathan said, Both 'kah leka' and 'we-yikehu eleka' mean from community funds, and what is intimated by saying 'kah leka' [take thee]? As it were,<sup>5</sup> 'I prefer your own [private means expended on this work] to the community's [expenditure]'. (Abba Hanan said in the name of R. Eleazar: One verse reads, Make thee an ark of wood,<sup>6</sup> and another,<sup>7</sup> And they shall make an ark of acacia-wood,<sup>8</sup> how is that?<sup>9</sup> Here it refers to a time when Israel act in accordance with His will,<sup>10</sup> there it deals with a time when they do not act in accordance with His will) — They<sup>11</sup> are disputing only as to the general meaning [of the word 'leka'] in connection with the command to 'take' or to 'do', as e.g., Take thou also unto thee the chief spices,<sup>12</sup> or Make thee two trumpets of silver,<sup>13</sup> but in the above cases<sup>14</sup> it is clearly indicated in the text that it is from thine own.<sup>15</sup> For consider in [the portion of the Bible dealing with the] consecration of the priests, it is written: And unto the children of Israel thou shalt speak, saying: Take ye a he-goat for a sin-offering,<sup>16</sup> why then the passage: And he said to Aaron: Take thee a bull-calf for a sin-offering?<sup>17</sup> Conclude from this 'kah leka' means 'mi-sheleka', from your own. [Similarly] in connection with the Day of Atonement it reads: Herewith shall Aaron come into the holy place: with a young bullock for a sin-offering,<sup>18</sup> etc. Why then the passage, And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel<sup>19</sup> and And Aaron shall present the bullock of the sin-offering which is lo [for himself]?<sup>20</sup> Conclude from this that the word 'lo' implies it is to be brought from his own means.

R. Ashi<sup>21</sup> said: It is legitimate to infer a case in which an ox is offered up as sin-offering and a ram as burnt-offering<sup>22</sup> from another case in which an ox is offered up as sin-offering and a ram as a burnt-offering;<sup>23</sup> this excludes from analogy New Year<sup>24</sup> and Pentecost,<sup>25</sup> [as] in both cases both animals are offered up as burnt-offerings only.

Rabina said: One may infer a service performed by the high priests<sup>26</sup> from another service performed by the high priest<sup>27</sup> that excludes [the occasions mentioned] in all the questions [raised], because the services mentioned therein are not performed by the high priest.<sup>28</sup> Others have this

version of Rabina's reply: One may infer [certain rules for] a service held for the first time from a service held for the first time. This excludes all the other cases [referred to above], because none of them took place for the first time. What does this 'first time' mean? — Does it mean that the high priest had first performed service there?<sup>29</sup> That would be [the argument of Rabina's in] the first version. No, it means the first service of its kind held in its place, which may fitly be inferred from another service<sup>30</sup> held for the first time in its place. When R. Dimi came<sup>31</sup> [from Palestine], he said: R. Johanan taught one thing, R. Joshua b. Levi two. R. Johanan taught one thing the words 'la'asoth', 'lekapper'<sup>32</sup> refer to the service of the Day of Atonement. R. Joshua b. Levi taught two things: 'la'asoth' means the ceremony of the [red] heifer, 'lekapper' refers to the service of the Day of Atonement. How could [you say that] R. Johanan taught [only] one thing? Have we not learnt in our Mishnah: SEVEN DAYS BEFORE THE DAY OF ATONEMENT, and in another Seven days before the burning of the heifer?<sup>33</sup> — That<sup>34</sup> is only a special provision.<sup>35</sup> But did not R. Minyumi b. Hilkiyah in the name of R. Mahsiah b. Idi, [and the latter] in the name of R. Johanan report the [interpretation of the text], 'As hath been done this day, so hath the Lord commanded la'asoth [to do] lekapper 'alekem [to make atonement for you]'. 'La'asoth' refers to the ceremony of the heifer and 'lekapper' to the service of the Day of Atonement?<sup>36</sup> This interpretation was that of his teacher.<sup>37</sup> For when Rabina came [from Palestine]<sup>38</sup> he said: R. Johanan reported in the name of R. Ishmael that 'la'asoth' referred to the ceremony of the heifer, and 'lekapper' to the work of the Day of Atonement.

Said Resh Lakish to R. Johanan: Whence do you infer this interpretation? From the Consecration Service?<sup>39</sup> Hence, just as with the Consecration Service, the omission of any prescribed form would render the service invalid [would you say that] here too<sup>40</sup> the omission of anything prescribed [by inference from congruity of text] for that service, would render it invalid? And if you said: Yes, indeed, surely we learnt: ANOTHER PRIEST IS PREPARED TO TAKE HIS PLACE, not another priest is removed from his house!<sup>41</sup> And if you would say MATHKININ [one prepares] and MAFRISHIN [one removes] mean the same thing, then the Mishnah ought to use in both passages either mathkinin or mafrishin!<sup>42</sup> — [R. Johanan] said to him: And whence do you, Sir, infer it?<sup>43</sup> — He answered: From [the account concerning] Sinai. For the Scriptural text reads, And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered him<sup>44</sup> six days, and He called unto Moses on the seventh day.<sup>45</sup> Now consider: Since it is written 'and He called unto Moses on the seventh day', what do the 'six days' mean? They establish a rule<sup>46</sup> for anyone who enters the camp of the Shechinah<sup>47</sup> that he must remove himself from his house for six days. But we have learnt SEVEN?<sup>48</sup> — Our Mishnah conforms to the opinion of R. Judah b. Bathyra who considers the possibility of the high priest's

---

(1) Num. X, 2.

(2) Must not be taken literally.

(3) Men. 28b.

(4) Ex. XXVII, 20.

(5) If it were possible to assume such intimation from God.

(6) Deut. X, 1.

(7) Ex. XXV, 10.

(8) In one verse the making is demanded of Moses, in the other of the children of Israel.

(9) Contradiction to be explained.

(10) When Israel fulfil God's will, it is they who get the credit for enabling Moses to perform His will. Otherwise all the credit is given to Moses.

(11) I.e., R. Josiah and R. Jonathan. Here follows the reply to the question, how meet the above argument in the view of R. Jonathan who holds that 'kah leka' means 'take for them from community funds'.

(12) Ex. XXX 34.

(13) Num. X, 2.

(14) In connection with the offerings of the high priest on the Day of Atonement and the eighth day of the Consecration.

- (15) The private means of the high priest.
- (16) Lev. IX, 3.
- (17) Ibid. IX, 2.
- (18) Lev. XVI, 3.
- (19) Ibid. XVI, 5.
- (20) Ibid. XVI, 6.
- (21) He and Rabina deal with the questions raised as to why the analogy may not include other festivals besides the Day of Atonement.
- (22) On the Day of Atonement the high priest offers up as his private sacrifice an ox for the sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering.
- (23) On the eighth day of the consecration a young ox is offered up as sin-offering and a ram as burnt-offering.
- (24) On Rosh ha-Shanah no ox is offered up as sin-offering, Num. XXIX, 1-6.
- (25) On 'Azereth (Shabuoth) no ox is offered up as sin-offering, ibid. XXVIII, 26-31.
- (26) The Day of Atonement.
- (27) The Consecration.
- (28) That answers all the questions raised.
- (29) The first service ever performed by a high priest was that on the eighth day of the Consecration, hence it would be right to infer therefrom the service on the Day of Atonement, when the high priest for the first time offered up the community's sacrifice, on the first Day of Atonement.
- (30) The service of the Day of Atonement took place in the Holy of Holies, which had never been entered before the first service on the first Day of Atonement, just as the Consecration Service included the first sacrifice on the outer altar, in priestly garments.
- (31) Atha 'came' is the technical term for the return of scholars from Babylonia to Palestine and vice versa.
- (32) Lekapper being the explanation of la'asoth.
- (33) The priest in question was removed from his house, v. supra 2a.
- (34) The rule in connection with the burning of the red heifer.
- (35) Because in some other respects there is latitude in connection with the heifer service (v. supra p. 1, n. 7), some more stringent ordinances were decided upon, not, however as a matter of traditional law, but rather as an ad hoc regulation.
- (36) This tradition in the name of R. Johanan is in evident conflict with the statement reported by R. Dimi.
- (37) He reported only his teacher's decision, but did not surrender his own opinion.
- (38) V. p. 9, n. 10.
- (39) V. supra 2a and notes.
- (40) With regard to the ceremony of the red heifer.
- (41) So that, if the high priest were prevented from officiating the substitute priest would perform the service without the necessary previous separation, which would render his service invalid and the ceremony unprovided with a priest.
- (42) Since the Mishnah deliberately uses two terms, their meaning must be different, hence Resh Lakish's question remains.
- (43) The obligation to remove the priest from his house.
- (44) I.e., Moses, R.V. 'it' referring to the mountain; v. infra 4a.
- (45) Ex. XXIV, 16.
- (46) Lit., 'build a father', a precedent, i.e., justify the conclusion from this specifically stated law to other cases.
- (47) Lit., 'royal residence', then Divine Presence, here the Divine Camp, the Sanctuary.
- (48) The Mishnah here speaks of a removal for seven days.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 4a**

becoming ritually impure through family contact.<sup>1</sup> R. Johanan said to Resh Lakish: It is right according to me who infer<sup>2</sup> from the Consecration; for this agrees with what we are taught: 'On both of them [the Priests]<sup>3</sup> we sprinkle throughout the seven days [water] from all the sin-offerings<sup>4</sup> that were there';<sup>5</sup> but according to you who infer from Sinai, was there any sprinkling done on Sinai? — But<sup>6</sup> according to your own reasoning, it would not be right either, for in the consecration [ceremony the sprinkling was done with] blood, whereas here with water? — That<sup>7</sup> is no difficulty. For R.

Hiyya taught: 'The water takes the place of blood', but according to you, was there any sprinkling on Sinai? — He answered: It was a mere additional provision.<sup>8</sup>

We have a teaching in accord with R. Johanan,<sup>9</sup> and we have a teaching in accord with Resh Lakish.<sup>10</sup> 'In accord with R. Johanan we have a teaching'; Scripture reads: Herewith [bezoth] shall Aaron come into the holy place,<sup>11</sup> i.e., with that mentioned in that section, the section of the Consecration. And what is mentioned in the section about the Consecration? Aaron was removed for seven days and then officiated for one day, and Moses handed over to him<sup>12</sup> throughout the seven days to train him in this service. Also for the future the high priest is to be removed for seven days and to officiate for one day, and two scholars of the disciples of Moses<sup>13</sup> [this excludes Sadducees]<sup>14</sup> transmitted to him throughout the seven days to train him in the service. Hence [the Rabbis] ruled that seven days before the Day of Atonement the high priest was removed from his house to the cell of the counsellors. And just as the high priest was removed, so was the priest burning the heifer removed to the cell lying in the north-eastern corner before the Temple and each of them was throughout the seven days sprinkled [with water] from all the sin-offerings that were there. And if you should ask: But during the Consecration the sprinkling was done with blood and here water, [remember] that the water takes the place of the blood. And it further says: 'As hath been done this day so the Lord hath commanded la'asoth [to do], lekapper [to make atonement] for you'.<sup>15</sup> 'La'asoth' refers to the ceremony of the heifer, 'lekapper' means the service of the Day of Atonement.<sup>16</sup> But the word 'be-zoth' is required for the verse itself,<sup>17</sup> i.e., with a young bullock for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering? — Answer:<sup>18</sup> If 'be-zoth' were meant to refer only to the sacrifices, the text should have said ba-zeh [with this] or ba-eleh [with these], why [was] 'be-zoth' [chosen]? So that you may learn both things from it.<sup>19</sup> Why was it necessary to cite the other verse?<sup>20</sup> — You might have said only the first Day of Atonement requires that the high priest be removed at the Consecration, but on all future Days of Atonement no such removal is necessary; or [you might say] only the first<sup>21</sup> high priest needed such removal but all future high priests do not require it; come and hear:<sup>22</sup> 'As hath been done this day etc.'<sup>23</sup>

'We have a teaching in accord with Resh Lakish': Moses went up in a cloud, was covered by the cloud, and was sanctified by the cloud in order that he might receive the Torah for Israel in sanctity, as it is written: And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai,<sup>24</sup> this took place after the Ten Commandments, which were at the beginning of the forty days,<sup>25</sup> this is the view of R. Jose the Galilean. R. Akiba said [with reference to] 'And the glory of the Lord abode' from the beginning of the [third] month, and the cloud wa-yekasehu [covered it],<sup>26</sup> i.e., the mountain,<sup>27</sup>

---

(1) Lit., 'the uncleanness of his house'. His wife might become menstruant during congress, he as one having had congress with a menstruant would be levitically impure for seven days, thus prevented from officiating on the Day of Atonement.

(2) The obligation to remove the priest.

(3) The one officiating on the Day of Atonement and the one engaged with the red heifer.

(4) Name by which the red heifer ashes are known, v. Num. XIX, 9.

(5) V. infra 8a. A reserve of ashes was kept in the sanctuary for sprinklings. V. Parah 111, 11.

(6) This is Resh Lakish's rejoinder.

(7) This is R. Johanan's reply.

(8) To emphasize the importance of the ceremony of the heifer, and to signify the entrance upon the sanctuary on the Day of Atonement.

(9) Who inferred the removal from consecration. A Baraita — a tradition or opinion of a Tanna not reported in the Mishnah.

(10) Who inferred it from Sinai.

(11) Lev. XVI, 3.

(12) The eighth day of the Consecration was ministered to by Aaron, Lev. IX, 2.

(13) The detailed laws for the service.

- (14) Who held divergent views as to the service and changed its order from the prescribed form.
- (15) Lev. VIII, 34.
- (16) This cited Baraita is thus in support of R. Johanan.
- (17) It cannot be torn from the text, where it has obvious and important meaning, to be used for ad hoc interpretation.
- (18) Lit., 'they say', or 'I will say'.
- (19) Zoth is feminine, the words for bullock and ram are masc., hence ba-zeh or ba-eleh would have been more correct. The choice of be-zoth indicates that something else is implied.
- (20) The citing of an additional verse, where the first or first ones seemed to convey sufficient information, is an indication that erroneous inference might be made, which the additional verse, through its information, prevents.
- (21) Aaron, Lev. VIII.
- (22) 'Come and hear', a technical term for refuting a wrong opinion or repelling an attack.
- (23) 'So the Lord commanded you', i.e., for all the future.
- (24) Ex. XXIV, 16.
- (25) Ex. XXIV, 18. Cf. *ibid.* XIX, 3,9,25.
- (26) Wa-yekasehu may be translated 'covered him' or 'covered it', Moses or the mountain, the Hebrew word *har* (mountain) being also masculine.
- (27) Moses came down to speak to Israel (Ex. XIX, 3f), hence it would be wrong to say that the cloud covered him six days before the Revelation.

### **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 4b**

then 'He called unto Moses on the seventh day'. Moses and all Israel were standing there,<sup>1</sup> but the purpose of Scripture was to honour Moses.<sup>2</sup> R. Nathan says: The purpose of Scripture was that he [Moses] might be purged of all food and drink in his bowels so as to make him equal to the ministering angels.<sup>3</sup> R. Mattiah b. Heresh<sup>4</sup> says, The purpose of Scripture here was to inspire him with awe, so that the Torah be given<sup>5</sup> with awe, with dread, with trembling, as it is said: Serve the Lord with fear and rejoice with trembling.<sup>6</sup> What is the meaning of 'And rejoice with trembling'?<sup>7</sup> — R. Adda b. Mattena says in the name of Rab: Where there will be joy, there shall be trembling.<sup>8</sup>

In what do R. Jose the Galilean and R. Akiba differ? — In the controversy of these Tannaim. For we have been taught:<sup>9</sup> On the sixth day of the month<sup>10</sup> was the Torah given to Israel. R. Jose says on the seventh. He who says that the Torah was given on the sixth day holds that on the sixth it was given and on the seventh Moses ascended the mountain;<sup>11</sup> he who holds that the Torah was given on the seventh assumes that on the seventh both the Torah was given and Moses ascended, as it is written, And He called unto Moses on the seventh day.<sup>12</sup> Now R. Jose the Galilean is of the same opinion as the first Tanna,<sup>13</sup> who held that the Torah was given on the sixth of the month, therefore this<sup>14</sup> happened after the giving of the Ten Commandments: 'The glory of the Lord abode on mount Sinai and the cloud covered him six days' 'him' meaning Moses- 'And He called unto Moses on the seventh day' to receive the remainder of the Torah.<sup>15</sup> For if the thought should come to you that 'And the glory of the Lord abode' from the New Moon [of Sivan], so that 'And the cloud covered him' referred to the mountain, and 'The Lord called unto Moses on the seventh day' to receive the Ten Commandments, surely they had received the Torah on the sixth day already and also the cloud had departed on the sixth day! — R. Akiba, however, held with R. Jose that the Torah was given to Israel on the seventh.<sup>16</sup> Quite in accord with R. Akiba's teaching is the statement<sup>17</sup> that the Tablets were broken on the seventeenth of Tammuz, for the twenty-four days of Sivan<sup>18</sup> and the sixteen of Tammuz make up the forty days he was on the mountain, and on the seventeenth of Tammuz he went down and came<sup>19</sup> to break the Tablets. But according to R. Jose the Galilean who holds that there were six days of the separation<sup>20</sup> in addition to forty days [spent] on the mountain, the Tablets could not have been broken before the twenty-third of Tammuz? — R. Jose the Galilean will answer you: The six days of the separation are included in the forty days on the mountain.

The Master said: "'And He called Moses", whilst Moses and all Israel were standing' there'. This

interpretation supports the view of R. Eleazar, for R. Eleazar said: ‘And He called unto Moses’ whilst Moses and all Israel were standing there; the only purpose of Scripture is to do honour to Moses. They<sup>21</sup> raised the following objection: [He heard the voice speaking] elaw [unto him] not lo [to him];<sup>22</sup> hence we know that Moses heard, but all Israel did not hear?<sup>23</sup> - This is no difficulty. The one passage speaks of Sinai, the other of the tent of meeting.<sup>24</sup> Or, you might say, the one statement refers to the call, the other to the speech.<sup>25</sup> R. Zerika asked a question concerning the contradiction of scriptural passages in the presence of R. Eleazar, or, according to another version, he asked the question in the name of R. Eleazar. One passage reads: And Moses was not able to enter into the tent of meeting because the cloud abode thereon,<sup>26</sup> whereas another verse says: And Moses entered into the midst of the cloud?<sup>27</sup> It teaches us that the Holy One, blessed be He, took hold of Moses and brought him into the cloud. The school of R. Ishmael taught: Here<sup>28</sup> the word be-thok [in the midst] appears and it also appears elsewhere: And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea,<sup>29</sup> just as there [the word be-thok] implies a path, as it is written: And the waters were a wall<sup>30</sup> unto them,<sup>29</sup> so here too there was a path, [for Moses through the cloud].

And the Lord called unto Moses, and spoke unto him,<sup>31</sup> why does Scripture mention the call before the speech? — The Torah teaches us good manners: a man should not address his neighbour without having first called him. This supports the view of R. Hanina, for R. Hanina said: No man shall speak to his neighbour unless he calls him first to speak to him. Rabbah said: Whence do we know that if a man had said something to his neighbour the latter must not spread the news without the informant's telling him ‘Go and say it’? From the scriptural text: The Lord spoke to him out of the tent of meeting, lemor [saying] .<sup>32</sup> At any rate it is to be inferred<sup>33</sup> that both hold that the omission of any detail mentioned in connection with the priest's Consecration renders the ceremony invalid, for it was said: With regard to the ceremony of Consecration R. Johanan and R. Hanina are disputing; one says: The omission of any form prescribed in connection with the ceremony renders it invalid, whilst the other holds only such matter as is indispensable on any future occasion is indispensable now, whereas such detail as is dispensable in future generations, is dispensable even the first time. One may conclude that it is R. Johanan who holds that the omission of any detail whatsoever that is mentioned in connection with the Consecration ceremony renders such ceremony invalid, because R. Simeon b. Lakish said to R. Johanan<sup>34</sup> [in the course of the argument]: ‘And just as with the ceremony of Consecration the omission of any prescribed detail renders the ceremony invalid. And R. Johanan did not retort at all’. That proof is conclusive.<sup>35</sup>

What is the [practical] difference between the opinions?

- 
- (1) Moses did not ascend the mountain nor did he separate from his circle till after the Revelation.
  - (2) All Israel were present, why then does Scripture report that the word of God came to Moses alone? — The answer is: To show him special regard.
  - (3) R. Nathan is of the opinion of R. Jose the Galilean that the call to Moses referred to in the verses was for separation after the Revelation, yet this offers no basis for necessitating separation before entering into the Sanctuary, as the object of Moses' separation was that he might be like the ministering angels.
  - (4) He too shares the opinion of R. Jose the Galilean.
  - (5) To Moses and through him to Israel.
  - (6) Ps. II, 11.
  - (7) The terms seem contradictory.
  - (8) The Torah is a source of joy. The precepts of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart, Ps. XIX, 9, cited by Rashi. But there shall also be awe, reverence for the numen, the Lord, the Lawgiver. Tosaf. cites I Chron. XVI, 27 Strength and gladness are in His Place.
  - (9) Shah. 86b.
  - (10) Of Sivan, the first day of Shabuoth.
  - (11) Sinai.
  - (12) Ex. XXIV, 16.

- (13) The anonymous Tanna of the Baraita
- (14) Moses' ascent on the mount.
- (15) The other laws (beside the Ten Commandments) and the Oral Law.
- (16) So that the 'Seventh day' refers to the seventh day on which the Torah was given.
- (17) V. Ta'an. 26a.
- (18) From the seventh to the thirtieth.
- (19) Either 'came to the camp of Israel, saw the dances and broke' or paraphrastic for 'broke'.
- (20) After the Revelation.
- (21) The teachers (students) in the academy.
- (22) The passage, Num. VII, 89 reads: Moses . . . heard the voice speaking elaw (to him, which is the longer form, lo being the normal one) from above the ark-cover etc. The use, in this passage, of the longer form, seemed to suggest a closer or exclusive communication. According to Hayyug, quoted Otzar ha-Geonim VI, 1, n. 4, there is a difference of meaning derivable in accord with grammatical principles, in 'lo' and 'elaw' respectively.
- (23) So that all Israel, indeed, did not hear God's message. If so, then the only purpose of the statement '. . . Scripture is to honour Moses' is unjustified. For Scripture does not change the fact. It was Moses alone whom the message reached.
- (24) In the tent of meeting only Moses could hear the voice. On Mount Sinai all Israel heard it, but to honour Moses, Scripture mentions him only as having done so.
- (25) The call proper, the honour of the individual call, was vouchsafed to Moses alone, the speech following was heard by all.
- (26) Ex. XL, 35.
- (27) Ibid. XXIV, 18.
- (28) The apparent contradiction is removed by the suggestion that he entered the cloud on this occasion with divine help.
- (29) Ex. XIV, 22.
- (30) The water being piled up like a wall, Israel walked along a path. The inference is from similarity of expression.
- (31) Lev. I,1.
- (32) Lemor here is taken to mean 'to say it (to others)', or else the next few words are illustratively, not logically implied: Speak (unto the children of Israel).
- (33) From Resh Lakish's question to R. Johanan: '... just as with the Consecration service the omission of any prescribed form would render the service invalid' and R. Johanan's tacit acceptance of this view, supra 3b.
- (34) Supra 3b.
- (35) Had he held a different view, he would surely not have permitted his opponent's statement to go unchallenged.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 5a**

R. Joseph says the putting<sup>1</sup> of the hands [upon the head of the sacrifice] is the difference. According to the one who holds that the omission of any detail renders the ceremony invalid, [failure] to lay the hand upon the head of the sacrifice would render the ceremony invalid. According to him who holds that only the omission of what is indispensable in the future renders the ceremony invalid, [omission of] the putting of the hand on the animal's head did not render the ceremony invalid. Whence do we know that in the future [the omission of] the putting of the hands [on the animal's head] is not indispensable?— For it has been taught: And he shall lay his hand . . . and it shall be accepted for him [to make atonement for him].<sup>2</sup> Does the laying on of the hand make atonement for one? Does not atonement come through the blood, as it is said: For it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life!<sup>3</sup> Why, then, is it written: 'And he shall lay his hand on . . . and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him'? To say that if he performed the laying on of the hands as an unimportant part<sup>4</sup> of the commandment, Scripture would account it to him as if he had not obtained proper atonement.<sup>5</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said: The waving<sup>6</sup> is the difference. According to him who holds whatever detail is prescribed for the ceremony is indispensable, the waving is indispensable; according to him who holds that only what is indispensable for all the future is indispensable now, the waving is not indispensable. Whence do we know that for all time to come the waving is not indispensable? — For we have been taught:<sup>7</sup> To be waved, to make atonement for him.<sup>8</sup> Does the waving make atonement? Is it not the blood which makes atonement, as it is written, 'For it is the

blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life'? Then why does Scripture say, 'To be waved, to make atonement for him'? To say that if he treats the waving as an unimportant part of the ceremony, Scripture accounts it to him as if he had not obtained proper atonement.

R. Papa said: The separation for seven days is the [practical] difference between the two opinions. According to the opinion that whatsoever is prescribed for the ceremony is indispensable, the separation, too, is indispensable; according to him who holds that only what is indispensable for all time to come is indispensable now, the separation is not indispensable. Whence do we know that the separation is not indispensable for all time to come? Because the Mishnah reads, [another priest] IS MADE READY FOR HIM, instead of is 'separated for him'.<sup>9</sup> Rabina said: The difference lies in the increase [in the number of garments]<sup>10</sup> and of the anointments<sup>11</sup> necessary during the seven days. According to the opinion that whatever is prescribed in connection therewith is indispensable, the increase [in the number of garments] and anointments during the seven days, too, is indispensable. According to him who holds that only what is indispensable for all time to come, is indispensable now, these things too are not indispensable. Whence do we know that they are not indispensable for all time to come? — For it was taught: And the priest who shall be anointed and who shall be consecrated to be priest in his father's stead, shall make the atonement.<sup>12</sup> What does the passage come to teach?<sup>13</sup> From the text: Seven days shall the son that is priest in his stead put them on [etc.],<sup>14</sup> I would know that a priest who had put on the required larger number of garments and who had been anointed on each of the seven days<sup>15</sup> was permitted to ['minister in the holy place']<sup>16</sup> at the Consecration. Whence would I know that if he had put on the larger number of garments for but one day, and had been anointed on each of the seven days; or, if he had been anointed but one day, but has put on the larger number of garments for seven days, [he would also be permitted]? To convey that teaching, Scripture says, 'Who shall be anointed and who shall be consecrated', that means anointed and consecrated in whatever way.<sup>17</sup> We have now found evidence that the larger number of garments is necessary in the first instance for the seven days. Whence do we know that anointment on each of the seven days is in the first instance required? You may infer that either from the fact that a special statement of the Torah was necessary to exclude it; or, if you wish, from the scriptural text itself, And the holy garments of Aaron shall be for his sons after him, to be anointed in them, and to be consecrated in them.<sup>18</sup> In this passage the anointing and the donning of the larger number of garments are put on the same level. Hence, just as the donning of the larger number of garments is required for the seven days, so is the anointing obligatory for the seven days.

What is the reason of the man who holds that the forms prescribed for the ceremonies are indispensable?— R. Isaac b. Bisna said: Scripture reads And kaka [thus] shalt thou do to Aaron and his sons, — 'thus means indispensableness.'<sup>19</sup>

You may be right with regard to any

---

(1) Lev. I, 4; VIII, 18.

(2) Lev. I, 4.

(3) Lev. XVII, 11.

(4) Lit., 'a remnant'.

(5) Lit., 'as it did not atone for him and it did'. Technically the ceremony had achieved its purpose, because essentially it is the blood which makes atonement, but since laying the hands on the animal's head is part of the ceremony (although not essential to it) and he has been negligent about it, he has obtained atonement for himself, but has not attained re-atonement with his creator, whose command he has treated slightly.

(6) Of part of the sacrifice, Lev. VIII, 27.

(7) Men. 93b.

(8) Lev. XIV, 21.

(9) If the separation of the priest were an indispensable part of the ceremony, the proposed substitute for the high priest would have to be separated too, so that in case of any mishap to the high priest he would enter upon the service properly

prepared by separation. Since the Mishnah reads 'prepared' only, the separation obviously is not deemed indispensable.

(10) The eight garments of the high priest as against the four of the ordinary priest.

(11) Every one of the seven days the head and the eye-lids of the high priest were anointed with oil.

(12) Lev. XVI, 32.

(13) Obviously the service was to be performed by the high priest, why then this apparently superfluous passage?

(14) Ex. XXIX, 30.

(15) Of his consecration as high priest, v. infra.

(16) That is on the Day of Atonement.

(17) As long as he has been consecrated, even if some detail of the ceremony has been omitted.

(18) Ex. XXIX, 29.

(19) The emphatic expression 'thus' intimates the indispensableness of the prescribed forms, 'thus' and 'not otherwise'.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 5b

form prescribed in this context. Whence do we know that forms not prescribed<sup>1</sup> here in this context are also indispensable? — R. Nahman b. Isaac said: We infer that from [the fact that in both contexts the same word] *petah* [is used].<sup>2</sup> R. Mesharsheya said: And keep the charge of the Lord<sup>3</sup> indicates the indispensableness [of the prescribed forms]. R. Ashi said: For so am I commanded<sup>4</sup> indicates indispensableness.

Our Rabbis taught:<sup>5</sup> For so am I commanded,<sup>6</sup> As I commanded,<sup>7</sup> As the Lord commanded.<sup>8</sup> [Of these passages], 'For so am I commanded' that they eat<sup>9</sup> it whilst in mourning; 'As I commanded' [this] he said to them at the time<sup>10</sup> of the occurrence;<sup>11</sup> 'As the Lord commanded', and not on my own authority.

R. Jose b. Hanina said: Breeches are not mentioned in the section.<sup>12</sup> But when it says, And this is the thing that thou shalt do unto them to hallow them, to minister,<sup>13</sup> it includes the breeches and the tenth part of an ephah.<sup>14</sup> It may rightly be said that breeches are included in the general term 'garments',<sup>15</sup> but whence do we know about the tenth of an ephah? — [This we know] by inferring [the meaning of the word] *zeh* [used here]<sup>16</sup> from *zeh* [in the verse], *Zeh* [this] is the offering of Aaron and his sons which they shall offer unto the Lord . . . the tenth part of an ephah.<sup>17</sup>

R. Johanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai said: Whence do we know that also the reading of the portion<sup>18</sup> was indispensable? To teach us that it is said, This is the *dabar* [thing] which the Lord has commanded to be done,<sup>19</sup> i.e., the speaking<sup>20</sup> thereof is indispensable. — In what order did he put the garments on them? — What is past, is past!<sup>21</sup> Rather, [the question is] in what order will he put the garments on them in the future?<sup>22</sup> — In the future, too,<sup>23</sup> when Aaron and his sons will come, Moses will come with them. But [the question is] how did he put the clothes on them [if we are] to understand the scriptural account?<sup>24</sup> -The sons of R. Hiyya and R. Johanan held different opinions about it. One said: Aaron was first clothed and afterwards his sons; whilst the other said: Aaron and his sons were clothed simultaneously. Said Abaye: With regard to the tunic and the mitre none disputes the fact that Aaron came first and his sons afterwards,<sup>25</sup> for both in the [text containing] the command and [the account of the] actual performance Aaron is mentioned first. What they are disputing is [the order of] the girdle.<sup>26</sup> He who says Aaron [came first] and then his sons [is of this opinion] because it is written, And he girded him with the girdle,<sup>27</sup> and only after this is it written, And he girded them with a girdle,<sup>28</sup> whereas he who holds that the girding took place without any interruption, [is of this opinion] because It is written, And thou shalt gird them with girdles, Aaron and his sons.<sup>29</sup> According to the opinion that Aaron and his sons were girded at the same time, does not Scripture first say, 'And he girded him with a girdle' and then only later is it written, 'And he girded them with a girdle'?<sup>30</sup> —

---

(1) In Ex. XXIX, 5, there are Instructions relative to the Consecration, such as putting on Aaron the tunic, the robe of the

ephod and the ephod, the breastplate, the mitre on his head, the holy crown on the mitre. These are not mentioned in the ceremony described in Lev. VIII.

(2) Ex. XXIX, 4 and Lev. VIII, 33.

(3) Lev. VIII, 35.

(4) Ibid. VIII, 35.

(5) Zeb. 101b.

(6) Lev. X, 13.

(7) Ibid. X, 18.

(8) Lev. X, 15

(9) Lev. X, 13: Take the meal-offering and eat it, this command contradicts Deut. XXVI, 14, I have not eaten thereof in my mourning. The answer is, 'So am I commanded', i.e., a special decision from God.

(10) The death of Nadab and Abihu, Lev. X, 2.

(11) When he found that the goat of the sin-offering had been burnt, he said to them, You should have eaten it 'as I commanded you' in regard to the meal-offering.

(12) Chapters VIII and IX of Lev. which deal with the Consecration.

(13) Ex. XXIX, 1.

(14) Which the priests are obliged to offer up on the day of their Consecration. V. Men. 51b.

(15) Ex. XXIX, 5: And thou shalt take the garments and put upon Aaron.

(16) Ex. XXIX, 1.

(17) Lev. VI, 13. The inference from similarity of expression is never used 'for the purpose of deducing a new law from Scripture, but merely as an attempt to find a scriptural support for an opinion expressed by one of the authorities in the Mishnah'. Mielziner, Intro. 148.

(18) The section on the Consecration. It was to be read as part of the ceremony.

(19) Lev. VIII, 5' Dabar may mean both 'word' and 'thing'. No further reference to the ceremony being necessary, the suggestion is made that dabar, the word, the reading of the word is commanded. Support may be found in the fact that the preceding verse speaks of The congregation assembled at the door of the tent of meeting, such 'assembly' for the purpose of hearing scriptural reading being expressly enjoined in Deut. XXXI, 28 and esp. at the Sukkoth festival in the year of release.

(20) The word, i.e., the section read.

(21) There is no relevance in archaeological research.

(22) I.e., in the Messianic future.

(23) There is no need for speculation. Moses will be in charge and he knows the law.

(24) There are apparent contradictions between the command as given in Ex. XXIX and the account of the ceremony in Lev. VIII respectively. In Ex. XXIX, 9: And thou shalt gird them with a girdle, Aaron and his sons intimates that this girding of father and sons took place in close succession to one another. I.e., he girded Aaron only after he had first clothed the sons with the other garments apart from the girdle, so that the girding of Aaron and his sons were, so to speak, at the same time (v. infra); whereas in Lev. VIII, 7: And girded him with the girdle and clothed him with the robe . . . and placed the breastplate upon him and set the mitre upon his head to be followed by ibid. v. 13: And Moses brought Aaron's sons and clothed them with tunics and girded them with girdles shows the girding of Aaron took place before the clothing of the sons had even begun.

(25) [Moses clothed Aaron with the tunic and the mitre before he began to clothe the sons with these garments. These would also include the breeches, as these were always to come first, v. infra 23b.]

(26) Whether Aaron was girded before or after the sons were clothed with the tunic and mitre.

(27) Lev. VIII, 7.

(28) Ibid. 13. I.e., after having first clothed them with the other garments.

(29) Ex. XXIX, 9.

(30) Cf. n. 4.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 6a**

He will tell you: This is to teach you that the girdle of the high priest was not the same [material] as that of the average priest.<sup>1</sup> According to the opinion that Aaron was girded and afterwards his sons,<sup>2</sup>

does not Scripture say, ‘And thou shalt gird them with a girdle’?— He will tell you this<sup>3</sup> informs us that the girdle of the high priest was of the same [material] as the average priest. Was it then necessary to state: ‘And he girded him with a girdle’ and [then] ‘And he girded them’? From that we infer that Aaron came first and then his sons. But how could it have been possible simultaneously?<sup>4</sup> — This only means to indicate that [Aaron] came first.<sup>5</sup>

**THE HIGH PRIEST WAS REMOVED.** Why was he removed?[You ask] why was he removed!<sup>6</sup> [Is it not] as you have said, either according to the derivation of R. Johanan, or to that of Resh Lakish? — No, this is<sup>7</sup> the question: Why was he separated from his house? — It was taught: R. Judah b. Bathyra said: Let his wife be found under doubt of being a menstruant and he have congress with her.<sup>8</sup> Do we speak of wicked people?<sup>9</sup> — Rather, perhaps he will have congress with his wife and she will then be found to be doubtfully a menstruant.<sup>10</sup> [The Rabbis] were discussing the decision before R. Hisda: According to whom was it made?-Obviously according to R. Akiba, who said: A menstruant makes him who had congress with her impure [retrospectively].<sup>11</sup> For, according to the Rabbis, behold they say: A menstruant does not render impure him who had congress with her [retrospectively]. R. Hisda said to them: It may be in accord even with the Rabbis. For they conflict with R. Akiba only in the case in which [the blood stains are found] much later<sup>12</sup> [than the congress], but, [if they be found] very soon afterwards,<sup>13</sup> they agree with him. R. Zera said: Hence it is evident that to one who had congress with a menstruant do not apply the same restrictions as do to the menstruant herself and he may bathe [for purification] in day time.<sup>14</sup> For, if you were to say that to one who had congress with a menstruant applied the same laws that apply to her, when could he bathe? Only at night. How could he, then, officiate on the morrow,<sup>15</sup> since he would have to await sunset for becoming ritually pure? Hence it must be [clear] that one who had intercourse with a menstruant is not subject to the same restrictions as the menstruant herself. Said R. Shimi of Nehardea: You might even say [that the above decision is in accord with the view] that one who has intercourse with a menstruant is like the menstruant, yet [would the high priest be able to officiate at the service] for we would separate him from his house an hour before sunset.<sup>16</sup> An objection was raised: All those who are obliged to take the ritual bath must take the bath at night.<sup>17</sup> A menstruant and a woman after confinement immerse during the day. A menstruant, then, only, but not one who had intercourse with her?<sup>18</sup> — [No, it means], A menstruant and all whom one may include in that term.<sup>19</sup> Another objection was raised: One to whom pollution has happened is like one who touched an unclean [dead] reptile. One who had intercourse with a menstruating woman is like one who was made unclean through a corpse.<sup>20</sup> Is it not concerning the bath?<sup>21</sup> — No, it is concerning [the conditions of] their uncleanness.<sup>22</sup> But [surely] concerning their uncleanness<sup>23</sup> there are direct statements in Scripture! In the first case it is written that it lasts for seven days,<sup>24</sup> and in the second case also the seven days’ duration is prescribed.<sup>25</sup>

---

(1) The girdle as described in Ex. XXXIX, 29 was to be made of fine twined linen, and blue and purple and scarlet, the work of the weaver in colours. The separate mention made of Aaron's girdle and that of his sons serves to indicate that they were not alike and that this description referred to the girdle of the high priest alone: the girdle of other priests was made of lesser material.

(2) From which one may infer that they are to be girded simultaneously, ‘them’, i.e., together.

(3) The answer is: The emphasis is not on the time or interval, but on the fact that father and son shall be girded with the same girdle, no distinction being allowed between the girdles worn by high priest and ordinary priest respectively.

(4) Taking the word simultaneously literally (cf. p. 21, n. 13), the question is, How could Moses have girded five men simultaneously?

(5) The Torah does not command any simultaneity. Aaron is mentioned in one passage and his sons in another, in order to emphasize that he must come first-whether in the clothing of the garments or in the girding.

(6) The first question was misunderstood. The answer implies that the source of the commandment to remove the priest was being sought.

(7) What was really intended was the practical motive of the enactment.

(8) Tosef. Yoma I.

(9) No good Jew (v. Sheb. 18b; Shulhan Aruk, Yoreh Deah 184, 2) would approach his wife unless her ritual purity were beyond doubt, how much less a high priest. Hence such contingency is unthinkable. Dealing with high priests, are we dealing with wicked men?

(10) Bloodstains may be found on the bed after congress and the doubt would arise, whether the discharge occurred before or after congress. Such a doubt would render her husband impure for seven days and ritually unfit to enter the sanctuary.

(11) [For twenty-four hours, so that should the stain be found after congress, the husband would be considered unclean for seven days, v. Nid. 14a.]

(12) Lit., 'after after', v. next note.

(13) [Lit., 'one after' this interval is defined in Nid. 12b as time enough to get down from the bed and rinse her face (euphemistically).]

(14) A menstruant is not permitted to bathe during the seventh day of her menstrual impurity, but only at night, after sunset, the beginning of the eighth day. But he who had congress with her would be permitted to bathe during the seventh day, without having to await the sunset of the seventh day. Hence he needs to be separated for but seven days. And if on the day of the separation he had congress and the doubt of her being a menstruant arose, he would count from the day of the separation until the day before the Day of Atonement, when he would take the bath during the day, await the sunset, and then be fit to enter the sanctuary on the Day of Atonement (Rashi).

(15) He would ritually be impure at the night of the Day of Atonement, hence there would have been no sunset before the Day of Atonement when he was pure and he would be unfit to officiate on the following day; thus the whole separation would be futile.

(16) That is, on the even before the eighth day before the Day of Atonement. One hour is a very short period and unimportant, hence the separation would still be called 'one of seven days'. He could bathe on the evening before the eve of the Day of Atonement (the seventh day after having become ritually impure) and be fit to officiate on the Day of Atonement, having awaited the sunset on the day before his bath.

(17) Meg. 20a, based on Num. XIX, 19, for the law that all may bathe during the day: And on the seventh day he shall purify him and bathe himself in water and be clean at even. — That a menstruant must not bathe before the night of the seventh day is inferred from Lev. XV,19: And if a woman have an issue, she shall be in her impurity seven days. A woman after confinement is compared to a menstruant in Lev. XII, 2: If a woman be delivered . . . , then she shall be unclean for seven days; as in the days of the impurity of her sickness shall she be unclean.; v. infra 88a

(18) Here would be a Tannaitic text invalidating an Amora's inference.

(19) Since the menstruant by contact communicates her impurity, it is logical to assume that the conditions of purification would be identical. Hence the implicit statement is sufficient.

(20) Zab. V, 11.

(21) That the bath could be taken in day-time.

(22) One to whom defilement has happened is like one who touched a dead reptile in that both become clean in the evening, and are unclean in the first degree of uncleanness; and he who had intercourse with a menstruant is afflicted with uncleanness for seven days and is one of the original causes of uncleanness like him who was made unclean through a corpse.

(23) I.e., that of one who has intercourse with a menstruant.

(24) Lev. XV, 24. Her impurity be upon him, he shall be unclean seven days.

(25) Num. XIX, 11: He that toucheth the dead, even any man's dead body, shall be unclean seven days.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 6b**

Must one not hence assume that the comparison concerns their bath?<sup>1</sup> No, indeed it refers only to [the conditions of] their uncleanness, and it was necessary to mention that only because of the latter clause [of that Mishnah, viz.,] that one who had intercourse with a menstruant is afflicted with a graver form of impurity than he [who has become unclean through a corpse] in that he causes uncleanness of couch and seat<sup>2</sup> [such uncleanness being of a lighter nature] so as to affect only foods and liquids.<sup>3</sup>

Come and hear:<sup>4</sup> For R. Hiyya taught: A man or a woman afflicted with gonorrhoea or with

leprosy, one who had intercourse with a menstruant, and one made unclean through a corpse, may take the bath during the day; a menstruant and a woman after confinement take their bath at night.<sup>5</sup> This is [indeed] a refutation.<sup>6</sup> Now whilst removing him from the [possible] impurity due to his house,<sup>7</sup> remove him from the [possibility of] uncleanness through a corpse!<sup>8</sup> R. Tahlifa, father of R. Huna, said in the name of Raba: This teaches that in the case of a community [the law of] corpse uncleanness is inoperative.<sup>9</sup> Rabina said: You might also say that [the law of] corpse uncleanness is only suspended in case of a community,<sup>10</sup> yet uncleanness due to contact with a corpse is infrequent,<sup>11</sup> whereas uncleanness due to marital life happens often. It has been said: As [to the law of] corpse-uncleanness R. Nahman said: It is inoperative in case of a community. R. Shesheth said: It is only suspended in case of an entire community. Whenever there are in the same priestly family-division<sup>12</sup> men, both clean and unclean ones, nobody disputes the fact that the clean ones do the service and the unclean ones forego it. The dispute concerns only the question as to whether one is obliged to make an endeavour to obtain, clean ones from another family-division. R. Nahman said: [The law of] corpse-uncleanness is inoperative in case of a community, hence we need make no such effort. R. Shesheth says: That law is only suspended in case of a community and hence we must endeavour [to find clean priests for the service].

Some hold that even in a case in which there are both clean and unclean priests in the same family-division, R. Nahman insists that even the unclean ones may officiate

---

(1) Since a statement as to the duration of their uncleanness, from its express form in the Torah, seems superfluous. But such repetition is illogical and hence the interpretation that it applies to the bathing is justified which proves that he who has intercourse with the menstruant may immerse by day.

(2) [As many couches as are under him become unclean although they had not been in direct contact with him, which is not the case with one who suffers corpse-uncleanness. He defiles only those couches which his body actually touches.]

(3) All original causes of uncleanness (**אבות הטומאה**) render, by touch, man and vessels unclean, whereas the derived first and second and third causes affect only foods and liquids, but neither human beings nor 'vessels' (apparel, etc.).

(4) This phrase in our case introduces a refutation.

(5) *Infra* 88a.

(6) This Tannaitic tradition is beyond the argument of any Amora. The refutation is complete.

(7) i.e., his wife.

(8) Keep away from him every company, lest someone die whilst in the same room with the high priest and render him unclean for seven days.

(9) Lit., 'permissible'.

(10) It is only suspended as by emergency and every effort is due to effect a proper service in its stead.

(11) Hence no precautionary measures, such as, so to speak, quarantining the priest, are necessary.

(12) *Beth-Ab. V. Glos.*

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 7a

because the Torah has rendered all levitical impurity caused through a corpse inoperative in case of a community.<sup>1</sup>

R. Shesheth said: Whence do I know that?<sup>2</sup> Because it has been taught: If the priest was standing and offering up the sheaf of the 'Omer<sup>3</sup> and it became unclean in his hands<sup>4</sup> let him tell and another one is brought in its place. And if there be none but this, one would say to him: 'Be clever and keep quiet'.<sup>5</sup> At all events he teaches, He should tell about it and another one is brought in its place!<sup>6</sup> — R. Nahman said: I admit<sup>7</sup> that where there is a remnant to be eaten [one would have to make an effort to procure a substitute sacrifice].<sup>8</sup> Another objection was raised: If he was offering up the meal-offering of the bullocks or rams or sheep, and it became unclean in his hand, he should say so and one brings another one in its place; but if there be none [available] but the first, one tells him,

‘Be wise and keep quiet’.<sup>9</sup> Does this not refer to the bullocks, rams and sheep offered up on the feast [of Sukkoth]?<sup>10</sup> — R. Nahman will answer you: No, the word ‘bullock’ refers to the bullock offered up in expiation of idolatry,<sup>11</sup> and although it is a community sacrifice, since there is no definite time fixed for it, one endeavours [to find a substitute offering]; the word ‘rams’ refers to the ram of Aaron<sup>12</sup> and although it is appointed to be sacrificed at a definite time, yet, since it is the offering of an individual, one endeavours [to procure a substitute]; the word ‘lambs’ refers to the lamb offered up together with the ‘Omer-sheaf, of which<sup>13</sup> there are remnants to be eaten. — Another objection was raised:<sup>14</sup> If [sacrificial] blood became unclean and one sprinkled it, if by mistake, it is accepted;<sup>15</sup> if wilfully, it is not accepted!<sup>16</sup> — This teaching refers to the sacrifice of an individual. Come and hear: For what [mistake at sacrifice] does the priest's plate<sup>17</sup> effect pardon?<sup>18</sup> Concerning blood, flesh, fat, which become unclean, whether by mistake or wilfully, whether by accident or voluntarily,<sup>19</sup> whether [the sacrifice] was offered up by an individual or by the entire community.<sup>20</sup> Now if it enter your mind that the law of uncleanness is inoperative in case of a community, what need is there for [the priest's plate] to effect pardon?— R. Nahman will answer you: What has been taught about the plate's effecting pardon, refers only to the sacrifice of an individual. Or, if you like, one might say, it refers also to such community sacrifices for which no definite time has been set. — Another objection was raised:<sup>20</sup> [Touching on] And Aaron shall bear the iniquity committed in the holy things. Does he bear any kind of iniquity? If you mean the iniquity of piggul [ — a sacrifice rejectable<sup>21</sup> because of the intended disposal beyond the legal limits of space], concerning this Scripture has said already, It will not be accepted.<sup>22</sup> If you mean the iniquity of nothar,<sup>23</sup> concerning that Scripture has said already, It shall not be imputed!<sup>24</sup>

(1) The source is Num. IX, 10: If any person . . . shall be unclean by reason of a dead body or be in a journey afar off, he could postpone the offering up of his paschal lamb until the fourteenth of the month of Iyar. From this R. Shesheth infers that a person (an individual) is suspended (postpones the celebration of Passover), but not a community. Pes. 66b.

(2) That the law is only suspended, not inoperative.

(3) V. Glos.

(4) The rendering in our text seems defective. In Men. 72a it reads: If he was standing and offering up the flour-offering of the ‘Omer and it became unclean, if there is another (available), he may say to him, — bring the other’ in its place. And if not he says to him — ‘Be clever and keep quiet’. The Tosef. reads: If he offered up the ‘Omer and it became unclean he tells it and one brings another one in its place. If there be none besides the first, one says to him, ‘Be clever and keep quiet about it’.

(5) Since no substitute is available, silence is wisdom, for the priest's frontplate procures forgiveness for such mishap. V. infra.

(6) Hence it is clear that even in the case of a community the law concerning corpse-uncleanness is but suspended, not rendered inoperative, which contradicts R. Nahman.

(7) Although a communal sacrifice may indeed be offered up also in a state of congregational impurity, it may not be eaten in a state of impurity. V. Pes. 77b.

(8) In the case of an ‘Omer offering, where the priest takes a fistful, I admit that remnants to be consumed must be consumed in cleanliness.

(9) This text is apparently taken from the Tosef. Men. II, yet in that text the word for ‘rams’ is omitted.

(10) V. Num. XXIX, 12ff. These are community sacrifices, with a definite time appointed for them, yet the law of impurity is only suspended, for ‘one brings another one in its place’.

(11) The passage in Num. XV, 22f: And when ye shall err and not observe all these commandments, then it shall be, if done in error by the congregation . . . that all the congregation shall offer up one bullock for a burnt-offering, is assumed to refer to the main and most potent error: idolatry.

(12) Offered up on the Day of Atonement.

(13) The meal-offering brought with the ‘Omer lamb, of which a fistful was taken by the priest and the remnants eaten.

(14) V. Pes. 16b.

(15) And the flesh thereof may be eaten.

(16) [In so far that the flesh may not be eaten, though pardon is effected by means of the priest's plate (v. infra). This proves that the law of uncleanness does operate in the case of a community (which is apparently included in the general

terms of this teaching).]

(17) The source is Ex. XXVIII, 36-38: And thou shalt make a plate of pure gold and engrave upon it, like the engravings of a signet: HOLY OF THE LORD. And thou shalt put it on a thread of blue, and it shall be upon the mitre: upon the forefront of the mitre it shall be. And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead and Aaron shall bear the iniquity committed in the holy things which the children of Israel hallow.

(18) Lit., 'Make (the sacrifice) acceptable.'

(19) The word רצון (free-will) after מזיד (wilfully) is tautologous, but it is a matter of Talmudic style, since אונם (accident) is mentioned, its opposite is also included, illustratively rather than logically.

(20) Men. 25b.

(21) Lev. VII, 18: And if any of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings (which according to the preceding verse may be eaten only in the day that it is offered on and on the morrow) be at all eaten on the third day, it shall not be accepted, neither shall it be imputed unto him that offereth it: it shall be an abhorred thing (piggul) and the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity. The term piggul although generally denoting the intention in the mind of the officiating priest to dispose of the sacrifice beyond the proper time (חוי' לזמנה) signifies here according to Rashi the intended disposal thereof beyond the legal limits of space, (חוי' למקומו). V. Zeb. 28a. Tosaf. explains differently.

(22) V. note 5.

(23) [Lit., 'left over', generally portions of sacrifice left over beyond the legal time and here with the special meaning of the intended disposal of the sacrifice beyond the legal time, so Rashi.]

(24) Lev. VII, 18.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 7b

Is it not hence that there is no iniquity which he bears except that concerning levitical uncleanness which has been declared inoperative in its general rule whenever a community sacrifice is involved, and the difficulty remains for R. Shesheth?<sup>1</sup> Concerning this matter the Tannaim differ,<sup>2</sup> for it has been taught:<sup>3</sup> The front plate effects pardon<sup>4</sup> whether it be on the high priest's forehead or not; these are the words of R. Simeon. R. Judah said: As long as it is on his forehead it effects pardon, if it is not on his forehead, it does not effect pardon. R. Simeon said to him: The case of the high priest on the Day of Atonement proves [your contention wrong], for the plate<sup>5</sup> is then not on his forehead and yet it effects pardon — R. Judah answered him: Leave the case of the high priest on the Day of Atonement alone, for to him, because the community is concerned,<sup>6</sup> the law of uncleanness has been rendered inoperative. Hence it is to be inferred that according to R. Simeon<sup>7</sup> the law of uncleanness is only suspended in case of a community.<sup>8</sup>

Abaye said: If the front plate was broken there is no conflicting opinion, all agreeing that it effects no pardon. The dispute concerns only the case when it is hung up on a peg, R. Judah holding, And it shall be upon the forehead [of Aaron] and he shall bear,<sup>9</sup> whilst R. Simeon bases his opinion on, And it shall be continually upon his forehead, that they may be accepted before the Lord.<sup>10</sup> Now what does 'continually' mean? Shall I say that it shall indeed be continually on his forehead? How is that possible? Must he not enter the privy<sup>11</sup> occasionally, must he not sleep at times?<sup>11</sup> Rather must it all imply that [the front plate] 'continually'<sup>12</sup> effects pardon. According to R. Judah,<sup>13</sup> does not Scripture say 'continually'?<sup>14</sup> — That word implies that he should never dismiss it from his mind;<sup>15</sup> this is in agreement with Rabbah son of Huna, for Rabbah son of Huna said: A man is obliged to touch his tefillin<sup>16</sup> every hour. This may be learned by inference ad majus from the front plate.

(1) Who holds that that law is only suspended, not abrogated, where a community sacrifice is involved.

(2) So that R. Shesheth may have the benefit of the support of the Tanna whose opinion he held.

(3) Pes. 77a.

(4) For uncleanness of a sacrifice.

(5) On that day, when the high priest enters the Holy of Holies, he doffs his golden garments, including the front plate, and wears simple linen.

- (6) He offers up the sacrifice to make atonement for the whole congregation.
- (7) Who opposes the view of R. Judah.
- (8) And it is the front plate that effects the pardon. This is the dispute of the Tannaim.
- (9) Ex. XXVII, 38.
- (10) Ibid., the pardon dependent upon the high priest's bearing the plate.
- (11) Respect for the holy garment would necessitate its removal at that time.
- (12) The evidence of the text seems to favour R. Simeon's interpretation.
- (13) Not only does his own interpretation appear wrong when confronted with R. Simeon's argument.
- (14) The word 'continually', which cannot be referred to the wearing of the plate, needs must be applied to its efficacy.
- (15) Not the outward efficacy of the plate; the attitude of the high priest towards its function is what the Torah prescribes here.
- (16) Originally the tefillin were worn all day. V. Shab. 130a.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 8a**

If touching the front plate, on which the mention [of God] is but inscribed once,<sup>1</sup> the Torah prescribes 'And it shall be continually upon his forehead,' i.e., he shall not dismiss it from his mind, how much more does this apply to the tefillin which contain the mention [of God] many a time!<sup>2</sup> But according to R. Simeon who says the front plate effects pardon always, does not Scripture intimate [in the passage], 'On the forehead [of Aaron] and he shall bear' [that the effecting of pardon depends on his bearing the plate]?- No, that passage merely serves to indicate the place of the plate. Whence does R. Judah know that there is a definite place prescribed for the front plate?<sup>3</sup> He infers that from 'On his forehead'. Why should not R. Simeon infer it from the passage too?<sup>4</sup> -Indeed he does. Then how does he interpret 'On the forehead [of Aaron] and he shall bear'?- He will tell you: [It means to say that] whatsoever is fit to rest 'on the forehead', can effect pardon, whatsoever is not fit to rest on the forehead cannot effect it. This excludes a broken plate, which, indeed, cannot effect a pardon. Whence now does R. Judah infer the law concerning a broken plate? — He derives it from the [fact that instead of] 'the forehead' the text has 'his forehead'.<sup>5</sup> R. Simeon, however, does not attach any significance to [the words] 'the forehead', [and] 'his forehead'.<sup>6</sup>

Are the above Tannaim disputing the principle of the following Tannaim? For it has been taught: On both of them<sup>7</sup> throughout the seven days they would sprinkle from all the sin-offerings<sup>8</sup> that were there;<sup>9</sup> these are the words of R. Meir. R. Jose said: They sprinkled him only on the third and seventh days. R. Hanina, the deputy high priest<sup>10</sup> said: The priest that was to burn the red heifer they sprinkled on each of the seven days, but the high priest that was to officiate on the Day of Atonement was sprinkled only on the third and seventh day.<sup>11</sup> Is it not that their difference rests on this principle: R. Meir holds the law concerning ritual uncleanness to be only suspended in the case of community, whilst R. Jose considers it inoperative in that case.<sup>12</sup> But how can you understand the case of a community?<sup>13</sup> If R. Jose holds that the law concerning ritual uncleanness is inoperative in case of a community, why is any sprinkling necessary? — Rather, you must assume that all agree that these Tannaim hold that law to be only suspended in case of a community and the point of issue here between them is this: R. Meir holds that we say that it is obligatory<sup>14</sup> for the ritual immersion to be taken in its proper time,<sup>15</sup> and R. Jose holds we do not say that it is obligatory for the ritual immersion to be taken in its proper time.<sup>15</sup> But does R. Jose hold that we do not maintain that it is obligatory for the ritual immersion to take place in its proper time? Surely, it has been taught: One who has the name [of God] inscribed on his flesh must not bathe<sup>16</sup> nor anoint himself nor stand at a place of filth. If he happens to have an obligatory ritual bath, he should place reed grass on that part and thus bathe.<sup>17</sup> R. Jose says: He may go down to bathe as usual, provided he does not rub that part.<sup>18</sup> And it is established that they are disputing the question as to whether it is obligatory for a ritual immersion to take place in its proper time; the first Tanna holding we do not say that it is obligatory for a ritual immersion to be taken in its proper time, and R. Jose affirming that we do say that it is obligatory for a ritual immersion to be taken in its proper place.<sup>19</sup> — Rather: Everybody

agrees that those two Tannaim<sup>20</sup> both hold we do say that it is obligatory for a ritual immersion to be taken in its proper time, and their dispute above concerns the following principle: R. Meir is of the opinion that we compare<sup>21</sup> the [law concerning] ‘sprinkling’ to [that concerning] the immersion<sup>22</sup> and R. Jose holds we do not compare ‘sprinkling’ to immersion’. What about R. Hanina, the deputy high priest? If he compares ‘sprinkling’ to ‘immersion’, the high priest on the Day of Atonement too [should be sprinkled on every day]. And if he does not compare ‘sprinkling’ to ‘immersion’ the priest who burns the heifer [should] neither [be sprinkled on every day]? — In truth he does not make that comparison, the enactment<sup>23</sup> touching the priest who burns the heifer being a mere special stringency.<sup>24</sup>

According to whose opinion is the following teaching: There is no difference between the priest who burns the heifer and the high priest on the Day of Atonement except

- 
- (1) In the inscription ‘HOLY UNTO THE LORD’.
  - (2) In the four excerpts from the Torah, which they contain. Hence the obligation to touch tefillin all the time, as a reminder of the lessons they convey.
  - (3) Since he interprets ‘On the forehead and he shall bear’ as indicating interdependence of pardon and plate, whence does he know the place of the plate?— Perhaps it may be worn elsewhere too.
  - (4) The passage is simple and direct enough and untouched by the controversy.
  - (5) In the phrase ‘On his forehead continually’, R. Judah derives the law of the broken plate from the use of the possessive.
  - (6) There is nothing abnormal calling for special attention in the use of the possessive.
  - (7) V. supra p. 12 notes.
  - (8) With water from the ashes.
  - (9) Which remained from red heifers from the time of Moses until that period (Bertinoro). V. also Parah III, 5. From the ashes of every heifer some part was kept for future use.
  - (10) Segan. V. Sanh., Sonc. ed. p. 91, n. 1.
  - (11) Cf. Num. XIX, 19.
  - (12) Which shows that R. Jose and R. Meir differ on the same principle as R. Judah and R. Simeon.
  - (13) Lit., ‘Can you hold that opinion?’
  - (14) Mizwah may mean ‘commandment’, ‘good deed’, ‘ought’, ‘is obligatory’.
  - (15) [On the day prescribed by the law, and the same applies to the sprinkling which for the reason explained infra must take place every day.]
  - (16) Lest he blot out the name of God.
  - (17) Lest he blot out ‘the name of God.’
  - (18) V. Shab. 120b.
  - (19) From here it would appear that R. Jose held the ritual bath should be taken as soon as it is due.
  - (20) R. Meir and R. Jose.
  - (21) Lit., ‘analogy’, ‘comparison’, usually based on the close connection of two subjects in one and the same passage of the Torah. Arguments from Hekkesch are, in general, regarded as being more conclusive than those from Gezerah Shawah, the former not admitting of refutation. Both could be applied only for the purpose of supporting a traditional law. Mielziner, l.c.
  - (22) Cf. supra p. 12.
  - (23) That he be sprinkled on the third and fifth days.
  - (24) As to the stringency v. p. 10, n. 2, but even so the sprinkling was not indispensable on any definite day; all that was prohibited was too long an interval between the first and the second sprinkling (Rashi).

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 8b**

that the latter is removed for the purpose of sanctity,<sup>1</sup> and his fellow priests were permitted to touch him, whilst the former is removed for purposes of ritual and his colleagues forbidden to touch him. According to whom [is this teaching]? According to the opinion either of R. Meir or of R. Jose. For

if it were in accord with the opinion of R. Hanina, deputy high priest, there would be one more point of difference.<sup>2</sup>

R. Jose, the son of R. Hanina demurred to this: It is quite right that we sprinkle him on the first day,<sup>3</sup> because that may be the third of his impurity; similarly on the second, because that may be the third day of his impurity; on the third, because that may be the third day of his impurity; on the fifth, because that may be the seventh day of his impurity; on the sixth, because that may be the seventh day of his impurity; on the seventh, because that may be the seventh day of his impurity. But on the fourth day why should there be any sprinkling at all? That day could not be in doubt as being either the third day<sup>4</sup> or the seventh day<sup>5</sup> of his impurity? — But, according to your own point of view, how can there be sprinkling throughout the seven days? For have we not an established rule that the sprinkling is forbidden as shebuth<sup>6</sup> and as such cannot override the Sabbath?<sup>7</sup> — But you must then needs say: ‘Seven days with the exception of the Sabbath’, similarly here, ‘Seven<sup>8</sup> with the exception of the fourth day.’ Rabah said: For that reason since the matter of the high priest on the Day of Atonement does not depend on us but on the fixing of the calendar,<sup>9</sup> he ought to be separated on the third of Tishri, and on whatever day the third of Tishri falls, we would remove him; but as to the priest who burns the heifer, since the matter depends on us,<sup>10</sup> we should remove him on the fourth of the week, so that his fourth day would fall on the Sabbath.

TO THE CELL OF THE COUNSELLORS etc. R. Judah said, Was it the ‘cell of the parhedrin [counsellors], was it not rather the ‘cell of the buleute<sup>11</sup> [senators]’? Originally, indeed, it was called the ‘cell of the buleute’ but because money<sup>12</sup> was being paid<sup>13</sup> for the purpose of obtaining the position of high priest and the [high priests] were changed every twelve<sup>14</sup> months, like those counsellors, who are changed every twelve months,<sup>15</sup> therefore it came to be called ‘the cell of the counsellors’.

We learnt elsewhere: upon the bakers<sup>16</sup> the Sages imposed only the duty of setting apart<sup>17</sup> enough for the heave-offering of tithes<sup>18</sup> and hallah.<sup>19</sup> Now, it is quite right [that they did not impose] the great heave-offering, because it has been taught:

---

(1) As the high priest was about to enter the sanctuary, he was removed from all, in order that he may, in solitude, take upon himself the holiness of the day, shed all pride of office and concentrate on his great responsibility viz., to obtain forgiveness of sin for Israel. As for the priest of the heifer, v. p. 2, n. 2.

(2) For according to R. Hanina, there is this additional difference that the high priest is sprinkled on the third and seventh day only, whereas the priest who is to burn the heifer is sprinkled on each of the seven days.

(3) Of the priest's separation, Num. XIX, 19: And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean person on the third day, and on the seventh day; and on the seventh day shall he purify him. Ibid. 12: But if he purify himself not on the third day and on the seventh day, he shall not be clean.

(4) For, since he became separated he did not touch a corpse.

(5) For if the fourth day of his separation were the seventh day of his impurity, then the day before his separation would needs have been the third day of his impurity, and not having been sprinkled on that day, he could not be sprinkled on the seventh day of his impurity (the fourth day of his separation) for a first sprinkling on the third day of the impurity is indispensable for the second sprinkling on the seventh day.

(6) Lit., ‘rest’, work forbidden by the Rabbis on the Sabbath and festivals as being out of spirit with the ceremony of the day.

(7) I.e., the prohibition of work on the Sabbath. Pes. 65a.

(8) ‘Seven’ must be understood to mean *exceptis excipiendis*, with the exception of those days on which the sprinkling is not lawful or not necessary.

(9) Lit., ‘month’. His entering the sanctuary on the Day of Atonement on the tenth of Tishri depends only on the fixing of the new moon by the Sanhedrin (Cf. Sanh. 2a), from which the tenth would be counted.

(10) There is no definite time prescribed for the burning of the red heifer.

(11) [\*\*, the members of the \*\*, the administrative body of the city of Jerusalem. V. Buchler, *Synedrion* p. 232.]

(12) To the Hasmonean kings and their satellites.

(13) [So Rashi cur. ed. (lit.,) 'they gave money for it' etc. The phrase 'for it' (לִּי) is obscure.]

(14) This is not to be taken literally. On an average, as the Talmud tells later on, these high priests lasted twelve months, no longer. [MS.M. reads: 'They were changed by Heaven'. I.e., they did not survive the twelve months. Others: 'They were removed by the king when a higher price was offered him for the priesthood.' Rashi reads: 'They changed it,' 'it' referring to the chamber. Each new priest on his accession would set up a new chamber for himself.]

(15) Rashi: The king removed his counsellors annually.

(16) Bakers who were 'Fellows' of the pharisaic order. As such they had to undertake scrupulous observance especially of the laws of levitical purity. The haberim (fellows) were distinguished from the great mass of the 'ame ha-arez, the untrained multitude, who were suspects as to levitical purity and also as to the payment of tithe. V. infra.

(17) From the doubtfully tithed fruit which they had brought of the 'amme ha-aretz.

(18) Terumath Ma'aser. V. Glos. s.v. terumah. Terumah Gedolah. V. Glos. s.v. terumah.

(19) The priest's share of the dough. V. Demai II, 4.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 9a

Because he<sup>1</sup> sent into all the districts of Israel and he found that they<sup>2</sup> were separating only the great heave-offering;<sup>3</sup> [it is also right that the Sages did not impose upon these bakers] the first tithe and the poor man's tithe,<sup>4</sup> because [of the principle that] the claimant must produce evidence;<sup>5</sup> but the second tithe, let then [the baker] separate, take it up to Jerusalem and eat it there! 'Ulla said: Because these parhedrin<sup>6</sup> were beating them all the twelve months<sup>7</sup> and telling them 'sell cheap, sell cheap,' the Sages did not burden them [to set apart the second tithe and take it up to Jerusalem].<sup>8</sup> What does parhedrin mean? — Porase [managers].<sup>9</sup> Rabbah b. Bar Hana said: What is the meaning of the passage, The fear of the Lord prolongeth days,' but the years of the wicked shall be shortened?<sup>10</sup> 'The fear of the Lord prolongeth days' refers to the first Sanctuary, which remained standing for four hundred and ten years and in which there served only eighteen<sup>11</sup> high priests. 'But the years of the wicked shall be shortened'<sup>10</sup> refers to the second Sanctuary, which abided for four hundred and twenty years and at which more than three hundred [high] priests served. Take off therefrom the forty years which Simeon the Righteous served,<sup>12</sup> eighty years which Johanan the high priest served,<sup>13</sup> ten, which Ishmael b. Fabi<sup>14</sup> served, or, as some say, the eleven years of R. Eleazar b. Harsum.<sup>15</sup> Count [the number of high priests] from then on and you will find that none of them completed his year [in office].<sup>16</sup> R. Johanan b. Torta<sup>17</sup> said: Why was Shiloh<sup>18</sup> destroyed? Because of two [evil] things that prevailed there, immorality and contemptuous treatment of sanctified objects. [Proof that] immorality prevailed because it is written, Now Eli was very old, and he heard all that his sons did unto Israel, and how that they lay with the women that did service at the door of the tent of meeting. Notwithstanding R. Samuel b. Nahmani who said in the name of R. Johanan: Whosoever says, The sons of Eli sinned<sup>19</sup> is but mistaken; it is

---

(1) Johanan, the high priest.

(2) The great mass of the people, exclusive of the Haberim. V. Glos. s.v. haber.

(3) V. Sot. 48a.

(4) The first tithe belonged to the Levite and was due annually; the second tithe was to be consumed by the owner in Jerusalem, annually; the third tithe was due every third year—it was the poor man's tithe.

(5) The heave-offering of the tithe, like the terumah (v. Glos.) itself, was, on penalty of death through divine action, forbidden to be eaten by a non-priest. With regard to the poor man's tithe, the baker could say: If you want to assert legal claim thereto, you will have to prove that the 'am ha-arez, from whom I bought it, has failed to give tithe thereof before he sold it to me. Unless such proof was forthcoming, there was no legal claim on the part of the Levite on the non-Levite poor to its possession.

(6) Paredroi-assessors, counsellors. The Mishnah J. reads paledroi. The Tosef. paredroi. These assessors had a bad reputation from their oppressive measures at the market places, over which, as commissioners, they had jurisdiction. So that, apart from the fact that the high priests, during the second Temple, were changed as often as these officials, the fact that they were dubbed paredroi indicates that there must have been more than one point of contact between these

officials and the priests.

(7) Usually their office was of twelve months' duration. As the next line shows, these officials made full use of their twelve months' opportunity for abuse of power.

(8) The Sages preferred to give the baker haberim the benefit of the doubt that the 'amme ha-arez, as a rule, do give the tithe.

(9) Cf. "\*\*, supervisor, purser, collector, which is logical rather than etymological.

(10) Prov. X, 27.

(11) [Var. lec., eight priests. Cf. I Chron. V, 36ff. Jehozadak who was taken to exile not being counted. V. Tosaf. s.v. **סז**] and Rashi I Chron. V, 36.]

(12) Simeon the Just, High Priest Simon I, c. 300 b.c.e. ' v. Aboth, Sonc. ed., p. 2.

(13) John Hyrcanus, the Hasmonean high priest (Jastrow). V. Ber. He succeeded Simeon the Righteous as high priest (Bertinoro, Ma'as. Sh., 5, end). After eighty years serving as high priest he became a Sadducee (Ber. 29a). That makes it difficult to identify him with John Hyrcanus.

(14) V. Tosef. cf. Yoma 1. [High priest in the days of Agrippa II. He is not to be confused with the high priest of the same name who is reported by Josephus (Wars VI 2, 2) to have been executed in Cyrene after the destruction of the Temple. V. Buchler. op. cit. p. 98.]

(15) V. ibid. I. The Tosef. reads Harsoth. In Yoma 35b he is described as a model rich man who forsook his financial interests to devote himself to the Torah.

(16) Bah, in his marginal notes, inserts on the basis of text on parallel passages the following interpolation here: R. Johanan b. Torta said: 'And why all that? Because they bought the priestly office for money, for R. Assi reported that Martha, the daughter of Boethus, brought King Jannai two kabful of denars to nominate Joshua b. Gamala as one of the high priests. And R. Johanan b. Torta said (further). The same statement is made, infra 18a, in the name of R. Assi.

(17) An interesting account of Torta is given in the Pesik. Rab. XIV: (tortah being taken as the feminine of tora, hence cow. It occurs in this form in the Targum Num. XIX, 2.) He said: If a cow that has no speech and no mind, recognized her Creator, should I, whom my Maker created in His image, not go and acknowledge Him. He became a Jew, studied, grew efficient in the Torah and they named him Johanan b. Torta.

(18) The seat of the Tabernacle after the conquest.

(19) As the text indicates. The same apologetics are elsewhere used to defend Reuben, the sons of Samuel, David, Solomon. (Shab. 55b).

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 9b**

because they delayed offering up their sacrificial<sup>1</sup> birds Scripture accounts it to them as if they had lain with them. The [sacred] offerings were treated contemptuously, as it is written,<sup>2</sup> Yea, before the fat was made to smoke, the priest's servant came and said to the man that sacrificed: 'Give flesh to roast for the priest,' for he will not have sodden flesh of thee, but raw.' And if the man said unto him: 'Let the fat be made to smoke first of all, and then take as much as thy soul desireth': then he would say: 'Nay, but thou shalt give it me now, and if not, I will take it by force. 'And the sin of the young men was very great before the Lord, — for the men dealt contemptuously with the offering of the Lord.

Why was the first Sanctuary destroyed? Because of three [evil] things which prevailed there: idolatry, immorality, bloodshed. Idolatry, as it is written: For the bed is too short for a man to stretch himself and the covering too narrow when he gathereth himself up.<sup>3</sup> What is the meaning of 'For the bed is too short for a man to stretch himself'? R. Jonathan said: It is: This bed<sup>4</sup> is too short for two neighbours to stretch themselves. And [what is the meaning of] 'the covering too narrow when he gathereth himself up'? — R. Samuel b. Nahmani said: When R. Jonathan [in his reading] came to this passage, he would cry and say: To Him, concerning Whom it is written, He gathereth the waters of the sea together like a heap,<sup>5</sup> the cover became too narrow! Immorality [prevailed] as it is written: Moreover the Lord said: Because the daughters of Zion are haughty, and walk with stretched-forth necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go, and make a tinkling with their feet.<sup>6</sup> 'Because the daughters of Zion are haughty', i.e., they used to walk with proud carriage. 'And

wanton eyes' i.e., they filled their eyes with kohl.<sup>7</sup> 'Walking and mincing as they go', i.e. , they used to walk with the heel touching the toe. 'And make a tinkling with their feet', R. Isaac said: They would take myrrh and balsam and place it in their shoes<sup>8</sup> and when they came near the young men of Israel they would kick, causing the balsam to squirt at them and would thus cause the evil desire to enter them like an adder's poison.

Bloodshed [prevailed] as it is written: Moreover Manaseh shed innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another.<sup>9</sup> They were wicked, but they placed their trust in the Holy One, blessed be He.<sup>10</sup> For it is written, The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money; yet will they lean upon the Lord and say 'Is not the Lord in the midst of us? No evil shall come upon us'.<sup>11</sup> Therefore the Holy One, blessed be He, brought them three evil decrees as against the three evils which were their own:<sup>12</sup> Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps and the mountain of the house as the high places of a forest. But why was the second Sanctuary destroyed, seeing that in its time they were occupying themselves with Torah, [observance of] precepts, and the practice of charity? Because therein prevailed hatred without cause. That teaches you that groundless hatred is considered as of even gravity with the three sins of idolatry, immorality, and bloodshed together . And [during the time of] the first Sanctuary did no groundless hatred prevail? Surely it is written: They are thrust down to the sword with my people; smite therefore upon my thigh,<sup>13</sup> and R. Eleazar said: This refers to people who eat and drink together and then thrust each other through with the daggers of their tongue! — That [passage] speaks of the princes in Israel, for it is written , Cry and wail, son of man; for it is upon my people,<sup>13</sup> etc. [The text reads] 'Cry and wail, son of man'. One might have assumed [it is upon] all [Israel], therefore it goes on, Upon all the princes of Israel.

R. Johanan and R. Eleazar both say: The former ones whose iniquity was revealed<sup>14</sup> had their end<sup>15</sup> revealed, the latter ones whose iniquity was not revealed have their end still unrevealed.

R. Johanan said: The fingernail of the earlier generations<sup>16</sup> is better than the whole<sup>17</sup> body of the later generations. Said Resh Lakish to him: On the contrary, the latter generations are better,<sup>18</sup> although they are oppressed by the governments, they are occupying themselves with the Torah .- He [R. Johanan] replied: The Sanctuary will prove [my point] for it came back to the former generations, but not to the latter ones.

The question was put to R. Eleazar: Were the earlier generations better, or the later ones? — He answered: Look upon the Sanctuary! Some say he answered: The Sanctuary is your witness [in this matter].<sup>19</sup>

Resh Lakish was swimming in the Jordan. Thereupon Rabbah b. Bar Hana came and gave him the hand:<sup>20</sup> Said [Resh Lakish] to him: By God! I hate you. For it is written: If she be a wall, we will build upon her a turret of silver; if she be a door, we will enclose her with boards of cedar.<sup>21</sup> Had you made yourself like a wall and had all come up in the days of Ezra, you would have been compared to silver, which no rottenness can ever affect. Now that you have come up like doors,<sup>22</sup> you are like cedarwood, which rottenness prevails over. What is erez ['cedar']?- 'Ulla said: It is sasmagor.<sup>23</sup> What is 'sasmagor'?-R. Abba says it is the divine<sup>24</sup> voice as it has been taught: After the later prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi had died, the Holy Spirit<sup>25</sup> departed from Israel, but they still availed themselves of the Bath Kol.<sup>26</sup> — But did Resh Lakish talk with Rabbah b. Bar Hana?<sup>27</sup> Even with R. Eleazar, who was the master of the land of Israel, Resh Lakish did not converse<sup>28</sup> [for anyone with whom Resh Lakish conversed in the street could get merchandise without witnesses]<sup>29</sup> would he engage in conversation with Rabbah b. Bar Hana?-R. Papa said: 'Throw a man between them'.<sup>30</sup> It was either Resh Lakish and Ze'iri or Rabbah b. Bar Hana and R. Eleazar.<sup>31</sup> When he [Resh Lakish] came before R. Johanan , he said to him: This is not the reason.<sup>32</sup> Even if they had all

come up in the time of Ezra, the Divine Presence would not have rested over the second Sanctuary, for it is written:<sup>33</sup> God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, [that means],

- 
- (1) Lev. XII, 8.
  - (2) I Sam. li, 15-17.
  - (3) Isa. XXVIII, 20.
  - (4) Manasseh the faithless king, introduced idols into the very Sanctuary. There was no room for the God of Israel, together with an idol, in his one Sanctuary.
  - (5) Ps. XXXIII, 7. The ad hoc exposition here is either: 'On his cover (the idol) became His rival,' or 'The cover itself, used for idolatrous purposes, thus became His rival,' the cover here standing for the Sanctuary.
  - (6) Isa. III, 16.
  - (7) A powder used for painting the eyelids, stibium (Jastrow).
  - (8) Bah interpolates here: and walking around in the streets of Jerusalem and when they came near etc., v. D.S.
  - (9) II Kings XXI, 16.
  - (10) The text as it stands is in need of correction. The present rearrangement based on text in parallel passages (v. D.S.) is adopted by Bah. [Cur. edd. insert: 'This refers to the first Sanctuary'. This, on the rearrangement of the text adopted (v. n. 5), is evidently superfluous. V. D.S.]
  - (11) Micah III, 11.
  - (12) Ibid. 12.
  - (13) Ezek. XXI, 17.
  - (14) 'Who did not hide their misdeeds' (Rashi).
  - (15) I.e., the end of their captivity. Jer. XXIX, 10: For thus saith the Lord: After seventy years are accomplished in Babylon, I will remember you and perform My good word to you, in causing you to return to this place.
  - (16) The earlier generations are, of course, those of the first Temple, the later ones Israel since the second destruction.
  - (17) Lit. , 'the belly'.
  - (18) Or 'better off'. There is a slight shift in the argument. R. Johanan had referred to their value, Resh Lakish to their political and moral condition.
  - (19) It came back to them after the first destruction, it has not come back to us as yet. There is only a slight difference in Hebrew between the two versions עיניכם and עידיכם.
  - (20) [To help Resh Lakish out of the water. V. D.S. a.l. n. 100.]
  - (21) Cant. VIII, 9.
  - (22) A wall is of one piece, a door, a gate at least of two. Had Israel come from Babylon, not in parts, but at once, Jewry in Palestine may have been found worthy of a restoration of the Sanctuary.
  - (23) Perhaps a comp. of sass and magor-magerah i.e. , a sawing worm. Bah reads: The worm destroys and saws it off from within.
  - (24) Bath Kol (v. Glos.). Just as some part of the cedar is unaffected by the worm, surviving the ruin, so was the gift of the divine voice a remnant of God's grace, even after the destruction. V., however, Cant. Rab. VIII, 11
  - (25) Of prophecy.
  - (26) V. Sot. 48b.
  - (27) [In the street, v. infra.]
  - (28) Tosaf. a.I. suggests that he would not address R. Eleazar, but would, of course, offer him the courtesy of a reply, when addressed by him; an example is cited from Zeb. 5a.
  - (29) One would trust the honesty of a man whom Resh Lakish honoured by engaging him in public conversation.
  - (30) Change the account by substituting one other man for one of the persons mentioned in the original account.
  - (31) 'If Resh Lakish was the swimmer, make Ze'iri the other man; or Rabbah b. Bar Hana offered the hand and R. Eleazar was the swimmer' (Rashi). [Aliter: Or Rabbah b. Bar Hana (who was a Palestinian) was the swimmer, and R. Eleazar (who was a Babylonian) offered the hand, v. Hyman, Toledoth, p.3 1076.]
  - (32) Your complaint was unjustified.
  - (33) Gen. IX, 27.

although God has enlarged Japheth,<sup>1</sup> the Divine Presence rests only in the tents of Shem.<sup>2</sup> Whence do we know that the Persians are derived from Japheth? — Because It is written: The sons of Japheth: Gomer, and Magog, and Madai and Javan, and Tubal, and Meshek, and Tiras.<sup>3</sup> ‘Gomer’, i.e. Germania;<sup>4</sup> ‘Magog’, i.e. Kandia;<sup>5</sup> ‘Madai’, i.e. Macedonia; ‘Javan’,<sup>6</sup> in its literal sense; ‘Tubal’, i.e. Beth-Unyaki;<sup>7</sup> ‘Meshek’, i.e. Mysia;<sup>8</sup> ‘Tiras’ — its identification is a matter of dispute between R. Simai and the Rabbis, or, according to another report, between R. Simon and the Rabbis, one holding that it is to be identified with Beth Tiryaka,<sup>9</sup> and the other [authorities] declaring it is Persia. R. Joseph learnt: ‘Tiras’ is Persia, Sabtah and Raamah, and Sabteca.<sup>10</sup> R. Joseph learnt: I.e. the inner Sakistan and the outer Sakistan.<sup>11</sup> Between the two there is [a distance] of one hundred parasangs and its circumference one thousand parasangs.<sup>12</sup> And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh in the land of Shinar.<sup>13</sup> ‘Babel’ in its usual sense; ‘Erech’ ‘i.e. Urikath;<sup>14</sup> ‘Accad’, i.e. Baskar;<sup>15</sup> ‘Calneh’, i.e. Nupar —<sup>16</sup> Ninpi. Out of that land went Ashur.<sup>17</sup> R. Joseph learnt: ‘Ashur’, i.e. Silok.<sup>18</sup> And builded Nineveh and Rehoboth-ir, and Calah.<sup>19</sup> ‘Nineveh in its usual Sense; ‘Rehoboth-ir’, i.e. Perath of Meshan.<sup>20</sup> ‘Calah’ i.e., Perath de Borsif.<sup>21</sup> And Resen between Nineveh and Calah — the same is the great city.<sup>22</sup> ‘Resen’, i.e., Ctesiphon.<sup>23</sup> ‘The same is the great city’. [From here] I do not know yet whether by ‘the great city’ Nineveh or Resen is meant. But, as Scripture says, Now Nineveh was an exceeding great city unto God, of three days’ journey,<sup>24</sup> say that by ‘the great city’ Nineveh is meant.

An<sup>25</sup> Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmai the children of Anak, were there.<sup>26</sup> A Tanna taught: ‘Ahiman’, i.e., the most skilful<sup>27</sup> of the brethren; ‘Sheshai’,<sup>28</sup> i.e., he made the ground [he stepped on] like pits; ‘Talmai’, i.e., he made the ground full of ridges. Another comment:<sup>29</sup> Ahiman built Anath, Sheshai built Alush; Talmai built Talbush.<sup>30</sup> [They were called] ‘the children of Anak’, because they lorded it over the sun by reason of their height.<sup>31</sup>

R. Joshua b. Levi in the name of Rabbi said: Rome is designed to fall into the hand of Persia, as it was said: Therefore hear ye the counsel of the Lord, that He hath taken against Edom; and His purposes that He hath purposed against the inhabitants of Teman: surely the least of the flock shall drag them away, surely their habitation shall be appalled to them.<sup>32</sup> Rabbah b. ‘Ullah demurred to this: What intimation is there that ‘the last of the flock’ refers to Persia? [Presumably] because Scripture reads: The ram which thou sawest having two horns, they are the kings of Media and Persia.<sup>33</sup> But say [perhaps] it is Greece, for it is written, And the rough he-goat is the king of Greece?<sup>34</sup> — When R. Habiba b. Surmaki came up,<sup>35</sup> he reported this interpretation before a certain scholar. The latter said: One who does not understand the meaning of the passage asks a question against Rabbi. What does, indeed, ‘the least of the flock’ mean? The youngest of his brethren, for R. Joseph learnt that Tiras is Persia.<sup>36</sup>

Rabbah b. Bar Hana in the name of R. Johanan, on the authority of R. Judah b. Ila'i, said: Rome is designed to fall into the hands of Persia, that may be concluded by inference a minori ad majus: If in the case of the first Sanctuary, which the sons of Shem [Solomon] built and the Chaldeans destroyed, the Chaldeans fell into the hands of the Persians,<sup>37</sup> then how much more should this be so with the second Sanctuary, which the Persians built and the Romans destroyed, that the Romans should fall into the hands of the Persians.<sup>38</sup> Rab said: Persia will fall into the hands of Rome. Thereupon R. Kahana and R. Assi asked of Rab: [Shall] the builders fall into the hands of the destroyers? — He said to them: Yes, it is the decree of the King.<sup>39</sup> Others say: He replied to them: They too are guilty for they destroyed the synagogues. It has also been taught in accord with the above, Persia will fall into the hands of Rome, first because they destroyed the synagogues, and then because it is the King's decree that the builders fall into the hands of the destroyers. Rab also said: The son of David will not come until the wicked kingdom of Rome will have spread [its sway] over the whole world for nine months, as it is said: Therefore will He give them up, until the time that she who travaileth hath brought forth; then the residue of his brethren shall return with the children of Israel.<sup>40</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: All the cells in the Sanctuary were without a mezuzah<sup>41</sup> with the exception of the cell of the counsellors, for therein there was a residence for the high priest. R. Judah said: Were there not a number of cells in the Sanctuary which had a compartment for a dwelling, yet had no mezuzah? Rather, the [reason for the] mezuzah on the cell of the counsellors was due to a preventive measure, What was the reason for R. Judah's statement? — Rabbah said, R. Judah is of the opinion, any house which is not made to serve both as a summer-home and a winter-home, is not a house.<sup>42</sup> Abaye raised an objection: But it is written: And I will smite the winter-house with the summer-house!<sup>43</sup> — He answered: They are called summer-house or winter-house, but not by the general name house. Abaye raised the following objection: ‘The sukkah<sup>44</sup> used at the Feast [of Tabernacles] according to R. Judah renders [the fruit brought during the Feast] liable to tithe, whereas the Sages exempt it [from such duty]’;<sup>45</sup> and it has been learnt in connection with it: R. Judah considers [a sukkah] liable to ‘erub,<sup>46</sup> a mezuzah to tithe.<sup>47</sup> And if you should say he considers it liable to these duties only on rabbinic enactment, that could apply to ‘erub and mezuzah, but as regards tithe, can one say that it is but a rabbinic enactment, [should we not fear]

(1) Japheth here stands for Persia, as the following account endeavours to show.

(2) [I.e. , the Divine Presence rests only in the Temple built by Solomon, a descendant of Shem and not in that built by the Persians, the descendants of Japheth.]

(3) Gen. X, 2.

(4) Germania, the land of the Cimmerii. [Rieger, P. (MGWJ, 1936 p. 455) identifies it with the modern Kerman in South Persia.]

(5) Usually identified with Crete. [J. Meg. I, 11 reads: Gothia, the land of the Goths.]

(6) [J.T.loc. cit. reads, ‘Madai in its literal sense, Javan is Ephesus’. Golds. accordingly reads Madai in its literal sense, Javan is Macedonia.]

(7) Bithynia in Asia Minor.

(8) Mysia, a district in Asia Minor.

(9) Thrace.

(10) Gen. X,7.

(11) Drangania, a district in Persia (Jast.). [Golds. Scythia.]

(12) Rashi: They are a district surrounded by mountains. The outer S. includes the inner S., the inner which is one hundred parasangs’ distance from the outer, while the circumference of the outer one is one thousand parasangs.

(13) Gen.X, 10.

(14) Warka, S.E. of Babylon (Jast.).

(15) Jast. reads כשכר Cashkar, Cascara in Babylonia (v. Payne-Smith 1843).

(16) Ass. Nippur, modern Niffer. [Ninpi was probably an additional name by which Nippur was known and which is probably derived from the planet-god Ninib, Obermeyer p. 336.]

(17) Gen. X, 11.

(18) In Keth. 10b the reading is סליקא Selucia, on the border of Babylonia and Assyria.

(19) Gen. X, 11 .

(20) Perath, according to Jastrow seems to be the general name of certain districts, thus in connection with Meshan, Messene, the island formed by the Euphrates, the Tigris and the royal canal. Berliner, Beitr. z. Geogr. 44.

(21) A city near the site of Babel, Borsippa.

(22) Gen. X,12.

(23) A town on the eastern bank of the Tigris.

(24) Jonah III, 3.

(25) The Talmud continues with aggadic interpretation of other names.

(26) Num. XIII, 22.

(27) Root מן (denominative of מן ‘right’). ‘To endow with skill’, ‘distinguish’.

(28) According to Rashi the name is to be connected with the root meaning ‘desolation’, Lam. III, 47.

(29) Rashi omits, ‘Another comment’, and just adds the information as to the building activity of the giant en passant.

(30) [Identified by Obermeyer with ‘Anah, Alusa and Telbeth, three fortified island-towns on the Northern Euphrates.]

(31) So Jast. Rashi: "With their height reaching up to the sun it surrounded their neck as a necklace does the neck.

- (32) Jer. XLIX, 20.
- (33) Dan. VIII, 20.
- (34) Dan. VIII, 21.
- (35) From Babylon to Palestine.
- (36) Tiras is mentioned last in Gen. X, 2, hence the 'youngest of the brethren'.
- (37) The destroyers fell into the hands of their enemies. Belshazzar into the hands of Darius (Rashi).
- (38) It seems logical that the destroyers fall into the hands of the builders.
- (39) The Supreme King of Kings.
- (40) Micah V, 2, interpreting the verse that the duration of the people's abandonment will be 'until the time etc.', i.e. nine months, the period of pregnancy.
- (41) The inscription of Deut. VI, 4-9, XI, 13-21 on a slip of parchment.
- (42) Only a 'house' (cf. Deut. VI, 9) requires a mezuzah, not a temporary residence.
- (43) Amos III, 15.
- (44) The booth covered with twigs for the seven days of Sukkoth (Tabernacles). Lev. XXIII, 33-44.
- (45) V. Ma'as. VII, 3. The liability to tithes begins only from the moment the produce is brought into the house, v. Ma'as. I, 3 and the point at issue between R. Judah and the Sages is whether a sukkah is considered a house in what concerns tithes.
- (46) For the purpose of regulating Sabbath limits of movement a legal community or continuity is symbolically established for the inhabitants of a city, a court etc. If the sukkah opens out into a court in which there are other dwellings too, the inhabitants of all these dwellings will contribute their share towards a dish to be deposited in one of the dwellings, by which act the dwellings are considered as common to all, and the carrying of objects across the court and from one dwelling to another will be permitted.
- (47) Only a house needs 'erub and mezuzah.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 10b

that he may come to set aside tithe from where it is obligatory for where it is exempt and from where it is exempt for where it is obligatory?<sup>1</sup> -Rather, said Abaye, there is no dispute concerning the seven days [of the separation], all agreeing that [the cell] is liable [to have a mezuzah];<sup>2</sup> what the dispute is concerned with is the other days of the year; the Rabbis would institute it as a precautionary measure on account of the seven days, whilst R. Judah does not see the need for such a measure. Raba said to him: But the teaching [of the Mishnah]<sup>3</sup> reads, 'The sukkah of the Feast during the Feast'! Therefore says Raba: On all other days of the year they all agree that there is no obligation [for a mezuzah at the sukkah and cell], the dispute touches only the seven days, and there is a special ground in the case of the sukkah and there is a special reason in the case of the cell. There is a special reason in the case of the sukkah: R. Judah, holding in accordance with his own principle, that the sukkah must have the character of a permanent residence, hence considers [the sukkah] is liable to a mezuzah, whilst the Rabbis, following their own principle, hold that the sukkah must have the character of an incidental residence, and hence requires no mezuzah. There is also a special reason for the dispute in the case of the cell [of the counsellors]; the Rabbis hold that a dwelling not freely chosen is called a dwelling whilst R. Judah is of the opinion that such dwelling is not included in the term dwelling; only rabbinically it was arranged that a mezuzah be affixed at the cell lest the people say the high priest is being kept in prison.<sup>4</sup>

Who has taught the following which our Rabbis have taught:

- 
- (1) He might take off the tithe from something that is liable to tithe only by rabbinic enactment for some other heap (of produce), which is liable by the law of the Torah, and vice versa, thus invalidating the former and the latter.
- (2) Even as at the sukkah.
- (3) V. supra p. 45, n. 5. And yet it is said: 'The Sages exempt it from tithe', hence even during the seven days, according to one view, there would be exemption from the duty.
- (4) Since only a dwelling not freely chosen does not need a mezuzah.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 11a

All the gates that were there<sup>1</sup> had no mezuzah, with the exception of the gate of Nicanor,<sup>2</sup> within which the cell of the counsellors was situated. Apparently this teaching is in agreement with the Rabbis<sup>3</sup> and not with R. Judah. For, if it were to be R. Judah's opinion [surely] he holds that [the mezuzah at the cell] itself is only a rabbinical enactment, shall we enact a preventive measure<sup>4</sup> to guard another preventive measure?<sup>5</sup> — You might even say it is in accord with R. Judah. [They are not two separate enactments, rather] the whole is but one measure.<sup>6</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: And upon thy gates:<sup>7</sup> alike upon the gates of houses, upon the gates of courts, upon the gates of provinces, upon the gates of cities rests the dutiful obligation<sup>8</sup> to the Omnipresent, as it is said, 'Upon the doorposts of thy house and upon thy gates'. Said Abaye to R. Safra: Why did the Rabbis not affix a mezuzah on the city gateways of Mahoza?<sup>9</sup> — He answered: They serve only as supports for the Fort of Turrets [of that city].<sup>10</sup> But the Fort of Turrets itself should have a mezuzah, for it contains a residence-compartment for the keeper of the prison! For it has been taught: A synagogue, which contains a dwelling-place for the synagogue attendant<sup>11</sup> must have a mezuzah! Rather, said Abaye, it<sup>12</sup> is due to a fear of danger.<sup>13</sup> For it has been taught: The mezuzah of an individual's [house] should be examined<sup>14</sup> twice every seven years, and of public buildings twice every fifty years. It happened to an Artaban<sup>15</sup> who was examining mezuzoth in the upper market of Sepphoris<sup>16</sup> that a quaestor found him and took from him a thousand zuz.<sup>17</sup> But R. Eleazar said: Messengers engaged in a mizwah do not come to harm? — Where danger is to be expected, it is different, for it is written: And Samuel said: How can I go? If Saul hear it, he will kill me. And the Lord said: Take a heifer with thee, and say: I am come to sacrifice unto the Lord.<sup>18</sup> R. Kahana recited before Rab Judah: The straw-magazine, the stable, the wood-shed, and the store-house are exempt from the mezuzah, because the women make use of them.<sup>19</sup> What does 'they make use [of them]' mean? — They bathe [therein].<sup>20</sup> Rab Judah said to him: The reason for the exemption is that they bathe [therein], but [had they been restricted to their] ordinary use, these places are liable to a mezuzah. But has it not been taught that an ox-stable is exempt from a mezuzah? Rather we must say that 'they make use [of them]' means they adorn themselves therein and this is what it teaches: Although the women adorn themselves therein, they are exempt from mezuzah.<sup>21</sup> Said R. Kahana to him: But are the [places] wherein women adorn themselves exempt [from a mezuzah]? Surely it has been taught: An ox-stable is exempt from mezuzah, and [places] where women adorn themselves are liable to a mezuzah — What then remains now for you to say [is that] the case of [dwellings] wherein women adorn themselves is being disputed by Tannaim,<sup>22</sup> and so on my view too<sup>23</sup> concerning these places [when limited to their] ordinary use, there is a dispute of Tannaim — For it has been taught: 'Thy house'<sup>24</sup> means 'a house appointed for thee', thus excluding the straw-magazine, the ox-stable, the wood-shed, and the store-house which are exempt from the mezuzah. Some however declare them liable [to have a mezuzah]. In truth, they said, the privy, the tannery, the bathhouse, the house for ritual immersion are exempt from a mezuzah. Now R. Kahana explains [this teaching] according to his view, and Rab Judah explains it according to his view. 'R. Kahana explains it according to his view' thus: 'Thy house' means 'the house appointed for thee', thus excluding a straw-magazine, ox-stable, woodshed and store-house which are exempt from a mezuzah. Some however declare them liable. In truth, they said, the privy, the tannery, the bath-house, the house for ritual immersion and the rooms which the women make use of to adorn themselves are exempt from the mezuzah. But if this is so, it is the same as merhaz? — We are informed about public and about private bath-houses. For the thought may have occurred that only public bath-houses are exempt because they are full of uncleanness, but private bathhouses, where there is less thereof, are liable to a mezuzah, therefore he lets us know [that even private bath-houses are exempt]. 'Rab Judah explains it in accord with his view': This is how it is taught: 'Thy house' means 'a house appointed for thee', that excludes the straw-magazine, ox-stable, wood-shed, and store-house as exempt from mezuzah, even though women adorn themselves [therein].<sup>25</sup> Some

consider houses wherein the women adorn themselves obliged to have a mezuzah. But [when restricted to their] ordinary use, all agree that they are exempt. In truth they said: The privy, the tannery, the private or public bathhouse, even though the women adorn themselves therein, are exempt from mezuzah, because they contain a great deal of uncleanness. But would, according to Rab Judah, all agree that [these places when restricted to their] ordinary use are exempt? Surely it has been taught: ‘In your gates’,<sup>26</sup> that implies alike the gates of houses, of courts, of provinces, of cities, cattle-sheds, hen-roosts, shed for straw, store-house for wine, store-house for oil — they all are liable to a mezuzah — One might assume this includes also

- 
- (1) All the gates in the eastern part of the Temple Court.
  - (2) Nicanor imported Corinthian bronze doors for the Temple gate called after him.
  - (3) I.e., the opponents of R. Judah in the Baraitha supra 10a.
  - (4) Making the Nicanor Gate liable to a mezuzah.
  - (5) V. Bez. 2b.
  - (6) Result of one enactment.
  - (7) Deut. VI, 9.
  - (8) Of affixing a mezuzah.
  - (9) A large Jewish trading town on the Tigris.
  - (10) [So Jast. Obermeyer p. 168: The fort of Be Koke, a fortress adjoining Mahoza.]
  - (11) Hazzan, v. Ta'an., Sonc. ed., p. 77, n. 2.
  - (12) The absence of a mezuzah at the Fort of Turrets.
  - (13) Rashi: Lest the king say: You are engaging in some witchcraft at the gate of my city. Perhaps because in examining the mezuzah from time to time one may find such an unpleasant quaestor as the Artaban did.
  - (14) It may have deteriorated by rotting or through worms, or it may have been stolen.
  - (15) A corruption or Judaization of ‘tribune’.
  - (16) In Upper Galilee.
  - (17) A silver coin, one fourth of a shekel, one denar.
  - (18) I Sam. XVI, 2.
  - (19) Lit., ‘are deriving benefit therein’.
  - (20) In the nude, hence it would be disrespectful to affix a mezuzah.
  - (21) [Rab Judah does not correct the Baraitha in stating that these places are exempt because the women make use of them. The Baraitha, in his view, means that although they make use of them, since, however, it is only for the purpose of adorning themselves and not as permanent dwellings, these places are exempt. Tosaf. s.v. פס]
  - (22) Whether they are liable to a mezuzah.
  - (23) Explaining the phrase as meaning ‘they bathe’.
  - (24) Deut. VI, 9.
  - (25) And which therefore might be considered dwellings.
  - (26) Deut. VI, 9.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 11b

the porter's lodge,<sup>1</sup> a veranda<sup>2</sup> and a balcony, therefore the text reads, ‘house’ — [meaning] just as ‘house’ means a building appointed for a dwelling it thus excludes all other buildings not appointed for a dwelling. One might have wanted to include also the privy, the tannery, the bath-house and the house for ritual immersion, therefore the text says, ‘house’: just as a ‘house is made for dignity, so only all such are implied, which also are made for dignity, to the exclusion of these, which are not made for dignity. One might have wanted to include the mountain of the Sanctuary,<sup>3</sup> the cells and the courts.<sup>4</sup> Therefore the text says ‘house’: just as a ‘house’ is for common use so are only such [houses] as are for common use [liable] to a mezuzah — to the exclusion of these which are sacred!<sup>5</sup> This is a refutation.

R. Samuel son of Rab Judah recited before Raba: Six gates are exempt from the mezuzah.- [the

gates of] the straw-shed, the stable, the wood-house, the store-house, the Median<sup>6</sup> gate, a gate without beams and a gate that is not ten handbreadths high. He [Raba] said to him: You started by saying six and you ended up with seven?—He replied: There is Tannaitic division of opinion concerning the Median gate, for it has been taught: An arched doorway<sup>7</sup> — R. Meir declares it liable to the mezuzah, while the Sages exempt it.<sup>8</sup> All agree, however, that, if the posts are ten handbreadths<sup>9</sup> [high], it is liable to the mezuzah.<sup>10</sup> Said Abaye: All agree that if the [whole] doorway is ten handbreadths in height, but the post is not even three<sup>11</sup> it is considered nothing;<sup>12</sup> again, if the post is three handbreadths in height, but the [whole] doorway not even ten, it is also considered nothing.<sup>12</sup> They are disputing only concerning doorways the [whole] height of which is ten, with the posts three in height, but with a width less than four handbreadths, space however being left to extend it to four handbreadths.<sup>13</sup> R. Meir holds one may extend<sup>14</sup> it by digging [to the required minimum of four handbreadths], whilst the Sages hold that we do not extend it by digging it. Our Rabbis taught: The synagogue, the women's apartment, and the house belonging to partners are liable to mezuzah — Is that not self-evident? — You might have said [the scriptural] ‘Thy house’<sup>15</sup> [means] her — but not [the woman's] house; ‘thy house’ but not their [partners’] house, hence we are taught [that they are included in the law of mezuzah]. But would you expound similarly: That your days may be multiplied and the days of your sons?<sup>16</sup> Do only their [sons] need life, not the others [women and their daughters]? What then is the significance of ‘Thy house’? — It is as Raba said: For Raba said: The way thou enterest [thy house], and when a man moves, he moves with the right foot first.<sup>17</sup>

Another [Baraita] taught:<sup>18</sup> The synagogue, the house belonging to partners, and the women's compartment are subject to uncleanness from house plagues. Is that not self-evident? You might have said: Then shall come he who has the house to him;<sup>19</sup> to him’ [implies] but not ‘to her’ [woman], ‘to him’ but not ‘to them’ [partners], therefore we are told [that this is not so]. Perhaps it is really so? — Scripture says, In a house of the land of your possession,<sup>20</sup> [which includes both] — Why then ‘to him’? [That means to say that] if one devotes his house to himself exclusively, refusing to lend his belongings by pretending he did not own them, the Holy One, blessed be He, exposes him as he removes his belongings.<sup>21</sup> Thus ‘to him’ excludes [from the infliction of the house plague] him who lends his belongings to others.<sup>22</sup>

But is a synagogue subject to uncleanness from house plagues? Has it not been taught: One might assume that synagogues and houses of learning are subject to uncleanness from house plagues, therefore Scripture says: ‘He who has the house to him’, i.e., he to whom alone the house belongs, that excludes those [houses] which do not belong to him alone? — This is no difficulty: The first teaching is in accord with R. Meir, the second with Rabba, for it has been taught: A synagogue which contains a dwelling for the synagogue attendant<sup>23</sup> is liable to a mezuzah, but one which has no dwelling apartment, R. Meir declares it liable but the Sages exempt it. Or, if you wish, you might say: Both teachings are in accord with the Rabbis. In the one case the synagogue referred to has a dwelling [apartment], in the other it has no dwelling apartment. Or, if you wish, you might say [in accounting for the discrepancy] that in both cases the synagogue has no dwelling apartment

---

(1) Lit., ‘a gate-house’.

(2) Exedra.

(3) The Temple mount.

(4) In the singular: The Temple court. In the plural the various compartments there, as the men's compartment, the women's compartment.

(5) [This proves that the places enumerated in the teaching of R. Kahana, even when restricted to their ordinary use, are also subject to a difference of opinion of Tannaim whether or not they are liable to a mezuzah, which contradicts Rab Judah.]

(6) The Median gate was usually made with an arched doorway, hence gates with such doorways came to be called Median.

- (7) Which is the same as a Median gate.
- (8) [Since it narrows down at the arch to less than four handbreadths, the required minimum of a gate, v. n. 10.]
- (9) Before the entrance began to narrow down at the arch.
- (10) 'Er. 11b.
- (11) It began to narrow down at less than three handbreadths from the ground.
- (12) And requires no mezuzah, for the minimum for any doorway is ten in height for the whole doorway, four in width, three for the posts; below it is but 'solid' earth.
- (13) Within the ten handbreadths, the minimum required height of the doorway.
- (14) By legal fiction. As long as the doorway starts on a breadth of four by three, allowing space for continued dimension up to ten, we look upon it as continuing in the same size, hence as entitled to the designation 'door', with the implication of being subject to the law of mezuzah
- (15) The possessive suffix in the Hebrew is masc. sing.
- (16) Deut. XI, 21. If you press the text so hard, excluding woman because the possessive is in the masculine form, then you should consistently expound: In order that your days, may be, where the possessive suffix, too, is masculine, that God holds out no promise for the prolongation of women's life. Perhaps benekem, which literally means 'your sons', although it is understood to include 'daughters', being usually translated as 'children' might render the consequence of such pedantic interpretation more absurd still.
- (17) Read ad hoc: instead of betheka, bi'atheka, i.e., 'thy coming in' instead of 'Thy house', to infer thence that the mezuzah should be affixed on the door-post at the right hand of him who enters. In this manner, indeed, the mezuzah is affixed, in the upper third of the post.
- (18) Men. 34a.
- (19) Lev. XIV, 35. So lit., E.V. 'he that owneth the house shall come',
- (20) Ibid. 34.
- (21) In accord with the priest's command, as prescribed: And the priest shall command that they empty the house before the priest go in to see the plague. Lev. XIV, 36.
- (22) The plague is thus seen as a punishment for niggardliness.
- (23) V. supra p. 47 n. 8.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 12a

, the first teaching referring to big cities, the second to villages.<sup>1</sup> But are synagogues in big cities really not subject to uncleanness from house plagues? Has it not been taught: 'In the house of the land of your possession,'<sup>2</sup> i.e., the house of the land of your possession could become defiled through leprosy, but Jerusalem<sup>3</sup> could not become defiled through leprosy. R. Judah said: I have heard that only the place of the Sanctuary is unaffected by the law of leprosy?<sup>4</sup> Now does not that imply that synagogues and houses of learning are subject to the law of leprosy even though they be in large cities? — Read R. Judah said: I have heard that only sacred places<sup>5</sup> are not subject to the law of leprosy. What principle are they disputing? — The first Tanna holds Jerusalem was not divided amongst the tribes<sup>6</sup> and R. Judah holds Jerusalem was divided among the tribes, the basis of their difference being the principle on which these Tannaim differ, for it has been taught: What lay in the lot of Judah? The Temple mount, the cells, the courts. And what lay in the lot of Benjamin? The Hall,<sup>7</sup> the Temple<sup>8</sup> and the Holy of Holies. And a strip of land went forth from Judah's lot and went into Benjamin's territory, and on this the Temple was built — Benjamin the Righteous was longing to swallow it every day as it is written: He coveteth him all day,<sup>9</sup> therefore he obtained the privilege of becoming the host of the Omnipotent,<sup>10</sup> as it is said: And He dwelleth between his shoulders<sup>11</sup> .

The following Tanna holds that Jerusalem was not divided amongst the tribes, for it has been taught: One does not rent houses in Jerusalem, because it [the city] does not belong to them, [the inhabitants]. R. Eleazar son of R. Zadok said: Nor any beds. Therefore the innkeepers take the skin of the sacrificial animals by force.<sup>12</sup> Abaye said: We may learn from this that it is usual for a man to leave to his host the empty wine pitcher and the hide.<sup>13</sup>

But are the synagogues of the villages subject to the laws of leprosy? Has it not been taught: As a possession,<sup>14</sup> i.e., until they conquer it. If they have conquered but not yet divided it among the tribes, or even divided it among the tribes but not divided it among the families, or even divided it among the families but before each man knows where his lot is, whence do we know [that the laws of leprosy do not apply yet]? To teach us that Scripture says: 'Then he who has the house to him' i.e., he to whom alone the house is belonging, excluding these [houses] which do not belong to him [the owner] alone.<sup>15</sup> — It is more correct as we have answered at first.<sup>16</sup>

**AND ANOTHER PRIEST IS PREPARED FOR HIM:** It is obvious that if any disqualifying mishap occurred to the high priest before the morning [daily] offering, that one<sup>17</sup> initiates the other priest with the morning burnt-offering. But if the mishap should have occurred after the morning sacrifice, how could he be initiated?<sup>18</sup> — R. Adda b. Ahabah said: With the girdle.<sup>19</sup> That will be in accord with him who holds that the girdle of the high priest is identical with that of the common priest,<sup>20</sup> but according to the opinion that the girdle of the high priest was not the same as that of the common priest,<sup>21</sup> what can be said?<sup>22</sup> — Abaye said: He would put on the eight garments and turn<sup>23</sup> with the hook, in accordance with what R. Huna said. For R. Huna said: If a non-priest turns with the hook, he incurs penalty of death.<sup>24</sup> R. Papa said:

- 
- (1) In the metropolis people from many cities assemble in the synagogue, it therefore seems to belong to everybody, i.e., to nobody, whilst in the villages those who attend are known to all, being like partners in the synagogue (Rashi).
- (2) Lev. XIV, 34.
- (3) Jerusalem was not divided among the tribes, but was kept in trust for all Israel and could therefore not be subject to a law applying to privately owned houses only.
- (4) Meg. 26a.
- (5) Instead of 'Sanctuary'. 'Sacred places' include synagogues and houses of learning.
- (6) V. supra p. 52, n. 6.
- (7) Ulam, leading to the interior of the Temple.
- (8) The Hall containing the golden altar, Mid. IV, 1.
- (9) Deut. XXXIII, 12. The ad hoc translation, lit., 'to bend over', thus to be anxious, hence (Rashi): he scratched himself in despair, was anxious to conquer it.
- (10) The Ark stood in his lot.
- (11) Ibid.
- (12) I Tosef. Ma'as. Sh. I.
- (13) Of the animal which he slaughters and consumes in the house of his host (Rashi).
- (14) Lev. XIV, 34.
- (15) Obviously then the synagogues in the villages are not subject to levitical uncleanness, hence the alternate answer above, 'One speaks of' synagogues in metropolises, the other of synagogues in villages', is unsatisfactory.
- (16) The distinction is rather between synagogues with a dwelling for the synagogue attendant and those without it.
- (17) He should officiate at the morning burnt-offering in the eight garments of the high priest.
- (18) The rest of the service of the Day of Atonement is performed in four garments, how will his office of high priestly function be indicated?
- (19) The high priest's girdle, which on the Day of Atonement is of fine linen (Lev. XVI, 4).
- (20) [I.e. the material for the girdle prescribed for the high priest in Ex. XXXIX, 29 was also intended to be used for the girdle of the common priests, so that the girding of a linen girdle by the priest on the Day of Atonement would serve to indicate his high priestly function.]
- (21) [I.e., the girdle of the common priest was of linen, the material of the girdle described in Ex. XXXIX, 29 being restricted to the high priest, so that the girding by the priest of a linen girdle on the Day of Atonement would indicate no particular high priestly function.]
- (22) How would it be recognizable that he is initiated into performing the high priest's service?
- (23) Rashi: Before starting on the service of the day, he puts on the eight garments, and turns on the outer altar one of the limbs of the daily burnt-offering with an iron hook. By reason of such turning that limb is more speedily consumed. He has thus done the initiative work for the office of high priest which he is to assume anon.

(24) This is only preparatory work, but since a non-priest, performing it in accord with R. Huna's opinion incurs the penalty of death, it is obviously considered as of even importance with the service proper, hence serving to initiate the newcomer into the high priest's office.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 12b

His service<sup>1</sup> initiates him — Has it not been taught: All the vessels which Moses made became sanctified through being anointed. From then on they become sanctified through being used at a service.<sup>2</sup> Similarly here his service initiates him.

When R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he reported: Concerning the girdle of the common priest there is a dispute between Rabbi and R. Eleazar b. Simeon, one said it was of kil'ayim [wool and linen in the same web],<sup>3</sup> the other said it was of fine linen.<sup>4</sup> It may be ascertained that it was Rabbi who said the girdle was made of kil'ayim, for it has been taught: There is no difference between the high priest and the common priest except in the girdle, this is the opinion of Rabbi. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon said: Not even in the girdle is there any distinction. Of what time [does this teaching speak]? If during the rest of the year, there are many points of difference, [as e.g.] the high priest [officiates] in eight garments, the common priest in four; you must say, then, that [the time discussed is] the Day of Atonement.<sup>5</sup> We can tell you: In fact the discussion deals with the other days of the year, and it refers to such garments which both wear alike<sup>6</sup> [the only difference being the girdle].

When Rabin came [from Palestine] he reported: Everybody agrees that the girdle of the high priest on the Day of Atonement was made of fine linen, and during the rest of the year of kil'ayim. The discussion concerned only the common priest's girdle, both on the Day of Atonement and during the rest of the year; concerning that Rabbi said it was made of kil'ayim and R. Eleazar b. Simeon of fine linen. R. Nahman b. Isaac said: We also have: Upon his flesh.<sup>7</sup> Why the repetition of 'he shall put on'? To include the mitre and the girdle for the removal of the ashes, this is the opinion of R. Judah. R. Dosa said: It is to include the provision that the [four] garments of the high priest on the Day of Atonement may be used by the common priest [during the rest of the year]. Rabbi says: There are two valid objections to this: First, that the girdle of the high priest on the Day of Atonement is different from that of the common priest; secondly, shall the garments worn for the service of most solemn sanctity be worn for ministration of lesser holiness? Rather 'he shall put on' [was repeated] to include worn-out garments.<sup>8</sup> R. Dosa adheres to his principle, for it has been taught: And shall leave them there,<sup>9</sup> that teaches that they must be hidden.<sup>10</sup> R. Dosa said: [It means that] he [the high priest] shall not use them on another Day of Atonement.<sup>11</sup> Our Rabbis have taught: If a disqualifying accident occurred to him, and another was appointed in his place then the former returns [afterwards] to his office, whilst the latter has upon himself all the obligations touching the high priesthood,<sup>12</sup> this is the opinion of R. Meir. R. Jose says: The first returns to his office, the second becomes unfit for the office of either high priest or common priest.<sup>13</sup> R. Jose said: It happened to Joseph b. Elam<sup>14</sup> of Sepphoris that after a disqualifying accident had happened to the high priest, he was appointed in the former's place, and the Sages said: The former returns to his office, the latter is unfit to be either common priest or high priest. He cannot be high priest for the sake of preventing ill-feeling,<sup>15</sup> nor can he any more be a common priest, for 'we may promote in [a matter] of sanctity, but not degrade'.<sup>16</sup> Rabbah b. Bar Hana said in the name of R. Johanan:

---

(1) His officiating, without other initiation, in itself is initiating.

(2) Sanh. 16b.

(3) V. Ex. XXXIX, 29, cf. supra p. 54, n. 6.

(4) Byssus.

(5) [When the high priest too has only four garments like a common priest, the difference between them being only as regards the girdle. Whereas the high priest's girdle was on that day of linen, that of the common priests was of kil'ayim, the same as during the whole year.]

- (6) The tunic, the breeches, mitre and girdle, the only difference being in the girdle.
- (7) Lev. VI, 3: And the priest shall put on his linen garment, and his breeches shall he put upon his flesh.
- (8) These may be used for the removal of the altar ashes. V. infra 23b.
- (9) Lev. XVI, 23: And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting, and shall put off the linen garments, which he put on when he went into the holy place, and shall leave them there.
- (10) To prevent their being used again, or their being used for any less sacred purpose.
- (11) But they may be used by a common priest.
- (12) Rashi: He must not let his hair grow long nor rend the clothes, nor contract ritual impurity because of a near relative's death; nor marry a widow; but he must officiate in eight garments.
- (13) V. infra.
- (14) Tosef. Yoma I, 4. The reading there is corrupt, and to be corrected in accord with the reading in Tosef. s.v. **כהן** and in J.Yoma 38a: It happened to Joseph ben Ulam of Sepphoris (not 'in Sepphoris', for it could have happened only in Jerusalem) who served for an hour (or: little while) as high priest and as he went out he said to the King: My lord and King: Whose were the bullock and the goat which were offered up to-day, did they come from me or from the high priest? The King understood (the trend) of his question and he replied: What is this, ben Ulam? Are you not satisfied with having served in the high priest's place for one hour before Him Who spoke and the world was created, so that you seek to obtain the high priest's office for yourself? In that moment ben Ulam understood that he was deposed from the high priesthood. V. Hor., Sonc., ed. p. 89 notes, and Meg. p. 59, n. 2.
- (15) Acc. to Tosef. ibid. the ill-feeling may also attack the King and the other priests.
- (16) V. infra 20b.

### Talmud - Mas. Yoma 13a

The halachah is in accord with R. Jose, but R. Jose admits that if [the substitute high priest] transgressed that injunction and officiated, his service is valid. Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: The halachah is in accord with R. Jose, but R. Jose admits that if the first [high priest] dies, the second [the substitute] returns to his service. Is that not self-evident?<sup>1</sup> — You might have said: This would involve for him a rivalry in his lifetime,<sup>2</sup> hence he informs us<sup>3</sup> [that this is not so].

R. JUDAH SAYS: ONE PROVIDES FOR HIM ALSO ANOTHER WIFE. But the Rabbis, too, are considering a possibility!<sup>4</sup> — The Rabbis will tell you: Levitical impurity is frequent,<sup>5</sup> death is infrequent.

THEY SAID TO HIM: IF SO THERE IS NO END TO THE MATTER. They gave a good answer to R. Judah! What then about R. Judah? — He will tell you: One may consider the possibility of one death, but one would not [go so far as to] consider the possibility of two [successive wives'] deaths. And the Rabbis? — [They hold that] if enactment [on the basis of consideration of the possibility] of death is justified, such [possibility] should be considered to include also two.<sup>6</sup> But the Rabbis ought to apply that consideration to themselves!<sup>7</sup> The Rabbis will answer you: The high priest is careful. If he be careful, why was another priest prepared [to take his place in case of accidental impurity]? — Since 'ye make the latter his rival, he will be all the more careful.

But is this arrangement<sup>8</sup> sufficient? The Divine Law said: His house<sup>9</sup> and that [substitute wife] is not 'his house'.<sup>10</sup> -He betroths her [unto himself]. — But [still] as long as he does not marry her,<sup>11</sup> she is not 'his house'? — He marries her. — But then he has 'two houses' and the Divine Law said: And make atonement for himself and for his house,<sup>12</sup> but not for 'two houses'? — He divorces her again. If he divorces her, our question reverts to its place?<sup>13</sup> — No, the provision applies to the case that he divorces her on condition; [namely], he says to her: Behold this thy letter of divorce<sup>14</sup> [to be valid] in case thou diest.<sup>15</sup> But perhaps she dies and he will have 'two houses'? — Rather, the case is that he says to her: Behold this thy letter of divorce [to be valid] if thou diest. If she does not die, then she is divorced;<sup>16</sup> and if she does die, there is [still] the other one alive. But perhaps she will not die, so that her letter of divorce is valid and the other [the first] one die, and he will stay without a

‘house’? Say rather: He says to her: Behold this thy letter of divorce [to be valid] if one of you die, so that if the one dies there is [still] the other one alive, and if the other one dies there is [still] this one alive. But perhaps neither of them will die and he will have ‘two houses’? Furthermore on such a condition<sup>17</sup> it, [the divorce,] is really not valid; has not Raba said: If he said: Behold this thy letter of divorce to be valid if thou drinkest no wine all the days of my life and thy life, it is not valid;<sup>18</sup> but if he said: ‘All the days of the life of So-and-so’, then it is valid?<sup>19</sup> — Rather say that he said to her: Behold this thy letter of divorce [to be valid] if thy fellow [wife] does not die. If her fellow does not die, she [the second wife] is divorced, and if she does die, then there is still the other [the second wife] alive [to be his house’]. — But perhaps her fellow wife will die in the middle of the service and it will become

---

(1) Since the only reason for his disqualification was the ill-will engendered in the heart of the original high priest.

(2) Lit., ‘from life’. When the substitute might be said to have awaited jealously the death of his predecessor.

(3) We do not go so far in endeavour to prevent ill-feeling.

(4) Since they agree to the provision of a substitute high priest.

(5) It may be due to pollution, to unexpected contact with the saliva of an ‘am ha-arez, (Rashi).

(6) The death of one within a day is a rather infrequent occurrence. The only reason for considering it would be a principle, according to which we must consider possibilities, even remote. On such basis the death of two successive wives may not be said to be outside the sphere of possibility, hence: ‘IF SO, THERE IS NO END.

(7) With even logic the Sages ought to admit that, since we are considering the possibility of accidental impurity disqualifying the incumbent high priest, it is perfectly within the sphere of possibility that the substitute, too, may suffer such accidental disqualification, hence, here too there is no end to it!

(8) Of preparing a substitute wife.

(9) Lev. XVI, 6.

(10) If the first wife dies, whilst the second is not yet married to him, he has no ‘house’ to obtain atonement for.

(11) Lit., ‘takes her (to his home)’.

(12) Ibid. The Mishnah interprets ‘his house’ as his wife, v. supra 2a.

(13) In its original force. V. supra.

(14) Get. v. Glos.

(15) On the Day of Atonement. If she die on that day, her letter of divorce is retroactively valid, there is one ‘house’ only: and if she does not die but her fellow die, then she remains as the ‘house’, her letter of divorce being invalid. Rashi makes this significant observation: These arguments are not valid, they are answers to hypothetical questions preparing the ground for the last, satisfactory answer.

(16) And the first woman is his only ‘house’,

(17) Where the condition attached refers to her life.

(18) The purpose of the divorce is complete divorcement, whereas by the term of this letter she would remain ‘connected’ with him all her life.

(19) Git. 83b.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 13b

retrospectively revealed that the letter of divorce of the other one was not valid and he would then have been officiating<sup>1</sup> at the service with ‘two houses’? — Rather assume, then, that he says to her: Behold this thy letter of divorce [to be valid] if thy fellow dies. — But perhaps the fellow wife will die and the letter of divorce of the first wife will be valid and he will stand there without a ‘house’? — Rather [say that] we speak of the case that he divorced them both, to the one he said: Behold this thy letter of divorce [to be valid] in case thy fellow wife does not die; and to the other one he said: Behold this thy letter of divorce [to be valid] if thou dost not enter the synagogue.<sup>2</sup> But perhaps her fellow will not die and she will not enter the synagogue, and the letter of divorce of both will be valid and he will stand without a ‘house’? — Rather: To the one he says: Behold this thy letter of divorce [to be valid] in case thy fellow does not die; and to the other one: Behold this thy letter of divorce [to be valid] if I enter the Synagogue, so that if the one die, the second be available, and if

the second die the first be available. What will you say in the case that her fellow wife dies in the midst of the service and retrospectively he will have officiated at the service with two 'houses'? If he saw that she was about to die, he would at once enter the synagogue and would render the divorce retroactively valid. — R. Assi or, as some say, R. 'Awira, demurred to this: Consequently, if this be so, two widows of one brother should not be married by the brother-in-law?<sup>3</sup> — Scripture repeats 'his sister-in-law' twice, to intimate [that even in the case of] two sisters-in-law the law of levirate marriage applies. But then a woman betrothed<sup>4</sup> should not be married to her levir?<sup>5</sup> — [By emphasizing] 'abroad'<sup>6</sup> the betrothed woman is meant to be included.

Our Rabbis taught: The high priest may offer up a sacrifice as a mourner,<sup>7</sup> but may not eat thereof. R. Judah said: Throughout the day.<sup>8</sup> What does 'throughout the day' signify? — Said Raba: It means to indicate that he should be brought from his house.<sup>9</sup> Abaye said to him: But now, according to R. Judah we even remove him<sup>10</sup> [from the Sanctuary], for it has been taught: If he was standing and offering up a sacrifice on the altar, and he hears that one [of his close relatives]<sup>11</sup> died, he should leave the service and go out. This is the opinion of R. Judah; R. Jose says: He should complete his service.<sup>12</sup> How can you then say that we bring him from his house?<sup>13</sup> — Rather, says Raba, 'throughout the day'

---

(1) I.e., the first part of the service.

(2) On the Day of Atonement.

(3) So shall it be done unto the man that doth not build up his brother's house. Deut. XXV, 9. Here also the word 'house' is used for 'wife' and since 'house' is taken to mean but one wife, no brother would be able to perform the levirate marriage where his dead brother had left two wives.

(4) 'Arusah', betrothed, engaged, but not 'brought home'. The betrothal carries with it almost all the legal consequences of marriage. V. Glos. s.v. Erusin.

(5) If 'house' is to be taken to refer to wife, why should a betrothed sister-in-law be subject to levirate marriage?

(6) If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not be married abroad unto one not of his kin. The word 'abroad' here is superfluous and is taken to indicate that even one who was 'still outside', not having been married properly, but only betrothed, is included in the law of the levirate marriage, v. Yeb. 13b.

(7) 'Onen' is a mourner before the burial of his kinsman, to be distinguished from 'abel', a mourner during the seven days after burial. With regard to the high priest, Lev. XXI, 11 reads: Neither shall he go into any dead body, nor defile himself for his father or for his mother; neither shall he go out of the sanctuary, nor profane the sanctuary of his God. Scripture thus permits his officiating but he is forbidden to eat of any sacred meat whilst in mourning. This is inferred ad majus from Deut. XXVI, 14 which, referring to tithe, is of lesser sanctity than the meat of sacrifices, as the Israelites say: I have not eaten thereof in my mourning.

(8) V. Hor. 12b.

(9) He should be deliberately brought to the Sanctuary from his house, so that his pre-occupation with the sacrifices may help to lessen his grief.

(10) This refers to the common priest.

(11) Father or mother or son or daughter or brother or unmarried sister. Rabbinical enactment includes the married sister.

(12) V. Hor. loc. cit.

(13) If in the case of the common priest R. Judah would have him removed if he became a mourner, would he in the case of the high priest consider it a good deed to bring him to the Sanctuary?

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 14a

means to say that he does not officiate all that day,<sup>1</sup> as a preventive measure lest he eat.<sup>2</sup> Said R. Adda b. Ahabah to Raba: But did R. Judah enact a preventive measure lest he eat? Have we not learnt, R. Judah said: WE ALSO PROVIDE ANOTHER WIFE FOR HIM, LEST HIS WIFE DIE? Now when his wife dies he may perform the service [on the same day] without R. Judah becoming apprehensive lest he eat?—He replied: Now is this so?<sup>3</sup> There, because it is the Day of Atonement, on

which all the world does not eat, he, too, would not be likely to eat, but here [on any day] when all the world is eating, he would also be ready to eat — But under such conditions<sup>4</sup> what mourning would be coming upon him because of her, since she is divorced from him? — Granted that no mourning would be obligatory, but he would surely be distracted.<sup>5</sup> MISHNAH. THROUGHOUT THE SEVEN DAYS HE SPRINKLES THE BLOOD<sup>6</sup> AND BURNS THE INCENSE<sup>7</sup> AND TRIMS THE LAMPS<sup>8</sup> AND OFFERS THE HEAD AND THE HIND LEG;<sup>9</sup> ON ALL OTHER DAYS HE OFFERS ONLY IF HE SO DESIRES; FOR THE HIGH PRIEST IS FIRST IN OFFERING A PORTION<sup>10</sup> AND HAS FIRST PLACE IN TAKING A PORTION.<sup>11</sup>

GEMARA. Who is the authority [for our Mishnah]? — R. Hisda said: It is not in accord with R. Akiba, for if it were, R. Akiba Surely holds that if some of the sprinkling<sup>12</sup> fell upon a clean person, it rendered him unclean! How could he then officiate at the service?<sup>13</sup> — For it has been taught: And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean,<sup>14</sup> i.e., [if sprinkled] ‘upon the unclean’, [he becomes] clean, [if sprinkled] upon the clean [he becomes] unclean, this is the opinion of R. Akiba. But the Sages hold that these matters [concerning sprinkling]<sup>15</sup> apply only to such things as are susceptible to uncleanness. I What is it about? — As we have learnt: If he intended sprinkling an animal and [happened to] sprinkle a man, then, if there be sufficient water on the hyssop, he may repeat [the sprinkling].<sup>16</sup> If he intended sprinkling a man and he [happened to] sprinkle an animal, then, if there be enough water on the hyssop, he may not repeat [the sprinkling].<sup>17</sup> What is the reason for R. Akiba's view? — Let the Divine Law write ‘And the clean person shall sprinkle upon him’, what is the meaning of ‘upon the unclean,’? Infer from this that [if sprinkled] the unclean becomes clean, and [if sprinkled] the clean becomes unclean. And [what is the reason for the view of] the Rabbis? — These words emphasize that [sprinkling is right] only upon matter susceptible to uncleanness. But this<sup>18</sup> case can be deduced a minori ad majus: If sprinkling upon an unclean makes clean, how much more shall sprinkling upon a clean [keep or make more] clean! And R. Akiba? — It is with reference to this that Solomon said: I said, I will get wisdom,, but it is far from me.<sup>19</sup> — And the Sages? [They explain] this [passage to refer] to [the fact that] he who sprinkles and he who is sprinkled are clean, whereas he who touches them [the waters of purification] is rendered unclean.<sup>20</sup> — But is he who sprinkles clean? Surely it is written, And he that sprinkleth the water of sprinkling shall wash his clothes?<sup>21</sup> — ‘Sprinkleth’ here means ‘toucheth’. — But the text reads ‘sprinkleth’ and also mentions ‘toucheth’;<sup>21</sup> furthermore, he who ‘sprinkleth’ must wash his clothes, whereas he who ‘toucheth’ need not wash his clothes? — Rather ‘sprinkleth’ here means ‘carrieth’ — Then let the Divine Law write ‘carrieth’, why is ‘sprinkleth’ written? — That [is meant] to let us know that there must be a quantity sufficient for the sprinkling.<sup>22</sup> That will be right according to him who holds that a definite minimum is necessary in the sprinkling,<sup>23</sup> but according to him who holds there is no required minimum in the sprinkling,<sup>23</sup> what is there to be said? Even according to him who holds there is no required minimum [it will be right], for that refers only to the back of the man,<sup>24</sup> but in the vessels there must be a definite quantity, as we have learnt: How much water is necessary to be sufficient for the sprinkling? Enough for dipping

---

(1) Until the evening.

(2) During the day he is forbidden by the Torah to eat, in the evening after burial the prohibition is only Rabbinical (Rashi).

(3) This analogy is incorrect.

(4) Since he would rush to the synagogue during her coma so that she would be divorced from him as soon as he entered it (v. infra), hence how could he be considered a mourner for his divorced wife. It is interesting to observe that sudden death does not enter among the many possibilities considered in this discussion. It would invalidate the suggestion of his leaving for the synagogue as soon as his wife was near death.

(5) upset by reminiscent tenderness, unable, as Rashi says, to be in the prescribed happy mood for eating sacrificial meat. [V. Hul. 132b, so that but for the fact that the apprehension lest he may eat does not arise on the Day of Atonement, he would not have been allowed to perform under such conditions the Temple service lest he eat of the sacrifices, Tosaf. Yesh.]

- (6) Of the daily morning and evening sacrifices on the outer altar. Ex. XXIX, 38-42.
- (7) Mornings and evenings on the golden inner altar, *ibid.* XXX, 1-8.
- (8) Of the seven-branched candlestick, *ibid.* XXVII, 20-21; also XXX, 7-8. The trimming consisted of the following: Every evening the lamps were kindled by a priest, every morning cleaned, filled with oil, and provided with fresh wick. All this work during the seven days was performed by the high priest.
- (9) According to Tam. IV, 2-3, the sacrificial lamb, after being slaughtered, was divided into certain parts, which, as a rule, were brought on the altar by the priests chosen by the count. Head and hind leg always were offered up first.
- (10) The high priest had the prerogative to offer up at any time any portion of any sacrifice he desires, other priests could do so only during their particular week of service, *v. Glos. s.v. Mishmar.*
- (11) Of the flesh of the sacrifice which was distributed among the priests: he could choose any part he preferred.
- (12) Of the ashes of the red heifer mixed with running water. Num. XIX, 17.
- (13) During the seven days of his separation, since he was to be sprinkled each day.
- (14) Num. XIX, 19: And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean, the words 'upon the unclean' seem superfluous, 'upon him' would have been clear enough. From this R. Akiba infers that only upon the unclean has the sprinkling a cleaning effect, with opposite effect on the clean.
- (15) The Sages also consider the words superfluous, but they find in them the intimation that sprinkling has its effect only upon things susceptible to uncleanness, hence, if sprinkled upon things unsusceptible to uncleanness it has been misused, and whatever is left of the water is invalid and may no more be used for sprinkling and cleansing.
- (16) (I.e., he can use the water left on the hyssop for a second sprinkling without necessarily dipping it again (Rash).]
- (17) V. Par. XIII, 3. [The hyssop must be dipped anew if the priest desires to perform with it another sprinkling. In having been sprinkled on the animal the water on the hyssop became disqualified as water of purification with which work has been done, and can no longer be used for ritual sprinkling. Thus the Sages infer from the superfluous words 'upon the unclean' that the water of purification may be used only for such things as are susceptible to uncleanness, and by being sprinkled on things not so susceptible it becomes invalid (Rashi). R. Hananel on the basis of another reading explains differently.]
- (18) The contention of the Sages that sprinkling could never have the effect of rendering unclean.
- (19) Eccl. VII, 23. This matter is beyond logic, it is a law which has puzzled others already.
- (20) Num. XIX, 21.
- (21) Num. XIX, 21.
- (22) For rendering the one who carries the water unclean; that is indicated by expressing 'carrying' in terms of 'sprinkling'.
- (23) V. Nid. 9a.
- (24) However small the quantity of the water that reaches him from the hyssop bundle, the cleansing is achieved.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 14b

the buds therein and for the water to be sprinkled.<sup>1</sup> Abaye said: [The Mishnah] may be in accord even with R. Akiba: He [the high priest] officiates all day, [and] in the evening is he sprinkled, then he takes the immersion and awaits the sunset.<sup>2</sup>

AND BURNS THE INCENSE AND TRIMS THE LAMPS. Hence [you may infer that] the incense came first and the lamps afterwards. A contradiction is raised against this:<sup>3</sup> He to whom it fell to clear the inner altar of ashes . . . he to whom it fell to clean the candlesticks . . . he to whom it fell to burn the incense?<sup>4</sup> R. Huna said: Who is the Tanna of [the Tractate] Tamid?<sup>5</sup> R. Simeon of Mizpah.<sup>6</sup> But surely we have learnt exactly the opposite.<sup>7</sup> For we have learnt:<sup>8</sup> As he<sup>9</sup> came to the north-eastern corner [of the altar], he sprinkled to the east and north;<sup>10</sup> then he came to the south-western corner and sprinkled it to the west and south. And with reference to this [Mishnaic statement] it was taught: Rabbi Simeon of Mizpah has this change in Tamid.<sup>11</sup> As he came to the north-eastern corner he sprinkled it to the east and to the north; then he came to the south-western corner, and sprinkled it to the west and afterwards to the south.<sup>12</sup> — Rather, said R. Johanan: Who is the authority for the order [given] in [the Tractate] Yoma? R. Simeon of Mizpah. But here is a contradiction between the order [given] in [the Tractate] Yoma and the order [given] in another

passage therein: The second count decided who should slaughter, who should sprinkle [the blood], who should remove the ashes from the inner altar, who should remove the ashes from the candlestick, who should take up the limbs [of the burnt-offering] to the ramp [of the altar]. The third count: 'Fresh ones, come and be counted for the incense!'<sup>13</sup> -Abaye said: This is no difficulty. The one case speaks of the trimming of the five lamps, the other of the trimming of the two lamps.<sup>14</sup> Shall we say that the incense interrupted the trimming of the lamps? But Abaye was recounting the order [of the daily Temple service] in the name of a tradition<sup>15</sup> and he has the trimming of the lamps interrupted by the blood of the regular daily offering?<sup>16</sup> — I will tell you: This is no difficulty, the one refers to the [order of the daily Temple service] in accord with Abba Saul, the other in accord with the Sages, for it has been taught: He should not trim the lamps and after that burn the incense, but he should offer the incense first and then trim the lamps. Abba Saul says: He should first trim and then offer [the incense] — What is the reason for Abba Saul's view? — For it is written: Every morning, when he dresseth the lamps,<sup>17</sup> and afterwards [it says], he shall burn it?<sup>18</sup> — And the Sages?<sup>19</sup> What the Divine Law intends here is

(1) Par. XIII, 5.

(2) Thus he would be clean at night and able to officiate again on the morrow. Next day exactly the same procedure will follow. V. infra 19a.

(3) The quotation is from two Mishnahs, Tam. III, 9 and ibid. V, 4.

(4) Here the trimming of lamps is mentioned as coming before the incense.

(5) [Ginzberg, *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy* 1, p. 200 takes this phrase to denote that the Tractate Tamid did not go through the hands of Rabbi as Redactor, but that it has comedown to us in the original form with R. Simeon of Mizpah, a contemporary of R. Gamaliel II, as its compiler.]

(6) V. Pe'ah II. He was either of Mizpah or 'Governor of the Watch-tower of the Temple' (Jastrow).

(7) R. Simeon of Mizpah opposes the teaching reported in Tamid.

(8) Tam. IV, 1.

(9) The priest who sprinkled the blood.

(10) The sprinkling had to be made in such a manner that one constituted two, it was done in form of a Greek 'gamma', from the two corners. '.

(11) **משנה בתמיד** a difficult phrase. Rashi: 'To change the order in connection with the Tamid, the daily regular offerings'. R. Hananel: He differs with the view laid down in Tamid. Ginzberg, op. cit., p. 285 n. 1 takes it as corresponding to **תמני**, 'teaches', used in introducing 'variants': R. Simeon's version of Tamid is . . .]

(12) R. Simeon insists that two separate applications had to be made from the south-western corner, one to the west and another to the south, and thus opposes the order given in Tamid, v. infra 15a, hence he could not be an authority for the Tractate.

(13) From here it is seen that incense was offered after the lamps, which contradicts our Mishnah here.

(14) There were seven lamps, the trimming of which, according to this answer, was interrupted by the offering of the incense, so that five lamps were trimmed, then the incense offered, after which the last two lamps of the seven-branched candlestick were trimmed, v. infra 33a.

(15) **משמיה דגמרא**. This expression seems to mean that Abaye could not give the precise source of his authority but referred it to 'tradition' in general, v. Bacher HUCA, 1924, p. 31.]

(16) His account thus varies from the statement he makes here.

(17) Ex. XXX, 7.

(18) Ibid. in the same passage.

(19) How do they explain this verse?

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 15a

that at the time the lamps are being trimmed there shall — [still] be a burning of the incense. For, if you would not interpret thus, [how will you account for 'at dusk'], as it is written: And when Aaron lighteth the lamps at dusk, he shall burn it.<sup>1</sup> Would you say here too that he shall first light the lamps and afterwards offer up the incense due at dusk? And if you will say, 'Indeed, so it is,' but has it not

been taught:<sup>2</sup> From evening to morning,<sup>3</sup> i.e., provide a sufficient quantity [of oil] that it may burn all night from evening to morning; or, according to another interpretation: ‘From evening to morning’, i.e., there is no service which is proper [to be performed] ‘from evening to morning’ except this.<sup>4</sup> What then the Divine Law intends is that at the time of the lighting there shall [still] be a burning of the incense. Here also: at the time of the trimming there shall [still] be a burning of the incense. And Abba Saul?<sup>5</sup> It is different there, because Scripture Says: otho [it].<sup>6</sup> R. Papa said: This<sup>7</sup> is no difficulty. The one account agrees with the Sages, the other with Abba Saul<sup>8</sup> How do you place the matter now: Our Mishnah in accord with the Sages, and [the Mishnah of] the count in accord with Abba Saul? Then consider the second part:<sup>9</sup> They brought to him the daily sacrifice. He made the incision and another finished the slaughtering for him. He entered to burn the incense and to trim the lamps.<sup>10</sup> That is in accord with the Sages. The beginning and the end [is then] in accord with the Sages and the middle in accord with Abba Saul?<sup>11</sup> — R. Papa will tell you: Yes, the beginning and end are in accord with the Sages and the middle with Abba Saul.<sup>12</sup> It is clear why Abaye does not agree with [the interpretation of] R. Papa: because he will not explain the first and last part [of the Mishnah] as being in accord with the Sages, whilst the middle with Abba Saul. But why does not R. Papa take Abaye's point of view? He will tell you: Would he [the Tanna] teach first<sup>13</sup> of the trimming of two lamps and only afterwards<sup>14</sup> of the trimming of five lamps? And Abaye? — He will tell you: First he teaches in a general fashion [of the obligation of the high priest to be occupied during the seven days],<sup>15</sup> and afterwards he describes the order [of the service].<sup>16</sup>

The text [above states]: He came to the north-eastern corner, and sprinkled the east and the north; then [as he came to] the south-western corner, he sprinkled the west and south, and in connection with that it was taught that R. Simeon of Mizpah had this changed in Tamid. As he came to the north-eastern corner he sprinkled the east and north; then as he came to the south-western corner he sprinkled the west and afterwards the south.<sup>17</sup> What is the reason of R. Simeon of Mizpah? — R. Johanan in the name of one of the school of R. Jannai said: Scripture said, And one he-goat for a sin-offering unto the Lord: it shall be offered beside the continual burnt-offering, and the drink-offering thereof.<sup>18</sup> It<sup>19</sup> is a burnt-offering and the Divine Law<sup>20</sup> says, Deal with it as with a sin-offering — How is that to be done? He sprinkles one in such a manner as to constitute two [sprinklings], as is prescribed for a burnt-offering and he sprinkles two separate ones as is prescribed for the sin-offering. But let him make two sprinklings in such a manner as to constitute four, as is prescribed for a burnt-offering, and four full sprinklings as is prescribed for a sin-offering? — We do not find anywhere that blood brings atonement and then brings atonement again. But we do find blood, half of which is sprinkled after the manner of a sin-offering, and the other half after the manner of a burnt-offering? What you must of needs [say is] that Scripture has brought them under the same category! Here too one might say ‘of needs Scripture has brought them under one category’? — Here it is a case of merely ‘splitting’ the sprinkling.<sup>21</sup> But let him sprinkle one so as to constitute two below, as is prescribed for a burnt-offering and two separate sprinklings above as is prescribed for sin-offerings?<sup>22</sup> — We do not find that any blood is sprinkled, half above, and half below. Not indeed? Have we not learnt: He sprinkled thereof once upwards, and seven times downwards? That was done *ke-mazlif* [like the movement of swinging a whip]. What does ‘*ke-mazlif*’ mean? Rab Judah showed it by [imitating the movements of] a lasher.<sup>23</sup> But [do we] not [find any blood sprinkled half above and half below]? surely we have learnt: He sprinkled thereof upon the tohar of the altar seven times.<sup>24</sup> Don't you think it means upon the middle [of the front] of the altar, as people say ‘the noon-light’ shines, meaning by ‘*tihara*’ the middle of the day? — Rabbah b. Shila said: No, it refers

---

(1) Ibid. 8.

(2) Pes. 59a.

(3) Ex. XXVII, 21.

(4) The lighting of the lamps. There is no other service that is proper from the time they have been lit in the evening till the following morning (Rashi).

(5) How does he meet this argument?

(6) Ex. XXVII, 21. Only this ('it') may be done from evening to morning and no other work, so that you are compelled to give this interpretation to the text, but with regard to the verse dealing with the trimming, no such necessity arises.

(7) He refers to the question from the apparent contradiction of the two Mishnahs in Yoma — our Mishnah and the one infra 25a.

(8) Where incense is mentioned as coming first, the teaching is in accord with the Sages, the other passage where the lamps are first in order is in agreement with Abba Saul.

(9) Of the Mishnah of the count, infra.

(10) V. infra 31b. [This must refer to the two lamps as there is general agreement that the trimming of the five lamps must precede the incense.]

(11) That is unlikely.

(12) This is not impossible.

(13) In our Mishnah.

(14) [In the Mishnah infra 25a. Surely the trimming of the five lamps was before that of the two!]

(15) Without being concerned as to the order.

(16) [And thus infra 25a speaks of the trimming of the five lamps and infra 31b of the trimming of the two.]

(17) V. supra p. 65 notes.

(18) Num. XXVIII, 15.

(19) [The continual burnt-offering.]

(20) [By placing it in juxtaposition to a sin-offering, v. infra.]

(21) Without any evidence that this is made after the manner of a sin-offering, since both are made in one corner.

(22) The blood of the burnt-offering was sprinkled below the red line, round the middle of the altar, that of the sin-offering above the red line. V. Mid. III, 1.

(23) Above and below is not said here with regard to some line in the middle of the thickness, but it means that of the mercy seat was upwards, the seven all downwards, as one who swings a whip will make similar movements, v. Tosaf. s.v. כּמַצְרִיף.

(24) [The Aramaic tohar is taken to mean 'shining' like the Hebrew zohar, infra].

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 15b

to the top of the altar itself,<sup>1</sup> for it is written: And the like of the very heaven for clearness.<sup>2</sup> Why does he just sprinkle first as due with the burnt-offering, and afterwards as due with the sin-offering? Let him first sprinkle as due in case of a sin-offering and after that as due with a burnt-offering! — Because it<sup>3</sup> is a burnt-offering, it comes first.<sup>4</sup> And why does he just sprinkle north-east and south-west. Let him sprinkle south-east and then north-west? — I will tell you: The burnt-offering requires the [projecting] base<sup>5</sup> [of the altar], and the south-eastern corner has no [projecting] base. — Why does he sprinkle first north-east and then south-west, let him sprinkle south-west and then northeast? — Since a master said:<sup>6</sup> All the turns you make in the Temple must be to the right, the east, he comes first to that [north-east].<sup>7</sup> Whence do you know that it is with the burnt-offering that the Divine Law states that it should be offered up in the manner due to a sin-offering? May it not be that it is with regard to the sin-offering<sup>8</sup> that the Torah says: Offer it up after the manner of the burnt-offerings? — Let not that thought arise in you. For it is written: Beside the continual burnt-offering and the drink-offering thereof.<sup>9</sup> What does the Divine Law mean by this? Apply the measures [forms] of the sin-offering to the burnt-offering.

We have learnt there: The memuneh<sup>10</sup> said to them: Go and bring a lamb from the Cell of the Lambs.<sup>11</sup> Now the Cell of the Lambs was in the north-western corner. Four cells were there: one was the Cell of the Lambs; one the Cell of the Seals;<sup>12</sup> one the Cell of the Fireplace,<sup>13</sup> and one cell, in which the shewbread was made.<sup>14</sup>

They raised an objection: There were four rooms in the Cell of the Fireplace, like small rooms opening into a reception room; two on holy ground, two outside of holy ground; and the ends of the

flagstones [in the pavement] indicated the mark between the sacred and the secular grounds. What was their use? The south-western was the Cell of the Lambs for offerings;

(1) The word tohar may mean 'pure', 'clear', and thus here the ashes on the top of the altar were shoved aside and the clear place in the middle sprinkled.

(2) Ex. XXIV, 10.

(3) The continual daily offering.

(4) Mid. III, 1.

(5) Zeb. 51a, based on Lev. IV, 18: the blood must be sprinkled to a place on the altar below which there is a projecting base.

(6) V. infra 45a.

(7) In the case of a sin-offering (the blood of which is applied to the corner of the altar), as he goes up to the ramp of the altar and turns right, he comes to the south-eastern corner first, but he may not sprinkle the blood there, because that corner has no projecting base. He therefore goes on to the north-eastern corner, where he sprinkles. The same order is also followed with a burnt-offering, although there is no ascent of the ramp since the blood thereof was sprinkled below the line round the middle of the altar. He approaches the front of the altar from the south, then turns to the right. [The words 'the east' do not apply here, as the first sprinkling is made, as stated, in the north-east. They are mentioned as a current phraseology arising from the context in which the phrase 'all the turns you make etc.' is first used. V. infra 58b.]

(8) [The he-goat of the New Moon.]

(9) Translate ad hoc: 'upon the burnt-offering', instead of 'beside the burnt-offering', cf. supra p. 68.

(10) Temple Superintendent, v. infra p. 97' n. 4.

(11) In which lambs were kept, which had been passed as fit for sacrifices, in accord with Lev. I, 11.

(12) Shek. V, 3, 5. There were four seals in the Temple and on them was inscribed 'Calf', 'Ram', 'Kid', 'Sinner'; 'Calf' signifying drink-offerings for (sacrifices from) the herd... 'Kid' signifying drink-offerings for (sacrifices from) the flocks . . . 'Ram' signifying drink-offerings for rams, 'Sinner' signifying drink-offerings for the three beasts offered up by the lepers. Anyone who wished to obtain drink-offerings would go to Johanan who was in charge of the seals, give him money and receive from him a seal, go from him to Ahiyah who was in charge of the drink-offerings, give him the seal and receive from him the drink-offering. V. Num. XV, 1-12.

(13) In which the fire was perpetually maintained, v. Tam. I, 1.

(14) Tam. 30a.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 16a

the south-eastern was the cell wherein they made shewbread; in the north-eastern the Hasmoneans hid the stones of the altar, which the Greek kings had defiled;<sup>1</sup> through the north-western they went down to the chamber of immersion!<sup>2</sup> — R. Huna said: Who is the authority for [the anonymous Mishnahs in] Middoth? R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for we have learnt: The court of the women was one hundred and thirty-five cubits long and one hundred and thirty-five cubits wide. At its four corners there were four cells. What was their use? The south-eastern was the Cell of the Nazirites, where the Nazirites cooked their peace-offerings, and cut off their hair and cast it under the pot;<sup>3</sup> the north-eastern was the Cell of the Wood-shed, wherein priests afflicted with a blemish were standing to examine the wood for worms-for any wood wherein a worm was found is unfit for the altar; the north-western was the Cell of the Lepers; as to the south-western, R. Eliezer b. Jacob said: I forget what its use was, whilst Abba Saul said: There they put wine and oil and it used to be called the Cell of the House of Oils.<sup>4</sup> It may also be proved by reasoning that the authority for [the anonymous Mishnahs in] Middoth is R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for we have learnt: All the walls that were there [in the Temple] were high with the exception of the eastern wall, because the priest who burns the heifer stands on the Mount of Olives and looks towards the entrance of the Temple at the time the blood [of the heifer] is sprinkled.<sup>5</sup>

And we have learnt: All the entrances that were there; were twenty cubits high and ten cubits wide.<sup>6</sup> And we have learnt: Inside this<sup>7</sup> was the Soreg [a railing of lattice work].<sup>8</sup> And we have

learnt: Inside this was the Hel [rampart],<sup>9</sup> ten cubits broad. There were twelve steps there,<sup>10</sup> the height of each step was half a cubit and the depth of each step was half a cubit. [Furthermore]: Fifteen steps which led from the Court of the Israelites to the Court of the Women, the height and depth of each step being half a cubit.<sup>11</sup> [Furthermore we learnt]: Between the Hall<sup>12</sup> and the altar there were twenty-two cubits, there were twelve steps, the height and depth of each half a cubit;<sup>13</sup> and we have learnt: R. Eliezer b. Jacob said: There<sup>14</sup> was a step one cubit high and the platform<sup>15</sup> was set thereon and on it were three steps half a cubit high each.<sup>16</sup> Now, if you can say that the authority for the anonymous<sup>17</sup> [Mishnahs in Tamid] is R. Eliezer b. Jacob then it will be quite right, because according to him the door is concealed;<sup>18</sup> but if you should say that it is in accord with [the other] Rabbis, there would be left half a cubit through which the door would be visible!<sup>19</sup> — R. Adda b. Ahaba said: It is R. Judah, for it has been taught:<sup>20</sup> R. Judah said: The altar was placed exactly in the centre of the Temple Court, measuring thirty-two cubits;

---

(1) The Hellenized Syrians under Antiochus Epiphanes, I Macc. IV, 44f.

(2) Mid. I, 6. An obvious contradiction of the first account above.

(3) Num. VI, 18: And the Nazirite shall shave his consecrated head at the door of the tent of meeting, and shall take the hair of his consecrated head, and put it on the fire which is under the sacrifice of peace-offerings.

(4) Mid. II, 5. R. Eliezer b. Jacob's statement, 'I forget what its use was indicates that he was the authority of the anonymous Mishnah.

(5) V. Mid. II, 4. (5) The following statement should make what follows clear. All the entrances of the buildings on the Temple mount were twenty cubits high. Inside the Hel were twelve steps, each half a cubit high. From the Court of the Women to the Court of Israel led fifteen steps, and twelve from the Hall to the Temple. Together thirty-nine steps, each half a cubit high, making nineteen and one half cubits in toto. According to this Tanna one need not assume that the eastern wall was lower, for since the height of the entrance is twenty cubits, there would still remain one half cubit of the door, which the steps (being only nineteen and one half cubits high) could not hide, so that the priest burning the heifer could look directly from the top of the Mount of Olives into the entrance to the Temple through the various entrances which were all exactly one against the other. But since we learnt that the eastern wall was lower, the Mishnah must be in accord with Eliezer b. Jacob, according to whom two and one half cubits were added to the height of the steps, for we have learnt in his name: There was a step, one cubit high, on which stood the platform with three steps of half a cubit height each. If we add that to the nineteen and a half cubits of the combined heights of the steps, we get twenty-two cubits (v. Tosaf. Jesh.) and that height would hide from view the entrance which was only twenty cubits high. The high priest burning the heifer looked westwards from the Mount of Olives, i.e. towards the eastern wall of the Temple, that is why, according to R. Eliezer b. Jacob, the eastern wall had to be lower, and that is the conclusive evidence that the anonymous Mishnah of Tamid is in accord with R. Eliezer.

(6) Mid. II, 3.

(7) Inside the entrance of the Temple Mount around the inner parts containing the Court of the Women and the Court of the Temple.

(8) [Or 'a stone wall', Mid. II, 3. The Soreg was the barrier beyond which heathens were not permitted to approach the Temple area, cf. Josephus, Wars, v. 5, 2.]

(9) [A raised platform going around the inner precincts.]

(10) In those ten cubits of the Hel leading up to the Court of the Women.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Ulam, leading to the interior of the Temple.

(13) Mid. III, 6.

(14) Between the Court of the Israelites and the Court of the Priests.

(15) It is the platform of the Levites, on which they stood, when singing or teaching, and from which the priests pronounced the benediction, V. Mid. II, 6.

(16) Mid. II, 2.

(17) Whenever no teacher is mentioned in the Mishnah of Middoth it is R. Eliezer b. Jacob, or whenever a Tanna is mentioned as opposing the anonymous Mishnah, he opposes R. Eliezer b. Jacob.

(18) By the height of the steps.

(19) To the priest looking across from the Mount of Olives; what necessity then was there for the eastern wall to be

lower?

(20) The Tanna who said that the eastern Temple wall was lower.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 16b**

ten cubits opposite the door of the Temple, eleven cubits toward the north, and eleven cubits toward the south. With the result that the altar was exactly opposite the Temple and its walls.<sup>1</sup> But, if you should consider that the authority for Middoth is in accord with R. Judah, how could the altar possibly have stood in the centre of the Temple? Surely we have learnt: The Temple Court in all had a length of a hundred and eighty-seven cubits and a width of a hundred and thirty-five cubits. From east to west it extended over a hundred and eighty-seven cubits; the space which [lay] Israelites trod was eleven cubits; eleven cubits was the space which the priests trod; the altar occupied thirty-two; between Hall and altar were twenty-two cubits; the Sanctuary a hundred cubits and eleven cubits behind the place of the mercy seat.<sup>2</sup> From north to south was a hundred and thirty-five cubits; the ramp and the altar occupying sixty-two cubits, from the altar to the rings<sup>3</sup> eight cubits; the place of the rings twenty-four; from the rings to the tables four; from the tables to the columns four;<sup>4</sup> from the columns to the walls of the Temple Court eight cubits and the remainder lay between the ramp and the wall and the place of the columns.<sup>5</sup> Now if you were to consider that the authority for Middoth is R. Judah, how is it possible that the altar be in the centre of the Temple, since the bigger part of the altar lies towards the south?<sup>6</sup>

---

(1) The inside of the Temple was twenty cubits, the walls were six cubits in depth, and the height of the altar was nine cubits to which must be added the thirteen and a half cubits rise in the level of the Court of the Israelites where the altar stood making a total of twenty-two and a half cubits; thus the altar would hide the Temple door, hence the lower eastern wall. V. Zeb. 58b.

(2) [An empty space beyond the Holy of Holies, the purpose of which is not stated anywhere.]

(3) They were set in the ground in the slaughter-house, north of the altar, and the necks of the animals were placed in them. The most holy sacrifices were slain on the north side of the altar, Zeb. 47a.

(4) Low columns placed in the ground, to which iron hooks were attached, on which the animals were hung for flaying.

(5) Mid. V, 1, 2.

(6) [The figures given here as from south to north make a total of a hundred and ten cubits. To this must be added the space of four cubits occupied by the table, which is not mentioned here, then leaving a remainder of twenty-one cubits which lay equally between the ramp and the wall and the place of columns. This allows for ten and a half cubits for the space between the ramp (which was on the south of the altar) and the southern wall of the court. Deducting this from sixty-seven and a half cubits which was half the breadth of the court from south to north, we are left with fifty-seven cubits within which lay the ramp, thirty cubits in length, and twenty-seven out of the thirty-cubits of the altar proper, with the result that the larger part of the altar lay in the southern half of the court. V. Rashi.]

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 17a

Must one not rather infer that the authority [for Middoth] is R. Eliezer b. Jacob?<sup>1</sup> That is the right inference.

R. Adda,<sup>2</sup> the son of R. Isaac said: That cell<sup>3</sup> was removed [from both] corners;<sup>4</sup> to him that came from the north it appeared to be in the south and to him who came from the south it appeared to be in the north — It is to be proved by inference that it lay more in the south-west. Whence [can this be proved]? From a contradiction from [one statement about the] Cell of the Shewbread to [another statement about the] Cell of the Shewbread and the answer given by R. Huna, the son of R. Joshua: 'One teacher considers it as lying to the right, and the other as lying to the left'.<sup>5</sup>

---

(1) [And the entrance of the Sanctuary was covered from the sight of the priest, who burnt the heifer on the Mount of Olives, by the extra step and not by the altar, for according to him the whole altar lay in the southern half of the court. V. infra 37b.]

(2) R. Adda wishes to reconcile the two contradictory Mishnahs in regard to the position of the Cell of the Lambs.

(3) The Cell of the Lambs.

(4) [Situated on the west side it extended from north to south, though removed from both extremities.]

(5) The Tanna in Tamid (supra 15b) mentions the Cell of the Lambs in the north-west, and assuming that he is counting towards the right, the Cell of the Seals would be in the south-west, the Cell of the Fireplace in the south-east, and the Cell of the Shewbread in the north-east. Against that the objection was raised, viz., the Mishnah in Middoth places the Cell of the Shewbread in the south-east. Whereupon R. Huna said: The Tanna of Middoth counts from the right, whereas the Tanna of Tamid counts from the left. Now, if we say that the Tanna of Tamid, who says that the Cell of the Lambs lay in the north-western corner, admits that it lay more to the south-west, but that it appeared (as the Gemara above has it) to the north-west, and he started in reality counting from the south-west, that will explain the contradictory statements in Tamid and Middoth; but if you say that his statement, the Cell of Lambs lay in the north-western corner, is to be taken literally, there is no sense in the answer, for even if one counted towards the left, that cell would be lying in the south-western corner.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 17b

Now, if you say that it lay in the south-western corner, it will be right that he answers the objection raised from [one statement about] shewbread to [another statement about] shewbread; but if you say it lay in the north-western corner, what sense is there in the answer about the shewbread? Must one not hence infer that it lay in the south-western corner? That is the right inference. But the Master has said: All the turns you make must be to the right, i.e., towards the east?<sup>1</sup> — That [rule] applies to the Temple service, but here it is merely on account of measurement.

FOR THE HIGH PRIEST IS FIRST IN OFFERING A PORTION AND FIRST IN TAKING A PORTION [OF THE SACRIFICES]. Our Rabbis taught: How is he first in offering a portion? He can say: This burnt-offering I shall offer up, this meal-offering I shall offer up. How has he first right in taking a portion? He can say: This sin-offering I am eating, this guilt-offering I am eating. He can take one of the two loaves,<sup>2</sup> four or five of the shewbread loaves. Rabbi says: Always five, for it is written: And it shall be for Aaron and his sons<sup>3</sup> i.e., half for Aaron and half for his sons. This [statement in] itself is difficult. You have said: 'He takes one of the two loaves'. That is in accord with Rabbi, who says: He can take one half. Now say the middle portion: 'Four or five of the shewbread loaves', that is in accord with the Sages who say that he does not take one half. Now say the last portion: Rabbi says: 'Always [he takes] five'. Does, then, the first and last part agree with Rabbi and the middle with the Sages?—Abaye said: The first and the second parts agree with the Sages, and the Sages admit that it is not a proper thing to give the high priest a piece of bread.<sup>4</sup>

---

(1) V. supra p. 69.

(2) Of Pentecost, v. Lev. XXIII, 17.

(3) Lev. XXIV, 9.

(4) Hence he may take one of the two loaves of Pentecost.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 18a

How is 'four or five' to be taken? — According to the Sages who say:<sup>1</sup> The incoming Mishmar<sup>2</sup> took six and the outgoing group took six, and there is no fee for the locking of the Temple gates,<sup>3</sup> the division is in respect of the twelves loaves. Deduct one from a half, that makes five. Whereas according to R. Judah who says: The incoming Mishmar takes seven, of which two are the fee for locking the Temple gates, and the outgoing division takes five; the division is in respect of ten<sup>4</sup> loaves, take one off the half, thus he takes four. Raba said: The whole teaching is in accord with Rabbi, but he is of the opinion of R. Judah.<sup>5</sup> How then does 'four' come in? He should take five? That is no difficulty: In the one case there is a Mishmar which<sup>6</sup> delayed in the Sanctuary, in the other there is no such Mishmar. If there be a Mishmar which delayed,<sup>7</sup> so that he would take four of them, the division is in respect of eight loaves; if there is no Mishmar which had delayed, one ought to divide ten, so that the division is in respect of ten loaves, he would take five loaves. If so, then, can Rabbi say: Always five? — That is, indeed, a difficulty. MISHNAH. THEY DELIVERED TO HIM ELDERS FROM THE ELDERS OF THE COURT AND THEY READ BEFORE HIM [THROUGHOUT THE SEVEN DAYS] OUT OF THE ORDER OF THE DAY.<sup>8</sup> THEY SAID TO HIM, SIR HIGH PRIEST, READ YOU YOURSELF WITH YOUR OWN MOUTH, PERCHANCE YOU HAVE FORGOTTEN OR PERCHANCE YOU HAVE NEVER LEARNT. ON THE EVE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IN THE MORNING THEY PLACE HIM AT THE EASTERN GATE AND PASS BEFORE HIM OXEN, RAMS AND SHEEP, THAT HE MAY LEARN TO KNOW AND BECOME FAMILIAR WITH THE SERVICE. THROUGHOUT THE SEVEN DAYS THEY DID NOT WITHHOLD FOOD OR DRINK FROM HIM. BUT ON THE EVE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT NEAR NIGHTFALL THEY WOULD NOT LET HIM EAT MUCH BECAUSE FOOD BRINGS ABOUT SLEEP.

GEMARA. It is quite right that [they assume] perchance he has forgotten, but that he never learnt, do we ever appoint men of that type? Surely it has been taught: And the priest that is highest among his brethren,<sup>9</sup> that means he should be highest among his brethren in strength, in beauty, in wisdom, and in riches. Others<sup>10</sup> say: Whence do we know that if he does not possess [any wealth], his brethren, the priests, endow him?<sup>11</sup> To teach us that it says: 'And the priest who is great by reason of his brethren',<sup>12</sup> i.e., make him great from what his brethren have?<sup>13</sup> -R. Joseph said: That is no difficulty. One refers to the first Temple, the other to the second, for R. Assi said: A tarkabful<sup>14</sup> of denars did Martha,<sup>15</sup> the daughter of Boethus give to King Jannai<sup>16</sup> to nominate<sup>17</sup> Joshua ben Gamala as one of the high priests.<sup>18</sup>

ON THE EVE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IN THE MORNING: A Tanna taught: Also the he-goats. Why has our Tanna not taught he-goats? — Since they are meant for sin[-offerings], he might feel discouraged. If it be so: does not a bullock,<sup>19</sup> too, come for a sin[-offering]? — Since that comes for himself and his brethren the priests, [there is this advantage] that if there be one among his brethren the priests with whom there is something the matter, he would know it and bring him back to repentance, but would he know that with all Israel? Rabina said: This is what the popular proverb means: If your sister's son has been appointed a constable, look out that you pass not before him in the street.<sup>20</sup>

THROUGHOUT THE SEVEN DAYS THEY DID NOT WITHHOLD etc. It has been taught: R. Judah b. Nakussa said: One fed him [cakes] of fine flour and eggs in order to produce [speedy] elimination. They answered him: Thus you will induce the more excitement.<sup>21</sup>

It has been taught: Symmachus said in the name of R. Meir: One does not feed him either A'B'Y,<sup>22</sup> and some say, neither A'B'B'Y,<sup>22</sup> and some say neither white wine. Neither A'B'Y, i.e., neither Ethrog [citron], nor Bezim [eggs], nor Yayin yashan [old wine]. And, according to others, no A'B'B'Y, i.e., neither Ethrog, nor Bezim, nor Bassar shamen [fat meat], nor Yayin yashan, some say neither white wine because white wine induces levitical impurity in man.<sup>23</sup> — Our Rabbis taught: To one afflicted with gonorrhoea one assigns food or too many kinds of food as the cause<sup>24</sup> of an attack of gonorrhoea. Eleazar b. Phinehas says in the name of R. Judah b. Bathyra: One does not feed him<sup>25</sup> either H'G'B'Y or G'B'M, or any other thing that induces impurity. Neither H'G'B'Y, i.e., neither Halab [milk], nor Gebinah [cheese], nor Bezah, nor Yayin: nor G'B'M, i.e., neither megrisen shel pul [soup of pounded beans], nor Basar shamen,, nor Muries<sup>26</sup>. 'Nor any other matters [foods] that induce impurity' — What is that meant to include? — It is meant to include what our Rabbis taught: Five things induce impurity in man, they are as follows: garlic,

(1) Suk. 56a.

(2) A division of priests, v. Glos. s.v. These divisions changed every Sabbath.

(3) [On Saturday evening, though the gates had been opened on that day by the outgoing division.]

(4) Not the half, as Rabbi would have it.

(5) That the two loaves are never divided.

(6) On festivals all priests irrespective of division came up for service in the Temple and shared in the shewbread. If the festival starts on a Sunday, the guest priests would have to arrive in Jerusalem on the Friday before, since travel on the Sabbath is forbidden. Similarly, if the festival closes on Friday, the priests would have to stay over the Sabbath in Jerusalem. Hence, in either case, they share equally in the shewbread with the priests of the division in service in that particular week. If however, the festival started on a Monday, so that the guest priests might have arrived on Sunday, but instead came on Friday already; or, if the festival closed on Thursday, so that the priests might have returned on Friday, but stayed in Jerusalem until Sunday, such 'delaying' divisions (or guest divisions) were allotted only two loaves whilst the remaining ten loaves were divided between the incoming and outgoing weekly divisions.

(7) And which obtained two loaves, Only eight remain for division — two having paid for the locking of the doors-and the high priest would receive but four.

(8) As prescribed in Lev. XVI.

(9) Lev. XXI, 10.

(10) Either: anonymous authorities, differing with the first Tanna of the Mishnah; or R. Meir, v. Hor. 13b.

(11) Raise him to independence by a collection taken up by all the priests.

(12) This is an ad hoc translation: (a) who is highest among his brethren (b) who is high because (of what) his brethren (do for him).

(13) V. Hul. 134b.

(14) [(a) **ברקב = קב תרי** two kabs; (b) \*\* = 2 1/2 kabs.]

(15) [His wife, v. Yeb. 61a.]

(16) [Jannai is often employed in the Talmud as a general patronymic for Hasmonean and Herodian rulers. Here it stands for Agrippa II, v. Josephus Ant. XX, 9, 4, and Derenbourg, Essai, 248ff.]

(17) The text has **על** 'because (he had nominated him)'. D.S. reads, correctly, **עד** 'so that'.

(18) To be, 'the elected by the electors'.

(19) Lev. XVI, 6, 11.

(20) Because he knows all your affairs and he may blackmail you.

(21) With the danger of pollution, which would unfit him for the service on the Day of Atonement, on the morrow.

(22) Mnemonic signs, explained below.

(23) Causing sex excitement and thus possible pollution.

(24) That benefit of the doubt will have this advantage for him: If it were due to his usual illness, he would have to count seven days from the day it happened before he would be pure again, but now he can continue his original count.

(25) During the time when he examines himself to make sure there has been no recurrent attack of gonorrhoea.

(26) A brine or pickle containing fish-hash and sometimes wine (Jast.).

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 18b

pepperwort, purslane, eggs, and garden-rocket.

And one went out into the field to gather oroth [herbs]<sup>1</sup> — A Tanna taught in the name of R. Meir: That refers to garden-rocket. R. Johanan said: Why are they called 'oroth'? because they enlighten the eyes.<sup>2</sup> R. Huna said: If one finds a garden-rocket he should eat it, if he can, and if not he should pass it over his eyes. R. Papa said: That refers to rocket growing on the balk. R. Giddal said in the name of Rab: A guest should not eat eggs nor sleep in the garment of his host.<sup>3</sup> Whenever Rab came to Darshis,<sup>4</sup> he would announce: Who would be mine for a day?<sup>5</sup> Whenever R. Nahman would come to Shekunzib<sup>6</sup> he would have it announced: Who will be mine for a day? But has it not been taught:<sup>7</sup> No man should marry a woman in one country and then go and marry a woman in another country lest they [their children]<sup>8</sup> might marry one another with the result that a brother would marry his sister or a father his daughter, and one fill all the world with bastardy to which the scriptural passage refers: And the land become full of lewdness?<sup>9</sup> — I will tell you: [The affairs of] the Rabbis are well-known.<sup>10</sup> But did not Raba say: If one has proposed marriage to a woman and she has consented then she must await seven clean<sup>11</sup> days? — The Rabbis informed them before by sending their messenger earlier. Or, if you like, say: They only arranged for private meetings with them, because 'You cannot compare one who has bread in his basket with one who has no bread in his basket'.<sup>12</sup>

MISHNAH. THE ELDERS OF THE COURT HANDED HIM OVER TO THE ELDERS OF THE PRIESTHOOD AND THEY TOOK HIM UP TO THE UPPER CHAMBER TO THE HOUSE OF ABTINAS.<sup>13</sup> THEY ADJURED HIM, TOOK THEIR LEAVE, AS THEY SAID TO HIM: SIR HIGH PRIEST, WE ARE MESSENGERS OF THE BETH DIN AND YOU ARE OUR MESSENGER AND THE MESSENGER OF THE COURT. WE ADJURE YOU BY HIM THAT MADE HIS NAME TO DWELL IN THIS HOUSE THAT YOU DO NOT CHANGE ANYTHING OF WHAT WE SAID TO YOU.<sup>14</sup> HE TURNED ASIDE AND WEPT AND THEY TURNED ASIDE AND WEPT.<sup>15</sup> IF HE WAS A SAGE HE WOULD EXPOUND, AND IF NOT, THE DISCIPLES OF THE SAGES WOULD EXPOUND BEFORE HIM. IF HE WAS FAMILIAR WITH READING [THE SCRIPTURES] HE WOULD READ. IF NOT THEY WOULD READ BEFORE HIM. FROM WHAT WOULD THEY READ BEFORE HIM? FROM JOB, EZRA AND CHRONICLES.<sup>16</sup> ZECHARIAH BEN KUBETAL SAID: OFTEN HAVE I READ BEFORE HIM FROM DANIEL.

---

(1) II Kings, IV, 39.

(2) This is a play on 'oroth', as if it were derived from the root 'or', light, thus 'enlightening'.

(3) Eggs might induce pollution. He might suffer pollution in the host's garment, which would be a doubly unpleasant occurrence.

(4) Be-Ardashir near Mahuza.

(5) Who would marry me for one day. 'This strange statement, completely contradicted by the saintly character of both Rab (v. 'Er. 100a, Hag. 5a, Keth. 48b, Sanh. 76a) and R. Nahman, has been explained through an account in Babli 76b. King Shapur entertained two guests, Bati b. Toba and Mar Judah. In accordance with Persian custom, he "honoured" them by sending to each a concubine. This gift was rejected by Mar Judah, but accepted by Bar Toba. Rab and R. Nahman, as leaders of their people would find themselves similarly embarrassed by such attention, on the occasion of their official visits to Persian cities. Some princes are known to have taken the refusal of their "gift" as a serious affront. In order to avoid complications, these Rabbis hit upon the device of declaring themselves married, i.e., provided with a wife in the city they visited, going to the length of marrying "for a day" the local wife, thus helping them to escape the royal "gift".' For another explanation v. Yeb., Sonc. ed., p. 235 n. 7.

(6) On the eastern bank of the Tigris.

(7) Yeb. 37b

(8) 'They' may mean either the children of that man, son and daughter, may meet as strangers; or he might meet his own daughter. The assumption being that he divorces his wife and so loses interest in her child.

(9) Lev. XIX, 29.

(10) Their children, their wives. They would boast of their descent, or of having once been married to a Sage.

(11) The assumption being that because of the excitement involved she has become a menstruant.

(12) The craving of him who lacks the opportunity of gratifying it is much more intense than that of him who has the opportunity.

(13) There the family of Abtinah prepared the incense, there the high priest was taught the skillful manipulation that would enable him to take up the incense without spilling one grain.

(14) That he would not act in the manner of the Sadducees. V. Gemara.

(15) The elders, because they had to utter such suspicion, he, because they had done so.

(16) These books, less known, might arouse his interest and keep him awake. Sleep was to be prevented, because of the risk of pollution.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 19a**

GEMARA. A Tanna taught: To teach him<sup>1</sup> the manipulation of hafinah.<sup>2</sup> R. Papa said: The high priest had two cells. One, the Cell of the Counsellors,<sup>3</sup> the other, the Cell of the House of Abtinah;<sup>4</sup> one to the north, the other to the south. 'One to the north', as we have learnt: Six cells were in the Temple Court, three to the north, three to the south.<sup>5</sup> Those to the north were the Cell of the Salt, the Cell of Parwah,<sup>6</sup> the Rinsing Cell. Into the Cell of the Salt the salt for the sacrifice was put; 'The Cell of Parwah', there the hides of the animal-offerings were salted and on its roof was the place of immersion for the high priest on the Day of Atonement; 'The Rinsing Cell': there the inwards of the animal-offerings were rinsed and an incline led from it to the roof of the Parwah Cell. The three to the north were: The Wood-Cell, the Exile Cell,<sup>7</sup> and the Cell of Hewn Stone. Concerning the Wood-Cell R. Eliezer b. Jacob said: I have forgotten what it was used for, but Abba Saul said: It was the Cell of the high priest and it lay behind the two and the roof of all the three was of the same height. 'The Exile Cell'; there was the Exile cistern, and a wheel was placed above it and from there they drew water for the whole Temple Court. 'The Cell of Hewn Stone'; there the Sanhedrin of Israel was sitting and judging the priests and whosoever was found unfit would put on a black dress and wrap himself in black, go out and go his way. And one in whom no blemish was found would put on a white garment, wrap himself in white, enter the Sanctuary and officiate with his brethren. 'One cell was to the south', as we have learnt.<sup>8</sup> There were seven gates in the Temple Court, three to the north, three to the south and one to the east. To the south: The Gate of Kindling, next to it the Gate of the Firstlings, the third being the Gate of the Water.<sup>9</sup> To the east the Nicanor Gate,<sup>10</sup> beside which were two cells, one to the right and the other to the left; the former the Cell of Phinehas, the keeper of the garments and the latter the Cell of the Makers of the Griddle Cakes. To the north: The Gate of the Spark:<sup>11</sup> it was a kind of portico with an upper chamber built on top of it, and the priests kept watch above and the Levites below. It had a doorway to the Hel;<sup>12</sup> next to it was the Gate of the offering<sup>13</sup> and the third was the Gate of the Cell of the Fireplace. And it was further taught: The high priest immersed himself five times and performed ten sanctifications<sup>14</sup> on that day, all of them on holy ground on the roof of the Parwah house, with the exception of this one,<sup>15</sup> which was on profane ground, on top of the Gate<sup>16</sup> which latter was beside his own cell. But, [continues R. Papa], I do not know whether the Cell of the Counsellors was to the north and the Cell of the house of Abtinah to the south, or the Cell of the house of Abtinah to the north and the Cell of the Counsellors to the south. But it could be proven that the Counsellors' Cell was to the south. How? He would get up,<sup>17</sup> relieve nature, immerse himself,<sup>18</sup> turn northward to learn his hafinah practice,<sup>19</sup> enter the Sanctuary and officiate all day at the service; towards evening he would be sprinkled,<sup>20</sup> return southward, immerse himself<sup>21</sup> and rest. But if you were to say that the Counsellors' Cell is to the north, he would then get up, relieve nature,<sup>22</sup> turn to the south, immerse himself and learn the hafinah, enter the Sanctuary, perform the service all day, be sprinkled towards evening, return to the south and immerse himself, and then he would have to turn and go to the north to rest. Would we trouble him so much?<sup>23</sup> Why should we not put him to much trouble so that if he be a Sadducee, he will give up; or in order that he become not too overbearing; for if you do not say so, let us place the two [cells] next to each

other; or, let one be enough for him.

THEY SAID TO HIM: SIR HIGH PRIEST etc. Shall we say that this<sup>24</sup> will be a refutation of R. Huna, the son of R. Joshua, for R. Huna, the son of R. Joshua said: These priests are messengers of the All Merciful God. For if you were to say they are our own messengers,

- 
- (1) The high priest, in that chamber.
  - (2) The taking of handfuls of incense.
  - (3) Where he slept.
  - (4) Where he would learn hafinah.
  - (5) Mid. V, 3.
  - (6) Named after a Persian builder of that name.
  - (7) [So called because it was constructed by the returned exiles from Babylon.]
  - (8) Mid. I, 4.
  - (9) Into which a bottle of water was brought for the water libation on the Sukkoth festival, v. Shek. 9a.
  - (10) Named after its designer or donor.
  - (11) A perpetual flame was kept up in its upper chamber to rekindle the fire in the Cell of the Fire-place.
  - (12) V. supra p. 72, n. 4.
  - (13) Animals destined for most holy sacrifices were brought there, because they had to be slaughtered on the north side of the altar.
  - (14) Washing his hands and feet; that is the traditional interpretation of Lev. XVI, 24.
  - (15) The first immersion, obligatory on any day, to anyone desiring to enter the Temple, v. infra 30b.
  - (16) V. infra 30a. This proves R. Papa's statement that the high priest had a private cell on the south side where the Water Gate was situated.
  - (17) Every morning of the seven days.
  - (18) [Assuming that the Counsellor's Cell where he slept was in the south, all this would take place in the south. The place for the first immersion was as first stated on top of the Water Gate which was no the south.]
  - (19) [That is in the cell of Abtinah.]
  - (20) The sprinkling made the clean unclean, hence the necessity of immediate immersion so as to fit him for to-morrow's service.
  - (21) V. supra 4b.
  - (22) [This would, on this assumption, take place in the north.]
  - (23) Hence it seemed reasonable to assume that the Counsellors' Cell lay to the south.
  - (24) Our Mishnah, according to which he is addressed as 'Our Messenger'.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 19b

is there anything that we ourselves are unable to perform<sup>1</sup> and our messengers can perform?<sup>2</sup> — Rather this is what they said to him: We adjure you according to our mind and in the mind of the Beth din.<sup>3</sup>

HE TURNED ASIDE AND WEPT AND THEY TURNED ASIDE AND WEPT. He turned aside and wept because they suspected him of being a Sadducee,<sup>4</sup> and they turned aside and wept, for R. Joshua b. Levi said: Whosoever suspects good folks will suffer [for it] on his own body.<sup>5</sup> Why was all this [solemn adjuration] necessary? Lest he arrange the incense outside and thus bring it in, in the manner of the Sadducees.<sup>6</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: There was a Sadducee who had arranged the incense without, and then brought it inside.<sup>7</sup> As he left he was exceedingly glad. On his coming out his father met him and said to him: My son, although we are Sadducees, we are afraid of the Pharisees. He replied: All my life was I aggrieved because of this scriptural verse: For I appear in the cloud upon the ark-cover.<sup>8</sup> I would say: When shall the opportunity come to my hand so that I might fulfil it.<sup>9</sup> Now that such

opportunity has come to my hand, should I not have fulfilled it? It is reported that it took only a few days until he died and was thrown on the dunghheap and worms came forth from his nose. Some say: He was smitten as he came out [of the Holy of Holies]. For R. Hiyya taught: Some sort of a noise was heard in the Temple Court, for an angel had come and struck him down on his face [to the ground] and his brethren the priests came in and they found the trace as of a calf's foot on his shoulder,<sup>10</sup> as it is written: And their feet were straight feet, and the sole of their feet was like the sole of a calf's foot.<sup>11</sup>

R. ZECHARIAH, THE SON OF KEBUTAL, SAID etc.: R. Hanan, the son of Raba, repeated to Hiyya, the son of Rab in the presence of Rab: R. Zechariah the son of Kefutal, whereupon Rab indicated to him with [a gesture of] the hand: [that it should be] Kebutal. Why did he not speak to him? — He was reading the Shema'.<sup>12</sup> But is such [interruption] permitted, has not R. Isaac b. Samuel b. Martha said: He who reads the Shema' may neither blink with his eyes, nor gesticulate with his lips, nor point with his fingers; and it has also been taught: R. Eleazar Hisma said concerning him who whilst reading the Shema' blinks with his eyes, gesticulates with his lips or points with his fingers, Scripture has said: Thou hast not called upon me, O Jacob?<sup>13</sup> — There is no difficulty; one view refers to the first portion of the Shema', the other to the second portion.<sup>14</sup>

Our Rabbis have taught: And thou shalt speak of them,<sup>15</sup> 'of them', but not during prayer;<sup>16</sup> of them thou mayest speak, but not of other things.<sup>17</sup> R. Aha said: 'And thou shalt speak of them', i.e. make them a regular programme, and not a casual topic. Raba said: One who engages in profane talk transgresses a positive command, for it is written: 'And thou shalt speak of them', 'of them', but not of other matters. R. Aha b. Jacob said: He transgresses against a prohibition, for it is said: All things toil to weariness; man cannot utter it.<sup>18</sup>

MISHNAH. IF HE SOUGHT TO SLUMBER, YOUNG<sup>19</sup> PRIESTS WOULD SNAP THEIR MIDDLE FINGER<sup>20</sup> BEFORE HIM AND SAY: SIR HIGH PRIEST, ARISE AND DRIVE THE SLEEP AWAY<sup>21</sup> THIS ONCE ON THE PAVEMENT. THEY WOULD KEEP HIM AMUSED UNTIL THE TIME FOR THE SLAUGHTERING [OF THE DAILY MORNING OFFERING] WOULD APPROACH.

GEMARA. What is 'zeredah?' — Rab Judah said: The rival of this one, which is it? the thumb.<sup>22</sup> R. Huna demonstrated it and its sound could be heard in the whole academy.

AND THEY WOULD SAY: SIR HIGH PRIEST, ARISE AND DRIVE THE SLEEP AWAY THIS ONCE. R. Isaac said: [Show us] something new.<sup>23</sup> What was that? — They said to him: Show us the kidah.<sup>24</sup>

AND THEY WOULD KEEP HIM AMUSED UNTIL THE TIME FOR THE SLAUGHTERING WOULD APPROACH. A Tanna taught: They kept him amused neither with the harp nor with the lyre, but with the mouth. What were they singing? Except the Lord build a house, they labour in vain that build it.<sup>25</sup> Some of the worthiest of Jerusalem<sup>26</sup> did not go to sleep all the night in order that the high priest might hear the reverberating noise,<sup>27</sup> so that sleep should not overcome him suddenly. It has been taught: Abba Saul said: Also in the country<sup>28</sup> they used to do so<sup>29</sup> in memory of the Temple, but they used to commit sin.<sup>30</sup> Abaye, or, as some say, R. Nahman b. Isaac, interpreted that to refer to Nehardea. For Elijah said to Rab Judah, the brother of R. Sila the Pious: You have said: Why has not Messiah come? Now to-day is the Day of Atonement and yet how many virgins were embraced in Nehardea! He answered: What did the Holy One, blessed be He, say? — He answered:

---

(1) V. Ned. 35a. Prohibiting the making of gestures whilst reading the Shema'.

(2) Permitting the making of gestures.

(3) [He is addressed as 'Our Messenger' only in respect of this adjuration, i.e., to impress on him that he must take the

oath in the sense as understood by them. (V. Ned. 24b-25a).]

(4) The Sadducees held that the high priest should prepare the incense on the fire pan before entering the Holy of Holies so that he would enter it with the pan as smoke. Many priests were suspected of adhering to that sect, hence the necessity of that solemn adjuration that the high priest would make no change.

(5) The text for this teaching is Ex. IV, I and 6. Moses had 'suspected' Israel of disbelieving the message of the Lord, when he would bring it to them, hence he was smitten with leprosy. But the leprosy there was neither meant as punishment, nor abiding, the verses are used illustratively rather than logically for the present purpose.

(6) V. infra 53a.

(7) Into the Holy 'of Holies.

(8) Lev. XVI, 2.

(9) The Sadducees interpreted the passage: For I appear in the cloud, as if it said: For I am to be seen only with the cloud (of the incense) upon the ark-cover. The whole verse, according to them is to mean: Let him not come into the holy place except with the cloud (of incense), for only thus, with the cloud, am I to be seen on the ark-cover. Hence the Sadducees' effort to enter the Holy of Holies with the fire pan as smoke, prepared and lit outside.

(10) [The high priest, in coming out of the Holy of Holies, walked backward so as not to turn his back on the Holy of Holies (v. infra 52b). When he reached the threshold and his back first emerged behind the curtain, the angel who was outside the curtain struck him on his back between the shoulders and threw him down, making him fall forward into the Holy of Holies with his face to the ground. There he lay till his brother priests came and threw him out. Cf. J. Yoma, I, 5. Lauterbach J.Z. HUCA IV, p. 193.]

(11) Ezek. I, 7. That trace is the 'evidence' that an angel had struck him, kicked him with his foot. The 'four living creatures' are identified with angels.

(12) V. Glos.

(13) Isa. XLIII, 22.

(14) In the first portion occur the words 'And these words shall be on thy heart', indicating that special devotion is necessary for such prayer to be properly read. Deut. VI, 6. The second portion, ibid XI, 13-22, contains no such special emphasis, hence no such restriction applies.

(15) Deut. VI, 7.

(16) Prayer should be silent.

(17) Loose talk, prattle.

(18) Eccl. I, 8. 'Cannot', i.e., 'ought not', i.e., 'must not',

(19) Lit., 'flowers' then 'young men' fig., in Job XXX, 12 the word is used contemptuously: Upon my right hand rises the brood.

(20) Zeredah is the middle finger, Tosef. Men, 35b as against Rashi a.l. Jastrow would derive it from zarad (be rough, in sound), thus 'the snapping finger'. Baneth (Mo'ed, a.l.) would connect it with 'strideo' (Engl. a 'strident' note). But since 'makkeh' is used for playing on a musical instrument, it may be that 'they played before him with the snapping finger', to keep him amused: or, cf. the Roman 'crepitus digitorum', it may have been a sign of command: Arise!

(21) 'Pug' means to stop. Lam. II, 18 thus 'remove', thus 'remove sleep'. The pavement was cool for his naked feet.

(22) Phonetic play: the match to this (the middle finger) or the nearest to this (the index finger), what is it? The thumb, i.e., the sound is produced with these two fingers (Jast.).

(23) על חדת lit., 'for something new explaining אַחַת' this once' in the Mishnah.

(24) Pressing both big toes against the floor, bowing and kissing the pavement, and rising without moving the feet — this difficult performance was called the kidah-the bowing to the ground.

(25) Ps. CXXXVII, 1. By implication: Except your service will be motivated by reverence for God, it will be in vain.

(26) יְקִירֵי יְרוּשָׁלַיִם 'the nobility of Jerusalem' designated also נְקִי־הַדְּעָת שְׁבִירוּשָׁלַיִם v. Klein מדעי היהדות I (1926) p. 74ff.]

(27) Of the people awake around him, singing and amusing him.

(28) Lit., 'border-towns', then: the country outside Jerusalem.

(29) Stay up all night before the Day of Atonement.

(30) Intimacy developed between men and women.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 20a

Sin coucheth at the door.<sup>1</sup> — What about Satan? — He answered: Satan has no permission to act as accuser on the Day of Atonement. Whence [is that derived]? — Rama b. Hama said: Hasatan<sup>2</sup> in numerical value is three hundred and sixty-four, that means: on three hundred and sixty-four days he has permission to act as accuser, but on the Day of Atonement he has no permission to act as accuser.

MISHNAH. EVERY DAY ONE WOULD REMOVE<sup>3</sup> [THE ASHES FROM] THE ALTAR AT KERI'ATH HA-GEBER OR ABOUT THAT TIME, EITHER BEFORE OR AFTER. BUT ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT AT MIDNIGHT,<sup>4</sup> AND ON THE FEASTS AT THE FIRST WATCH,<sup>5</sup> AND BEFORE THE COCKCROW APPROACHED THE TEMPLE COURT WAS FULL OF ISRAELITES. GEMARA. We have learnt elsewhere: If limbs [of animal offerings] burst off from upon the altar before midnight, they must be put back and the law of Me'ilah<sup>6</sup> applies to them; if they sprang off the altar after midnight, they need not be put back and the law of Me'ilah does not apply to them.<sup>7</sup> Whence do we know that?<sup>8</sup> — Rab said: One scriptural verse says: All night and . . . he shall make smoke<sup>9</sup> and another passage says: All night . . . and he shall take up [the ashes],<sup>10</sup> how is that? Divide [the night] half of it for smoking and the other half for taking up [of the ashes].<sup>11</sup>

R. Kahana raised an objection: EVERY DAY ONE WOULD REMOVE THE ASHES FROM THE ALTAR AT COCKCROW OR ABOUT THAT TIME, EITHER BEFORE OR AFTER. BUT ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT AT MIDNIGHT AND ON THE FEASTS AT THE FIRST WATCH: Now

---

(1) Gen. IV, 7. Overcoming people against their better intentions.

(2) The Satan.

(3) Lev. VI, 3: And the priest . . . shall take up the ashes whereto the fire hath consumed the burnt-offering on the altar, and he shall put them beside the altar. In reality one did not remove all the ashes, but a handful. The rest was swept together on top of the altar and formed gradually a cone or 'apple', (tapuah ha-mizbeah) which was considered an ornament. It was removed only when it occupied too much room: And he . . . shall carry forth the ashes without the camp unto a clean place (ibid. 4).

(4) To keep the high priest busy. This part of the work need not have been done by him, as Tosaf. Zeb. 86b proves.

(5) As to the watch, there is a diversity of opinion in Ber. 3a, some dividing the night into three, others into four such watches.

(6) Me'ilah is the law concerning the unlawful use of sacred property; ma'al means 'commit a trespass' and refers to the use or appropriation of anything that belongs to the altar, to the Sanctuary, to God. If me'ilah has been committed by error, there is reparation and a guilt-offering: If one commit a trespass and sin through error, then he shall bring his forfeit to the Lord, a ram without blemish . . . for a guilt-offering, and he shall make restitution for that which he hath done amiss . . . and shall add the fifth part thereto (Lev. V, 15-16).

(7) Zeb. 86a.

(8) That by midnight the limbs are considered consumed and treated as ashes.

(9) Lev. VI, 2-5. It is a loose combination of passages.

(10) In reality the smoking, mentioned at the end, might be assumed to take place at the end. The argument here is from the facts back to some support in the text.

(11) Any limb bursting off after midnight is regarded as consumed and can be removed as ashes.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 20b

if the thought should arise in you that midnight is a time fixed by the Torah, how could it be anticipated [or postponed]?<sup>1</sup> — Rather said R. Johanan: By mere logical conclusion from the text 'All the night' would I not know that it means until the morning, why then the teaching 'until the morning'? Add another morning to the 'morning of the night',<sup>2</sup> Hence every day one would remove the ashes at cockcrow, either before or after being ample [time]. On the Day of Atonement, when the high priest is weak, we do it about midnight and on the Feasts when many Israelites are present and

many sacrifices<sup>3</sup> are offered we do it from the first watch, as indeed the reason therefore is indicated: BEFORE THE COCKCROW APPROACHED, THE TEMPLE COURT WAS FULL OF ISRAELITES. What does 'keri'ath ha-geber'<sup>4</sup> mean? — Rab said: The call of a man,<sup>5</sup> R. Shila: The call of the cock. Rab came to the place of R. Shila, when there happened to be no interpreter<sup>6</sup> to stand next to R. Shila, so Rab took the stand next to him and interpreted 'keriath hageber' as 'the call of the man'. R. Shila said to him: Would you, Sir, interpret it as: Cockcrow! Rab replied: 'A flute is musical to nobles, but give it to weavers, they will not accept it'.<sup>7</sup> When I stood before R. Hiyya and interpreted 'keriath ha-geber' as the 'call of the man' he did not object to it and you say to me: Say, perhaps, the cock's crow! He said: Sir, you are Rab, would you sit down, Sir!<sup>8</sup> He replied: People say: If you have hired yourself away [to someone] pull his wool!<sup>9</sup> Some say: Thus did he reply to him: One may promote a man in holy things, but not demote<sup>10</sup> him. There is a teaching in accordance with Rab, and there is also a teaching in accord with R. Shila. There is a teaching in accord with Rab: What does Gebini the Temple crier call out: Arise, ye priests for your service, Levites for your platform, Israel for your post! And his voice was audible for three parasangs. It happened that King Agrippa who came along travelling, heard his voice from three parasangs, and as he came home, he sent gifts to him. Nevertheless, the high priest is more excellent than even he, for the Master said:<sup>11</sup> It has happened already that when he prayed 'Oh Lord' that his voice was heard in Jericho, and Rabbah b. Bar Hana said in the name of R. Johanan: From Jerusalem to Jericho is a distance of ten parasangs:<sup>12</sup> and although here there is weakness,<sup>13</sup> and there none, and here it is day and there night;<sup>14</sup> for R. Levi said: Why is the voice of man not heard by day as it is heard by night? Because of the revolution<sup>15</sup> of the sun which saws in the sky like a carpenter sawing cedars. Those sunmotes are called 'la',<sup>16</sup> and with reference to them Nebuchadnezzar said:<sup>17</sup> And all the inhabitants of the world are considered as 'la'. Our Rabbis taught: Were it not for the revolution of the sun, the sound of the tumult of Rome would be heard: and were it not for the sound of the tumult of Rome, the sound of the revolution of the sun would be heard.

Our Rabbis taught : There are three voices<sup>18</sup> going from one end of the world to the other: The sound of the revolution of the sun; the sound of the tumult of Rome, and the sound of the soul as it leaves the body. Some say also the sound of childbirth

- 
- (1) [Since before midnight it is not considered consumed. Rashi omits 'or postponed' which is bracketed in cur. edd. Tosaf. retains it explaining it on the principle that 'the zealous perform a religious duty as early as possible'.]
  - (2) The morning of the night' is the dawn. The additional morning is the margin of before and after the cockcrow.
  - (3) Since there were many ashes and they had all to be removed for the 'apple' to be imposing, they started earlier on these days.
  - (4) The call of 'geber'. That word means in Hebrew both 'man' and 'cock'. Hence it may mean that the work started at cockcrow or as soon as the man (officer) called them in the morning.
  - (5) The officer summoned all, priests, Levites, and Israelites, to their respective duties.
  - (6) Amora (v. Glos.). The Rabbi taught in Hebrew, which he spoke to the interpreter. The latter translated the lecture into Aramaic, the language of the people, as against Hebrew, more and more the language of the scholars (Rashi).
  - (7) I.e., fools would criticize, where men of taste admire.
  - (8) Do not continue as my interpreter. You are too big to serve me.
  - (9) Having undertaken the task, I will complete it, unconcerned about questions of dignity.
  - (10) The next interpreter may know very little and it would be a sort of disgrace for you to have to put up with an ignoramus after my service, The emphasis is on the ignoramus, not on any implied self-praise.
  - (11) Infra 39b.
  - (12) V. Glos.
  - (13) The weakness due to the Fast.
  - (14) The high priest prayed during the day, when his voice would be less audible because of the revolution of the sun.
  - (15) Lit., 'the wheel', V. Otzar ha-Geonim, a.l.: 'There is a voice heard now in Babylon, sounding from pools, and connected trenches, a harsh voice, which is ascribed to Ridya. Thus also do the Ishmaelites (Muslim Arabs) call it. It sounds from the month of Iyar through the harvest'. V. Ginzberg, Geonica, I, 345

(16) Nothing, to which is equal a mere mote, a particle.

(17) Ran. IV, 32. And 'in the inhabitants of the world are reputed as nothing is ad hoc translated 'as sun-motes'.

(18) Aliter: reputation.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 21a

and some say also the sound of Ridya.<sup>1</sup> The Sages prayed for the soul as it leaves the body and achieved the stopping [of that cry].

We have learnt in accord with R. Shila: If one starts out on a journey before kerith ha-geber, his blood comes upon his own head!<sup>2</sup> R. Josiah says: [He should wait] until he has crowed twice, some say: Until he has crowed thrice. What kind of cock? The average type.<sup>3</sup>

Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: When the Israelites come up to the festivals, they stand pressed together,<sup>4</sup> but they prostrate themselves, with wide spaces [between them], and they extend eleven cubits behind the back wall of the Holy of Holies.<sup>5</sup> What does that mean? — It means that although they extended eleven cubits behind the back wall of the Holy of Holies, standing pressed together, yet when they prostrated themselves, they prostrated themselves with wide spaces [between them]. This is one of the ten miracles which were wrought in the Temple, for we have learnt: Ten miracles were wrought in the Temple:<sup>6</sup> no woman miscarried from the scent of the holy flesh; the holy flesh never became putrid; no fly was seen in the slaughter house; no pollution ever befell the high priest on the Day of Atonement; no rain ever quenched the fire of the wood-pile on the altar; neither did the wind overcome the column of smoke that arose therefrom; nor was there ever found any disqualifying defect in the 'Omer<sup>7</sup> or in the two loaves,<sup>8</sup> or in the shewbread; though the people stood closely pressed together, they still found wide spaces between them to prostrate themselves; never did serpent or scorpion injure anyone in Jerusalem, nor did any man ever say to his fellow: The place is too narrow for me to stay overnight in Jerusalem.<sup>9</sup> — He started with [miracles in] the Temple and concludes with [those wrought] in Jerusalem! — There are two more [miracles wrought] in the Temple. For it has been taught: Never did rains quench the fire of the pile of wood on the altar; and as for the smoke arising from the pile of wood, even if all the winds of the world came blowing, they could not divert it from its wonted place. But are there no more? Has not R. Shemaya of Kalnebo<sup>10</sup> taught that the fragments of earthenware<sup>11</sup> were swallowed up in the very place [where they were broken];<sup>12</sup> and Abaye said: The crop, the feathers, the ashes removed from the inner altar and from the candlestick were swallowed up in the very place [where they were taken off]? — The three<sup>13</sup> [referring to] disqualifications were included under one head, hence take off two and add two! But then all [cases of] things swallowed up ought also to be included under one<sup>14</sup> head, so that the count would be one short? — There are also other [miracles], for R. Joshua b. Levi said:<sup>15</sup> A great miracle was wrought with the shewbread, viz., when it was removed it was as fresh as when it was put on, as it was said: To put hot bread in the day it was taken away.<sup>16</sup> But are there no more? Has not R. Levi said: This matter has been handed down as a tradition to us from our forefathers: The place on which the ark stands is not included in the measurement;<sup>17</sup> and has not Rabbanai in the name of Samuel said: The Cherubs<sup>14</sup> were standing by sheer miracle? — The count refers to miracles wrought outside [the Temple], miracles wrought inside are not mentioned. If that be so, what of the shewbread which is also a miracle that happened inside the Temple? — No, that miracle happened outside, for Resh Lakish said: What is the meaning of the passage: Upon the pure table before the Lord;<sup>18</sup> the statement that it is pure implies that it was susceptible to uncleanness.

---

(1) **אֵלֶּיךָ**: name of the angel of rain. In Ta'an. 25b his figure is said to be that of a calf, and according to Rashi it is from this fact that it derives its name, **אֵלֶּיךָ** being the Aramaic equivalent of **חֹרֶשׁ** a ploughing (ox).

(2) Which proves the phrase to mean, cockcrow.

(3) One that crows neither too early nor too late.

(4) Pressed, squeezed together in the Temple. Rashi would have it as a simile of a 'floating mass', immovable in a

swaying mob.

(5) Lit., 'House of the Mercy Seat', v. supra p. 73, n. 5.

(6) Another reading has 'unto our forefathers in etc.'

(7) Of new barley offered on the second day of Passover, Lev. XXIII, 10f.

(8) The first fruits of the wheat harvest offered on Pentecost, *ibid.* 17.

(9) V. Aboth, Sonc. ed., p. 62 notes,

(10) [Kar-nebo, the city of Nebo. Probably Borsippa, v. Funk, Monumenta I p. 299.]

(11) In which flesh of sin-offerings was boiled, and which according to Lev. had to be broken, v. Lev. VI, 21.

(12) Zeb. 96a.

(13) Of the 'Omer, the two loaves and the shewbread.

(14) Broken earthenware, crop, feathers, ashes. Broken earthenware was counted as one and all the other things swallowed up came as under one head, so that if they were all to be placed on one count, there would be one miracle short of the number.

(15) Hag. 26b.

(16) I Sam. XXI, 7

(17) The Cherubim which Solomon made stood on the floor next to the ark, on the right and left, The spread of their wings was twenty cubits, Since the whole room had no more than twenty cubits, the body of the Cherubs, as separate from the wings, was in the room by miraculous provision. The same applies to the ark.

(18) Lev. XXIV, 6.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 21b

[But surely] it was a wooden vessel, intended for resting, and every wooden vessel intended for resting is not susceptible to uncleanness and sets up a barrier<sup>1</sup> against uncleanness?<sup>2</sup> Rather does this teach us that the table would be lifted<sup>3</sup> up for the gaze of those who came up to the Festivals, with the mark: Behold how beloved you are of God, for it is as fresh when it is taken off as it was when put on, as it was said: 'To put hot bread in the day it was taken away'.<sup>4</sup>

But were there no more [miracles]? Did not R. Oshaia say?<sup>5</sup> When King Solomon built the Sanctuary, he planted therein all kinds of [trees of] golden delights, which were bringing forth their fruits in their season and as the winds blew at them, they would fall off, as it is written: May his fruits rustle like Lebanon,<sup>6</sup> and when the foreigners entered the Temple they withered, as it is written: And the flower of Lebanon languishes;<sup>7</sup> and the Holy One, blessed be He, will in the future restore them, as it is said: It shall blossom abundantly and rejoice, even with joy and singing; the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it?<sup>8</sup> -Permanent miracles he does not include in his count. And now that we have come to this [conclusion], the ark and the Cherubim are also permanent miracles.<sup>9</sup>

The Master said: 'And the [smoke arising from the] pile of wood on the altar'. But was there smoke arising from the pile of wood? Has it not been taught: Five things were reported about the fire of the pile of wood: It<sup>10</sup> was lying like a lion, it was as clear as sunlight, its flame was of solid substance, it devoured wet wood like dry wood, and it caused no smoke to arise from it? — What we said [about the smoke] referred to the wood from outside [of the Sanctuary].<sup>11</sup> For it has been taught: And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar<sup>12</sup> — although the fire comes down from heaven, it is a proper thing to bring fire from outside too.<sup>13</sup>

'Lying like a lion'. But has it not been taught: R. Hanina, deputy high priest, said: I myself have seen it and it was lying like a dog? — This is no contradiction: The first statement refers to the first Temple, the second to the second Temple.<sup>14</sup> But was the fire present at the second Temple?-Surely R. Samuel b. Inia said: What is the meaning of the scriptural verse: And I will take pleasure in it [we-ikabed] and I will be glorified?<sup>15</sup> The traditional reading is 'we-ikabedah', then why is the [letter] 'he' omitted [in the text]? To indicate that in five<sup>16</sup> things the first Sanctuary differed from the second: in the ark, the ark-cover, the Cherubim,<sup>17</sup> the fire, the Shechinah, the Holy Spirit [of

Prophecy], and the Urim-we-Thummim [the Oracle Plate]? — I will tell you, They were present, but they were not as helpful [as before].

Our Rabbis taught: There are six different kinds of fire: Fire which eats but does not drink; fire which drinks but does not eat; fire which eats and drinks; fire which consumes dry matter as well as moist matter; and fire which pushes fire away; fire which eats fire. ‘Fire which eats but does not drink’: that is our fire [water quenches it]; ‘which drinks but does not eat’: the fever of the sick; ‘eats and drinks’: that of Elijah, for it is written: And licked up the water that was in the trench;<sup>18</sup> ‘eats both dry and moist matter’: the fire of the pile of wood; ‘fire which pushes other fire away’: that of Gabriel;<sup>19</sup> and ‘fire which eats fire’: that of the Shechinah, for a Master said: He put forth His finger among them and burned them.<sup>20</sup> [It is stated above], ‘But the smoke arising from the pile of wood, even all the winds of the world could not move it from its place’. But [did not] R. Isaac b. Abdimi Say: ‘On the night following<sup>21</sup> the last day of the [Sukkoth] Festival all were gazing upon the smoke arising from the pile of wood. If it inclined northward, the poor rejoiced and the people of means were sad, because the rains of the coming year would be abundant and their fruits would rot.<sup>22</sup> If it inclined southward, the poor were depressed and the men of means rejoiced, for there would be little rain that year and the fruit could be preserved. If it inclined eastwards, all rejoiced;<sup>23</sup> if westwards all were depressed’?<sup>24</sup> — It merely means that it swayed hither and thither like a tree, but it was not scattered. The Master said: [If it inclined] eastward all rejoiced: westward — all were depressed. There is a contradiction against it: The east wind is always good ‘ the west wind always bad, the north wind benefits wheat when it has grown to one third [of its usual height], and is bad for olives when they are budding; the south wind is bad for wheat which has grown one third [of its normal size] and good for olives when they are budding and R. Joseph or Mar Zutra said, in connection therewith, as a sign: The table was in the north, and the candlestick in the south,<sup>25</sup> i.e., the one [north wind] grows what is good for the table,<sup>26</sup> and the other [south wind] what is good for the candlestick?<sup>27</sup> — This is no contradiction: the former statement refers to us,<sup>28</sup> the latter to them.<sup>29</sup> [

---

(1) חוּצֵי. The root ‘hazaz’ means to cut off, to divide, to serve as an intervening object.

(2) Wooden utensils which are not intended to be moved (as e.g., a table) are not only not susceptible to uncleanness, but they form a barrier against uncleanness, effectively preventing its spread. This is inferred from the passage: And upon whatsoever any of them, when they are dead, doth fall, it shall be unclean; whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack (Lev. XI, 32). In this passage sack and vessel of wood are cited together, hence our Sages infer that just as a sack is movable and moved, so uncleanness can befall only such wooden vessels as are movable and moved; whereas a wooden vessel meant to rest (or have things placed thereon) is different and hence unsusceptible.

(3) The table being taken out periodically to be shown to the pilgrims was no longer considered an immovable object and became susceptible to uncleanness, and the miracle consisted in the fact that nevertheless it never actually became unclean,

(4) I Sam. XXI, 7.

(5) Infra 39b.

(6) Ps. LXXII, 16. Hence there are fruits in Lebanon. But Lebanon was identified with the Sanctuary (Git. 56b), thus the paraphrase of the trees and the winds to create the rustling.

(7) Nahum I, 4.

(8) Isa, XXXV, 2.

(9) And therefore not included.

(10) Either as the simple text suggests, the fire, majestically, quietly; or, as Rashi has it: ‘It’ refers to a great lump of coal which fell from heaven in the days of Solomon and stayed there until the time of Manasseh; that lump having the form of a lion.

(11) Lit., ‘private (man)’ — not part of the altar wood, but wood which was brought in addition and unaffected by the special property of the holy fire.

(12) Lev, I, 7.

(13) Infra 53a.

(14) The first Sanctuary was held in great reverence, itself, its priests, its influence. The second came to be held in

disrespect. The above tradition may well reflect the attitude towards both, as crystallized in the Aggada. Therefore the very pile of wood 'was lying like a lion' in David's Temple, and appeared 'lying like a dog' in the second.

(15) Hag. I, 8: Go up to the hill-country and bring wood, and build the house; and I will take pleasure in it and I will be glorified, saith the Lord.

(16) The numerical value of **ה** is five.

(17) The first three form one unit.

(18) I Kings XVIII, 38: Then the fire of the Lord fell and consumed . . . and licked up.

(19) Pes. 118a, ref. to Dan.III, 27.

(20) The angels objecting to the creation of man. The angels are of fire, v. Sanh. 38b.

(21) V. R. H. 16a: At the Feast of Tabernacles the World is judged through water. V. Ta'an. 2a. Hence the anxiety to watch for the decision from the direction of the wind.

(22) Hence they would have to sell them fast, i.e., cheaply.

(23) Because it meant average rain, plenty of fruit, without danger of rotting so that the merchants could charge moderate prices.

(24) Because it dries up the seeds, and causes famine, v. B.B. 147a. At any rate the smoke moved, which contradicts the statement above.

(25) Sc. in the Sanctuary.

(26) Wheat for the shewbread.

(27) Oil of the olive.

(28) For Babylonia, which is always full of moisture, the east wind is good.

(29) For Palestine, which is dry, full of mountains and hills, it is bad.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 22a**

### CHAPTER II

MISHNAH. ORIGINALLY WHOSOEVER<sup>1</sup> DESIRED TO REMOVE [THE ASHES FROM] THE ALTAR DID SO. IF THEY WERE MANY, THEY WOULD RUN AND MOUNT THE RAMP<sup>2</sup> [OF THE ALTAR] AND HE THAT CAME FIRST WITHIN FOUR CUBITS<sup>3</sup> OBTAINED THE PRIVILEGE. IF TWO WERE EVEN, THE OFFICER<sup>4</sup> WOULD SAY TO THEM [ALL:]<sup>5</sup> RAISE THE FINGER!<sup>6</sup> AND HOW MANY DID THEY PUT FORTH? ONE OR<sup>7</sup> TWO BUT ONE DID NOT PUT FORTH THE THUMB IN THE TEMPLE.<sup>8</sup> IT ONCE HAPPENED THAT TWO WERE EVEN AS THEY RAN TO MOUNT THE RAMP. ONE OF THEM PUSHED HIS FELLOW WHO FELL AND BROKE HIS LEG. WHEN THE COURT SAW THAT THEY INCURRED DANGER, THEY ORDAINED THAT THE ALTAR BE CLEARED ONLY BY COUNT. THERE WERE FOUR COUNTS. THIS IS THE FIRST COUNT.

GEMARA. But why did our Rabbis not establish the count for this service from the beginning? They thought, Since it was a night service, it would not be considered so precious and they [many priests] would not come. But when they saw that [many] were coming and incurred danger,<sup>9</sup> they arranged the count. But the burning on the altar of the limbs and fat-pieces is also a night service, and yet our Rabbis arranged a count for it? — It is rather the end of the service of the day.<sup>10</sup> But the other<sup>11</sup> too is the beginning of the service of the day, for R. Johanan said: If he sanctified his hands [by washing]<sup>12</sup> for clearing the ashes off the altar he need not in the morning sanctify them again,<sup>13</sup> because he has sanctified them already from the beginning of the service?<sup>14</sup> — Say: Because he has from the beginning<sup>15</sup> sanctified his hands for the service. Some say:<sup>16</sup> First they [the Rabbis] believed that since [many of them] are overcome by sleep, they would not come [to this night service], but when they saw they were coming and incurring danger, our Rabbis arranged for the count. But with the burning of the limbs and fat-pieces, [taking also place at a time when] they are also overcome by sleep and yet our Rabbis arranged for a count? There is a difference between going to sleep and rising from sleep.<sup>17</sup>

But was the arrangement due to that consideration, was it not rather due to another consideration, for it has been taught:<sup>18</sup> He who obtained the task of clearing the altar of the ashes thereby also obtained the ordering of the pile of wood on the altar and of the two pieces of wood?<sup>19</sup> — R. Ashi said: There were two arrangements. First they [the Rabbis] opined that they would not come [at night], but when they saw that the priests did come and incurred danger, they arranged for the count. When the count had been arranged, they did not come, for they said: ‘Who can tell whether the lot will fall on me’ [therefore] they [the Rabbis] arranged that he who had obtained the task of clearing the ashes off the altar, should thereby also obtain the task of arranging the piles of wood and the two pieces of wood, in order that they might come and submit to the count.

IF THEY WERE MANY etc.: R. Papa said: It is obvious to me [that within four cubits does] not [refer to] the four cubits on the floor,<sup>20</sup> because we learnt: THEY WOULD RUN AND MOUNT THE RAMP; neither does it mean the first<sup>21</sup> [four cubits], because we learnt: THEY WOULD RUN AND MOUNT THE RAMP, and after that: HE THAT CAME FIRST WITHIN FOUR CUBITS; neither does it mean [four cubits] in the middle because this is not clearly indicated; hence it is self-evident that it means [four cubits] off the altar. But R. Papa asked: Do these four cubits, of which we have spoken, include the one cubit of the [projecting] base and the one cubit of the gallery,<sup>22</sup>

- 
- (1) There were twenty-four divisions (Mishmaroth) of the priests, each division (Mishmar, v. Glos.) consisting of four to nine families (Bate Aboth). Every week another division did service in the Sanctuary, being relieved on the Sabbath. During the week they distributed the service among the families. (V. Tosef. Ta'an. II.) Any one among the family (Beth-Ab, v. Glos.) whose turn came on that day, could originally, if he so desired, remove the ashes from the altar.
  - (2) The ramp, at the south of the altar, led up to it. Its length was thirty-two cubits.
  - (3) Off the altar.
  - (4) Memuneh. Lit., ‘the appointed one’ general term for temple official of high rank. Here the officer in charge of the count; v. Shek. V, 1.
  - (5) Not to the two alone, but to all that were present.
  - (6) So that the decision would be reached by the count. The officer would place them in a (circular) queue, take the mitre off one of them, and after having named a number, would start counting from that man by the fingers put forth. The priest with whom the number was reached, secured the task.
  - (7) There may be some older, weaker, or sick priests for whom it was inconvenient to put one finger forth and hold it aloft until the count was over. Whenever one such handicapped priest was present, the officer would require all to put forth two fingers, which is less of an effort.
  - (8) A trickster foreseeing where the count would end, might place his index-finger at some distance from the thumb, so that the officer would count his two fingers as belonging to two people, with the result that the count would be wrong and designed to serve the trickster's end.
  - (9) By racing together, they might push one another down.
  - (10) And so considered important by the priests.
  - (11) The removal of the ashes.
  - (12) V. Ex. XXX, 19.
  - (13) Unless he should leave the Temple, when another sanctification by washing would be due.
  - (14) Hence it is the beginning of the service, and the argument is void.
  - (15) Interpret R. Johanan's word to mean: He sanctified himself from the beginning (during the night) for the service.
  - (16) In answer to the question: why was this count not arranged from the very first?
  - (17) A man will find it easier to postpone the hour of sleep than to rise from sleep early in the morning (for the purpose of clearing the altar of the ashes).
  - (18) Infra 28a.
  - (19) Two logs of wood, placed above the pile of wood on the altar. V. infra 26b. These being considered an important service would require a count.
  - (20) Before reaching the ramp.
  - (21) At the foot of the ramp.

(22) Sobeb. Lit., 'a ring', or 'hoop'; here a gallery round the altar for the priest to walk on.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 22b

or does it mean exclusive of the one cubit base and one cubit gallery?<sup>1</sup> — [The question] stands.

IF TWO WERE EVEN, THE OFFICER WOULD SAY TO THEM: RAISE THE FINGER, etc.

A Tanna taught: Put forth your fingers for the count. But let him count them?<sup>2</sup> — That supports the statement of R. Isaac, for R. Isaac said: It is forbidden to count Israel even for [the purpose of fulfilling] a commandment, as it is written: And he numbered them be-bezek [with pebbles].<sup>3</sup> R. Ashi demurred to this: Whence do you know that the word 'bezek' is here used in the sense of being broken [i.e., pebbles], perhaps it is the name of a place, as it is written: And they found Adoni-Bezek in Bezek?<sup>4</sup> — Rather it is from here: And Saul summoned the people and numbered them with telaim<sup>5</sup> [sheep].

R. Eleazar said: Whosoever counts Israel, transgresses a [biblical] prohibition, as it is said: Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured.<sup>6</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said: He would transgress two prohibitions, for it is written: 'Which cannot be measured nor numbered'. R. Samuel b. Nahmani said: R. Jonathan raised an objection: It is written: 'Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea,' and it is also written: 'Which cannot be numbered?'<sup>7</sup> This is no contradiction: Here<sup>8</sup> it speaks of the time when Israel fulfils the will of the Lord, there of the time when they do not fulfil His will. Rabbi,<sup>9</sup> on behalf of Abba Jose son of Dosthai, said: This is no contradiction: Here it speaks of [counting done] by human beings, there of counting by Heaven.<sup>10</sup> R. Nehilai b. Idi said in the name of Samuel: As soon as a man is appointed administrator of a community, he becomes rich — First it was written: 'And he counted them by means of pebbles,' and, in the end, 'And he counted them by means of sheep'. But perhaps these sheep were of their own? — Then what is remarkable about it?<sup>11</sup>

And he strove in the valley.<sup>12</sup> R. Mani said: Because of what happens 'in the valley': When the Holy One, blessed be He, said to Saul: Now go and smite Amalek,<sup>13</sup> he said: If on account of one person the Torah said: Perform the ceremony of the heifer whose neck is to be broken,<sup>14</sup> how much more [ought consideration to be given] to all these persons! And if human beings sinned, what has the cattle committed; and if the adults have sinned, what have the little ones done?<sup>15</sup> A divine voice came forth and said: Be not righteous overmuch.<sup>16</sup> And when Saul said to Doeg: Turn thou and fall upon the priests,<sup>17</sup> a heavenly voice came forth to say: Be not overmuch wicked.<sup>18</sup>

R. Huna said: How little does he whom the Lord supports need to grieve or trouble himself! Saul sinned once and it brought [calamity] upon him, David sinned twice and it did not bring evil upon him — What was the one sin of Saul? The affair with Agag.<sup>19</sup> But there was also the matter with Nob,<sup>20</sup> the city of the priests? — [Still] it was because of what happened with Agag that Scripture says: It repenteth Me that I have set up Saul to be king.<sup>21</sup> What were the two sins of David? — The sin against Uriah<sup>22</sup> and that [of counting the people to which] he was enticed.<sup>23</sup> But there was also the matter of Bathsheba?<sup>24</sup> — For that he was punished, as it is written, And he shall restore the lamb fourfold:<sup>25</sup> the child, Amnon, Tamar and Absalom.<sup>26</sup> But for the other sin he was also punished as it is written: So the Lord sent a pestilence upon Israel from the morning even to the time appointed?<sup>27</sup> — There his own body was not punished — But in the former case, too, his own body was not punished either?<sup>28</sup> Not indeed? He was punished on his own body, for Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: For six months David was smitten with leprosy, the Sanhedrin removed from him, and the Shechinah departed from him, as it is written: Let those that fear Thee return unto me, and they that know Thy testimonies,<sup>29</sup> and it is also written: Restore unto me the joy of Thy salvation.<sup>30</sup> But Rab said that David also listened to evil talk?<sup>31</sup> — We hold like Samuel [who says] that David did

not do so. And even according to Rab, who says that David listened to calumny, was he not punished for it? For Rab Judah said in the name of Rab. At the time when David said to Mephibosheth: I say: Thou and Ziba divide the land,<sup>32</sup> a heavenly voice came forth to say to him: Rehoboam and Jeroboam will divide the Kingdom.

Saul<sup>33</sup> was a year old<sup>34</sup> when he began to reign. R. Huna said: Like an infant of one year, who had not tasted the taste of sin. R. Nahman b. Isaac demurred to this: Say perhaps: Like an infant of one year old that is filthy with mud and excrement?<sup>35</sup> R. Nahman thereupon was shown a frightening vision in his dream, whereupon he said: I beg your pardon,<sup>36</sup> bones of Saul, son of Kish. But he saw again a frightening vision in his dream, whereupon he said: I beg your pardon, bones of Saul, son of Kish,<sup>37</sup> King in Israel.

Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel: Why did the kingdom of Saul not endure? Because no reproach rested on him,<sup>38</sup> for R. Johanan had said in the name of R. Simeon b. Jehozadak: One should not appoint any one administrator of a community, unless he carries a basket of reptiles on his back, so that if he became arrogant, one could tell him: Turn around!<sup>39</sup>

Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: Why was Saul punished? Because he forewent the honour due to himself, as it is said: But certain base fellows said: 'How shall this man save us?' And they despised him and brought him no present. But he was as one that held his peace,<sup>40</sup> and it is written [immediately following that]: Then Nahash the Ammonite came up and encamped against Jabesh-gilead.<sup>41</sup> R. Johanan further said in the name of R. Simeon b. Jehozadak: Any scholar,

---

(1) [The altar was constructed with two rebatements of two cubits, one cubit at the base and another at the Sobeb; and R. Papa's query is whether these two cubits are to be included in the four cubits distance, so that the real distance measured in a straight line from the main structure of the altar would be six cubits.]

(2) By heads.

(3) I Sam. XI, 8.

(4) Judg. I, 5.

(5) I Sam. XV, 4.

(6) Hosea II, 1. 'Cannot be numbered' is interpreted-and grammatically there is no solid objection as 'should not, must not be numbered', thus a positive statement becomes a prohibition. The assumption is justified that here again the ultimate basis of the prohibition is not this passage, but the passage is a peg on which to hang the idea. There are more obvious sources of the prohibition known to the disputants.

(7) Ibid. The sand of the sea, however tremendous the number of grains, yet could be counted. Why then the second part of the passage which cannot be numbered'? It is true this verse is divested of its simple meaning, which does not permit this dichotomy. But again the major purpose of the questioner is to drive home a moral.

(8) When Israel fulfils the Lord's commands, it will become infinite, beyond the possibility of a count: if it does not live up to His law, it may, nevertheless, be great in number, but it will be countable.

(9) Another reading: R. Assi. There is no valid objection to the text here.

(10) Maharsha: Human beings would weary of counting, because of the great number.

(11) That Scripture mentions it especially. E.V. takes 'Telaim' to be the name of a place.

(12) I Sam. XV, 5. E.V.: 'And he lay in wait'. Saul was thus 'striving because of what happens in the valley', i.e., he argued from that ceremony against the slaying of the Amalekites. V. Gruenberg, s. Exeg. Beitrage, III, index.

(13) I Sam. XV, 3.

(14) Deut. XXI, 1-9.

(15) I Sam. XV, 3: Slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass.

(16) Eccl. VII, 16.

(17) I Sam. XXII, 18.

(18) Eccl. VII, 17.

(19) I Sam. XV, 2ff

(20) Ibid. XXII, 19.

- (21) Ibid. XV, 11.
- (22) II Sam. XI, 2-27.
- (23) Ibid. XXIV, 1.
- (24) He had committed adultery in addition to having instigated murder.
- (25) II Sam. XII, 6. He had unconsciously prophesied his own punishment.
- (26) All of whom died during his lifetime; thus he paid four of his 'lambs' for the one he had unrighteously taken from its master.
- (27) II Sam. XXIV, 15.
- (28) Just as here the people died and not he, so was it his children, but not he, who were afflicted because of his sin.
- (29) Ps. CXIX, 79.
- (30) Ibid. LI, 14.
- (31) The evil reports of Ziba against Mephibosheth. So that he committed a third sin.
- (32) II Sam. XIX, 30.
- (33) I Sam. XIII, 1.
- (34) The literal interpretation being impossible because of earlier texts, the Rabbis endeavour to find therein homiletical suggestion.
- (35) R. Nahman was not actuated by any animus against Saul. He objected primarily to the too ready way of moralizing in advance of textual equivocality. With even justice one could illustrate an opposite aspect of infancy, and an analogy would thus throw evil light on King Saul.
- (36) His conscience smote him afterwards, for in his eagerness to demonstrate the error of hasty interpretation, he had offended the memory of Saul.
- (37) His conscience was not at rest, until he had fully realized that he had offended the King of Israel. His dreams reflected his thoughts by day, and only after his second apology did he feel relieved.
- (38) On Saul's descent. None could therefore prevent his arrogance by pointing to a family skeleton, saying: Turn around and your basket of reptiles (family ignominy) will stand revealed.
- (39) V. preceding note.
- (40) I Sam. X, 27.
- (41) Ibid. XI, 1, hence, because immediately following, viewed as consequence of his too great humility.

### **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 23a**

who does not avenge himself and retain anger like a serpent, is no [real] scholar.<sup>1</sup> But is it not written: Thou shalt not take vengeance nor bear any grudge?<sup>2</sup> — That refers to monetary affairs, for it has been taught: What is revenge and what is bearing a grudge? If one said to his fellow: 'Lend me your sickle', and he replied 'No', and to-morrow the second comes [to the first] and says: 'Lend me your axe'! and he replies: 'I will not lend it to you, just as you would not lend me your sickle' — that is revenge. And what is bearing a grudge? If one says to his fellow: 'Lend me your axe', he replies 'No', and on the morrow the second asks: 'Lend me your garment', and he answers: 'Here it is. I am not like you who would not lend me [what I asked for]' — that is bearing a grudge. But [does] not [this prohibition apply to] personal affliction? Has it not been taught: Concerning those who are insulted but do not insult others [in revenge], who hear themselves reproached without replying, who [perform good] work out of love of the Lord and rejoice in their sufferings,<sup>3</sup> Scripture says: But they that love Him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might?<sup>4</sup> — [That means,] indeed, that he keeps it in his heart [though without taking action]. Rut Raba said: He who passes over his retaliations has all his transgressions passed over?<sup>5</sup> — [That speaks of the case] that an endeavour was made to obtain his reconciliation, and his consent is obtained.

AND HOW MANY DID THEY PUT FORTH? ONE OR TWO. If they may put forth two, why is it necessary to mention that they may put forth one? — R. Hisda said: This is no difficulty: The one speaks of healthy persons, the other of sick ones.<sup>6</sup> Thus has it been taught: One finger is put forth, but not two. To whom does this rule apply? To a healthy person, but a sick one may put forth even two. But the 'Yehidim'<sup>7</sup> put forward two and one counts only one thereof.<sup>8</sup> But has it not been

taught: One does not put forth either the third finger or the thumb because of tricksters, and if one had put forth the third finger, it would be counted,<sup>9</sup> but if one had put forth the thumb it would not be counted, and not alone that but the officer strikes him with the pekia'?'<sup>10</sup> — What does 'it would be counted' mean? Only one. What is pekia'?' — Rab said: A madra [chastising whip]. What is madra? R. Papa said: The whip of the Arabs, the head [sting] of which is taken off. — Abaye said: Originally I believed that which we have learnt: Ben Bibai was in charge of "pekia"<sup>11</sup> meant, in charge of the wicks, as we have learnt: From the outworn breeches and belts of the priests they used to make 'peki'in' and light them<sup>12</sup> Now that I hear that it was taught: Not that alone, but the officer would strike him with the 'pekia" I understand that 'pekia" means lash.<sup>13</sup>

IT ONCE HAPPENED THAT TWO WERE EVEN AS THEY RAN TO MOUNT THE RAMP. Our Rabbis taught: It once happened that two priests were equal as they ran to mount the ramp and when one of them came first within four cubits of the altar, the other took a knife and thrust it into his heart. R. Zadok stood on the steps of the Hall<sup>14</sup> and said: Our brethren of the house of Israel, hear ye! Behold it says: If one be found slain in the land... then thy elders and judges shall come forth . . .<sup>15</sup> On whose behalf shall we offer the heifer whose neck is to be broken, on behalf of the city or on behalf of the Temple Courts? All the people burst out weeping. The father of the young man came and found him still in convulsions. He said: 'May he be an atonement for you. My son is still in convulsions and the knife has not become unclean.' [His remark] comes to teach you that the cleanness of their vessels was of greater concern to them even than the shedding of blood. Thus is it also said: Moreover Manasseh shed innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to the other.<sup>16</sup>

Which event took place first?<sup>17</sup> Would you say that of the bloodshed took place first? Now, if in spite of the bloodshed they did not establish the count, would they have arranged it because of the [incident of the] broken leg? Rather, the [incident of the] broken leg came first — But since they had already arranged a count how was [the affair of the bloodshed] within the four cubits possible? — Rather, the incident of the bloodshed came first, but at first [the Rabbis] thought it was a mere accident; but when however they saw that even without [such unfortunate accidents] they incurred danger, they enacted the count.

'R. Zadok stood upon the steps of the Hall and called out: Our brethren of the House of Israel, hear ye! Behold it says: If one be found slain in the land.<sup>18</sup> On whose behalf shall we bring the heifer whose neck is to be broken, on behalf of the city or of the Temple Courts?' But does [the community of] Jerusalem bring a heifer whose neck is to be broken? Surely it has been taught: Ten things were said concerning Jerusalem and this is one of them —

---

(1) Maharsha interprets this statement by reference to Gen. III, 15: And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; they shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise their heel. The man will endeavour to crush the serpent so as to deprive it of its life: whereas the serpent retaliates by bruising only the heel, a non-vital part of the human body. Thus, 'serpent-like' the scholar should retaliate most moderately even when great wrong was done to him. — This proverb may also be a reaction to too humble a scholar, who by reason of his extreme forbearance seemingly encourages impudent and cruel people in their nefarious conduct. — Another suggested interpretation: just as great serpents swallowing their prey, moisten it with so much saliva as to be deprived of a sense of what, subjectively, they are eating, knowing only, objectively, that they are eating something, so should the scholar, against whom a wrong was committed, not endeavour to avenge himself subjectively, but to avenge objectively the wrong that was perpetrated. [Bacher (ZDMG, 1874, p. 6) relates this dictum to the one preceding: Any scholar who does not avenge himself like Nahash (which is the Hebrew for serpent) is no scholar. The reference is to a tradition preserved in a fragment of the Jerusalem Targum on Isa. XI, 2 that the condition made by Nahash for the offered covenant was that the Gileadites remove the injunction from the Torah barring the Ammonites from the congregation of Israel — an injunction which he considered an affront.]

(2) Lev. XIX, 18.

(3) Because imposed by the Lord, either to test their faith or to punish them in this world for their sins, rewarding their virtues in the world to come, cf. Git. 68b: 'In order that he may enjoy his world here whence the theory that the wicked who prosper are rewarded here for their good deeds and punished for their evil doings in the hereafter, with the opposite method applied to the virtuous.

(4) Judg. V, 31.

(5) He who forbears to retaliate will find forbearance for his own failings.

(6) V. supra p. 97, n. 7.

(7) Certain individuals, i.e., scholars, v. Ta'an 10a. They would, out of respect for their learning, be permitted a convenience, which sick persons are granted out of consideration for their health.

(8) Tosef. Yoma I, 10.

(9) No trickiness is involved here, because the distance between these fingers is too small to mislead the officer into assuming that he saw the fingers of two different persons in the count, but with the thumb a dishonest motive seems obvious, hence both, the disregard and the punishment.

(10) Pekia' — may mean: strip, shreds of garments, hence either wick or whip.

(11) Shek. V, 1.

(12) Suk. 51a.

(13) Abaye does not absolutely exclude two compatible meanings of the word.

(14) Ulam, the hall leading to the interior of the Temple.

(15) Deut. XXI, 1.

(16) II Kings XXI, 16.

(17) The bloodshed or the breaking of the leg.

(18) Deut. XXI, 1.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 23b**

it does not have to bring a heifer whose neck is to be broken.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore: And it be not known who hath smitten him but here it is known who has smitten him?—Rather [he put his question rhetorically] to increase the weeping.<sup>2</sup>

'The father of the young man came and found the boy in convulsions. He said: "May he be an atonement for you.<sup>3</sup> My son is still in convulsions, etc." To teach you that they looked upon the purity of their vessels as a graver matter than bloodshed!' [The Scholars in the Academy] asked this question: Was it that bloodshed became a minor matter to them, whereas the purity of their vessels remained in its original importance, or did bloodshed concern them as before but the purity of the vessels became for them of a still graver concern? Come and hear: Because the Talmud adduces 'And also innocent blood did Manasseh shed' that indicates that bloodshed had become a matter of smaller concern to them whilst the purity of the vessels retained its original importance.

Our Rabbis taught: And he shall put off his garments and put on other garments and carry forth the ashes<sup>4</sup> — from this I might learn even as on the Day of Atonement,<sup>5</sup> [so] that he put off his holy garments and put on profane garments.<sup>6</sup> To teach us [the true law] it says: 'And he shall put off his garments and put on other garments, thus comparing the garments he put on with the garments he put off; just as the former are holy garments, so are the latter holy garments. If so, what does [the word] 'other' teach?<sup>7</sup> [They shall be] inferior to the former. R. Eliezer said: [The words] 'other' and 'he shall carry forth' indicate that priests afflicted with a blemish<sup>8</sup> are permitted to carry forth the ashes.

The Master said: "'Other garments", i.e. inferior to the former', as the school of R. Ishmael taught: For the school of R. Ishmael taught: One should not offer a cup of wine to one's teacher while wearing the garment wherein one has cooked a dish<sup>9</sup> for him.

Resh Lakish said: Just as there is diversity of opinion about the carrying forth of the ashes,<sup>10</sup> so there is about clearing them off the altar.<sup>11</sup> R. Johanan said: The diversity of opinion applies only to

the carrying forth, but as to clearing them off the altar, all agree that this is [regular] service.<sup>12</sup> What is the reason for Resh Lakish's view? He will tell you: If it should enter your mind that this [the clearing of the ashes off the altar] is considered a [regular] service — then you would have a service legitimate in two garments.<sup>13</sup> And R. Johanan?<sup>14</sup> — The Divine Law revealed the regulation for tunic and breeches, but it includes also mitre and girdle.<sup>15</sup> Then why are these [two specially mentioned]? — ‘Middo bad’ [‘linen garments’] is written [here to indicate] proper measure,<sup>16</sup> ‘miknese bad’ [‘linen breeches’] to teach us in accord with what has been taught:<sup>17</sup> Whence is it known that nothing may be put on before the breeches? Because it is said: ‘And he shall have the linen breeches upon his flesh.’ And Resh Lakish? — That the garment must have the proper measure [he infers] from the fact that the Divine Law employs [the word] ‘middo’ [garment, not tunic]; that nothing may be put on before the breeches, he infers from the words: ‘on his flesh’. Shall we say that the point at issue is the same as between the following Tannaim: ‘[And his linen breeches shall he put] on his flesh.’ Why does Scripture say: ‘Shall he put on?’<sup>18</sup> That is meant to include the [obligation of wearing] mitre and girdle for the clearing off of the ashes — this is the opinion of R. Judah. R. Dosa says: That means to include [the rule] that the [four white] garments worn by the high priest on the Day of Atonement may be worn by the common priest [during the remainder of the year].<sup>19</sup> Rabbi said: There are two refutations to this matter. One: the girdle of the high priest<sup>20</sup> is different from that of the common priest.<sup>21</sup> Two: shall garments used at a service of solemn holiness be worn at a service of lesser holiness? — But what, rather, is the significance of ‘yilbash’?

---

(1) Sot. 45a.

(2) To make them conscious of the horrible nature of the deed perpetrated.

(3) Maharsha explains that since Jerusalem is deprived of the heifer ceremony, which would normally obtain forgiveness for them, the generous father prayed for atonement by the grace of God.

(4) Lev. VI, 4.

(5) When the high priest changed his garments with every different service, cf. infra 70a.

(6) In the case of the high priest he changes from golden garments into linen garments and vice versa. With the ordinary priest however who has no alternate holy garments, the change would be from holy garments into profane ones.

(7) The word ‘other’ is connected with ‘and he shall carry forth’ to which it is placed in juxtaposition in the Hebrew text, thus referring to the priest.

(8) And thus designated ‘other’, i.e., than those who are usually fit for service.

(9) Similarly there should be different garments worn for the service proper and for the removal of the ashes respectively.

(10) As to whether blemished priests may remove them.

(11) That matter depends on the answer to the question, as to whether the removal of the ashes is considered a service or not.

(12) Requiring the putting on of four garments and the ministrations of unblemished priests.

(13) Scripture says: He shall put on his linen garments and his linen breeches shall he put upon his flesh. (Lev. VI, 3.) If the removal of the ashes, whereof this passage speaks, were a service, how could Scripture demand only ‘the linen garment’ and the ‘linen breeches i.e., two garments, when a service proper requires four? Since only two garments are required, evidently the removal of the ashes is not considered a service and hence may be performed even by blemished priests, who would not be admissible to service proper!

(14) R. Johanan who considers this a proper service, requiring unblemished priests, how will he account for the contradictory fact that Scripture insists on two garments only.

(15) He explains that in reality four garments are required here, as may be inferred from the parallel passage in Lev. XVI, 4, where as a matter of course ‘mitre and girdle’ are added, the one passage supplementing implicates the other.

(16) He connects ‘middo’ which comes from a root meaning garment, with ‘madad’, which means to measure, i.e., the garment must be of proper measure, for the priest's figure. Resh Lakish infers from the fact that ‘middo’ (garment) is used instead of the usual ‘kethoneth’ (tunic) that a properly fitting garment is required.

(17) Zeb. 35a.

(18) Lev. XVI, 4: The text could have stated ‘He shall put on the holy tunic and the linen breeches on his flesh’. The word ‘yilbash’ (‘he shall put on’) is superfluous. The word ‘yilbash’ is a sort of terminus technicus for complete dress,

i.e., the four garments.

(19) [He utilizes yilbash, written here, for the purpose of a gezerah shawah with yilbash mentioned in connection with the four garments put on by the high priest on the Day of Atonement. V. Lev. XVI, 4 to teach this rule.]

(20) Included in the four garments worn by the high priest on the Day of Atonement.

(21) V. supra p. 55, n. 6. So that the ordinary priests could not wear the four garments of the high priests.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 24a

It includes worn-out garments.<sup>1</sup> And he shall leave them there,<sup>2</sup> that teaches that they must be hidden away. R. Dosa says: They are fit for use by a common priest. What does 'And he shall leave them there' intimate? That he [the high priest] must not use them on another Day of Atonement.<sup>3</sup> Now would you not say that this is the subject of their dispute: that one<sup>4</sup> holds it [the removal of the ashes] to be a service<sup>5</sup> and the other<sup>6</sup> does not consider it such?<sup>7</sup> — No. Everybody agrees it is a service; the point of dispute here is this: One says another scriptural passage is necessary<sup>8</sup> to include also for this service [the four garments]; the other: no such passage is necessary.<sup>9</sup>

R. Abin asked: How much of the ashes of the altar is to be removed? Shall we infer [the quantity] from the taking off of the tithes,<sup>10</sup> or from what was taken off from the [spoil of] Midian?<sup>11</sup> — Come and hear: For R. Hiyya taught: Here<sup>12</sup> the word 'herim' ['he shall take up'] is used and there<sup>13</sup> the expression 'we-herim' ['and he shall take up'] is used. Just as in the latter case it means taking a handful, so in the former case it means taking a handful.<sup>14</sup>

Rab said:<sup>15</sup> There are four services for the performance of which a non-priest [stranger] incurs penalty of death:<sup>16</sup> sprinkling, smoking [the fat],<sup>17</sup> the water libation, and the libation of wine. Levi says: also the removal of the ashes. Thus did Levi also teach us in his Baraitha: Also the removal of the ashes. What is the reason for Rab's view? It is written: And thou and thy sons with thee shall keep the priesthood in everything that pertaineth to the altar, and to that within the veil; and ye shall serve; I give you the priesthood as a service of gift; and the common man that draweth nigh shall be put to death.<sup>18</sup> 'A service of gift', but not a service of removal;<sup>19</sup> 'and you shall serve, i.e., a complete service, not a service followed by another.'<sup>20</sup> And Levi?<sup>21</sup> — The Divine Law included it<sup>22</sup> in saying: 'In every thing that pertaineth to the altar.' And Rab?<sup>23</sup> — That is meant to include the seven sprinklings within,<sup>24</sup> and those concerning the leper.<sup>25</sup>

And Levi?<sup>26</sup> — He infers [these] from [the fact that instead of] 'the thing', [is written] 'every thing', [that pertaineth]. And Rab?<sup>27</sup> — He does not infer aught from 'every thing'.<sup>28</sup> But say this: 'In everything that pertaineth to the altar' is a general proposition; 'service of gift' is a specification.<sup>29</sup> Now: if a general proposition is followed by a specification, the scope of the proposition is limited by the specification,<sup>30</sup> hence the 'service of gift' would be included, but a service of removal would be excluded? — The scriptural text reads:

---

(1) They may be worn for any service as long as they are wearable, i.e., whole.

(2) Lev. XVI, 23. With reference to the garments worn by the high priest on the Day of Atonement.

(3) This is the end of the Baraitha, 46a.

(4) R. Judah.

(5) And therefore it requires for it all the four garments.

(6) R. Dosa.

(7) And therefore holds that the linen tunic and breeches are sufficient without the mitre and girdle.

(8) Lest one assume that the verse is to be taken literally, that only two garments are required, hence that this is no service proper.

(9) Since Scripture insists on the tunic and breeches it is evidently considered a service, requiring all the four garments.

(10) Num. XVIII, 25, where about one per cent is taken off.

(11) Ibid. XXXI, 28-40, where it is but one-fifth of one per cent.

(12) Lev. VI, 3.

(13) Ibid. 8.

(14) [It is not inferred either from tithe or from the spoil of Midian, but from the handful taken by the priest. This however applies only to the minimum, which may however be exceeded at will (Rashi).]

(15) Zeb. 112b .

(16) Although the common man is forbidden to perform any service in the sanctuary, he does not incur the penalty of death in any but the following cases.

(17) Or 'the handful of the meal-offering'.

(18) Num. XVIII, 7.

(19) E.g., the removal of the ashes.

(20) The Hebrew word עבודת תמה is divided into עבודת תמה so as to read: perfect service, i.e., one complete, without additional functions such as the four services mentioned by Rab. This excludes a service such as slaughtering which is not complete without the rites connected with the sprinkling of the blood that follow it.

(21) Rab's inferences excluding the removal of the ashes seem to be right?

(22) The removal of the ashes for the performance of which a non-priest incurs penalty of death.

(23) Everything that pertaineth obviously includes something else. Unless some other service is intended, Levi proves his case.

(24) Lev. IV, 6: And sprinkle of the blood seven times before the Lord; *ibid.* 17. also *ibid.* XVI, 14.

(25) Lev. XIV, 51: And he shall take the cedar-wood . . . and sprinkle the house seven times, which may not be considered as part of 'the altar' service; the same applies to the functions referred to in the preceding note.

(26) Whence does he infer these?

(27) What does 'everything' suggest to him.

(28) Lit., 'he does not expound the thing' as everything'.

(29) Already comprehended in the general proposition.

(30) This is one of the principles of hermeneutics (*kelal u-ferat*) according to R. Ishmael, *v. Shebu.*, *Sonc. ed.*, p. 12, n. 9.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 24b

'And to that within the veil . . . and you shall serve',<sup>1</sup> [i.e.] Only within the veil is 'the service of gift'<sup>2</sup> [included] but not the 'service of removal away',<sup>3</sup> but outside [the Temple] even a 'service of removal'<sup>4</sup> [is included].<sup>5</sup> But [one could] similarly [argue with regard to the exposition of] 'you shall serve' only within the veil, is a complete service<sup>6</sup> [included] but not one service which is followed by another service,<sup>7</sup> but outside, even a service followed by another [is also included]?<sup>8</sup> — [Scripture, by saying] 'And ye shall serve' has reconnected them.<sup>9</sup>

Raba asked: What is the law regarding [a service of] removal within the Temple?<sup>10</sup> Do we compare it with [a service of removal] within<sup>11</sup> [the veil] or with [one] outside [the Temple]? Then he answered the question himself: It is to be compared to [a removal service] within [the veil]. [For Scripture instead of] 'within' [says:] 'And to that within [the veil]'.<sup>12</sup> But then<sup>13</sup> should the common man who arranged the [shewbread] table be guilty? — There is the arrangement of the censer of frankincense.<sup>14</sup> — Then if he arranges the censers let him incur the penalty!<sup>15</sup> — There is the removal of the censers<sup>16</sup> and the smoking of the incense. Let the common man who put the candlestick in order incur the penalty! — That is to be followed by the putting in of the wick. Then if he put the wick in let him incur that penalty! — There is the adding<sup>16</sup> of the oil. Then if he puts the oil in let him incur that penalty? There is the lighting.<sup>16</sup> Then if he lights it let him incur that penalty! — Lighting is not considered a service. Is it, indeed, not [considered a service]? But it has been taught:<sup>17</sup> And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar, and lay wood in order upon the fire<sup>18</sup> — this teaches that the kindling of the wood of the fig-tree<sup>19</sup> must be performed by a priest who is fit [for service] and with garments of ministration.<sup>20</sup> The kindling of the fig-wood is considered service, but not the lighting of the candlestick. Then let the common man who puts the pile of wood [on the altar] in order, incur that penalty! — There is the arrangement of the two logs of wood.<sup>21</sup> — Then if he arranged the two logs of wood, let him incur that penalty? — It is followed by

the arranging of the limbs.<sup>22</sup> But R. Assi had said in the name of R. Johanan: A common man who arranged the two logs of wood incurred the penalty of death? — In this indeed there is division of opinion,<sup>23</sup> one holding [the arrangement of the two logs of wood] is a complete service, the other holding that it is not a complete service.

There is a teaching in accord with Rab, and there is a teaching in accord with Levi. 'There is the teaching in accord with Rab': These are the services for the performance of which a common man incurs penalty of death: the sprinkling of the blood, both within [the Temple] and within the Holy of Holies: and he who sprinkles the blood of a bird offered as a sin-offering;<sup>24</sup> and he who wrings out the blood, and who smokes the bird offered up as a burnt-offering;<sup>25</sup> and he who makes the libation of three logs of water or of wine.<sup>26</sup> 'There is a teaching in accord with Levi': The services for the performance of which a common man incurs penalty of death are: the removal of the ashes, the seven sprinklings within [the Holy of Holies] and he who offers up on the altar a sacrifice whether fit or unfit. THERE WERE FOUR COUNTS etc.<sup>27</sup> Why do they decide by count? [You ask,] 'Why?' As we have explained. Rather: Why did they decide by count once and again?<sup>28</sup> — R. Johanan said: To stir up the whole Temple Court, as it is said: We took sweet counsel together, in the house of God we walked be-ragesh [with tumult].<sup>29</sup>

What garments do they wear when taking the count? R. Nahman said: Common garments, R. Shesheth said: Sacred garments. 'R. Nahman said: Common garments'. For if you were to say these garments were sacred there would be violent men who would serve by force.<sup>30</sup> 'R. Shesheth said: Sacred garments'. For if you were to say common garments, it would happen that, out of sheer love [of the service] they would perform it in common clothes.<sup>31</sup> R. Nahman said: On what ground do I hold my view? Because we have learnt: They delivered them to the Temple sextons, who stripped them of their garments and left them with their breeches only.<sup>32</sup>

- 
- (1) These words separate the general proposition from the specification, and thus sever the connection with them and render any inference as from one to the other invalid.
  - (2) [E.g., the sprinkling of the blood and the burning of incense in the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement, v. Lev. XVI, 13-14.]
  - (3) E.g., the taking out of the censer on the Day of Atonement from the Holy of Holies.
  - (4) [E.g., the removal of the ashes.]
  - (5) In the services for his performance of which a non-priest incurs the penalty of death.
  - (6) [E.g., the putting of incense on the fire in the Holy of Holies.]
  - (7) E.g., the bringing in of the spoon and the censer in the Holy of Holies which must be followed by the burning of the incense.
  - (8) E.g., the removal of the ashes.
  - (9) [The waw of עבדתם connects the general statement and particularization as far as the deduction made from the word itself is concerned, but it does not affect the exposition based as 'a service of gift' which is still governed by the words 'within the veil'.]
  - (10) E.g., the removal of the ashes of the golden altar and candlestick.
  - (11) 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 of death, or to service without, when he would incur it?
  - (12) The letter 'waw is superfluous. It includes also the Temple, hence in case of a gift service, he would incur that penalty there too, and with a removal service he would be exempt as within the veil.
  - (13) If a common man who performs in the Temple a Service of gift incurs the penalty of death.
  - (14) After the shewbread is arranged. V. Lev. XXIV, 7. Hence the former is not a complete service, for the performance of which a commoner incurs the penalty of death.
  - (15) Assuming this to be a 'complete' service, not followed by anything else.
  - (16) On the following Sabbath, which forms a completion of this service. V. ibid, 8.

- (17) Infra 45a.  
 (18) Lev. I, 7.  
 (19) Used as kindling wood on the altar, V. Tam. II, 4.  
 (20) Hence it is considered a proper service and the commoner performing it should incur the penalty.  
 (21) v. infra, 33a.  
 (22) Of the Daily continual offering.  
 (23) Between Rab who limits the liability to the four he enumerates and R. Johanan who includes the arrangement of the two logs of wood.  
 (24) V. Lev. V, 9.  
 (25) V. Ibid. I, 15.  
 (26) Suk. 48a.  
 (27) The text here is corrected in accordance with Bah.  
 (28) The Mishnah speaks of four counts.  
 (29) Ps. LV, 15. The word, **ברגש**, usually translated as 'multitude' is here connected with **רגש**, meaning 'to stir up', thus, 'enthusiasm', 'love'.  
 (30) Even without having been chosen by count, his being fitly dressed encouraging such forwardness.  
 (31) If the lot fell on them.  
 (32) Tam. V, 3.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 25a

Don't [you agree] that this refers to those who had obtained part in the day's services by the count?<sup>1</sup> — R. Shesheth said: No, it refers to those who had not obtained part in the day's service by the count.<sup>2</sup> Thus also does it appear provable by logic. For, if it were to refer to those who were allotted part in the service by count, how could it be stated that they left them the breeches only; surely it has been taught: Whence do we know that nothing may be put on before the breeches? To teach us that it says:<sup>3</sup> And breeches of linen shall be on his flesh.<sup>4</sup> — And the other?<sup>5</sup> — This is no difficulty: This is what it teaches: Whilst they still wore the common clothes, they put on the holy breeches, after that they removed the common clothes and left them with the [holy] breeches.

Said R. Shesheth: Whence do I hold my view? From what has been taught: The Cell of the Hewn Stone<sup>6</sup> was [built] in the style of a large basilica. The count took place in the eastern side, with the elder<sup>7</sup> sitting in the west, and the priests in the form of a spiral figure. The officer came and took the mitre from the head of one of them. One would know then that the count would start from him.<sup>8</sup> Now, if the thought should arise that the priests [came to the count] in common garment — is there a mitre in common dress? — Yes, there is, as Rab Judah or, as some say, R. Samuel b. Judah reported: A priest for whom his mother made a tunic, could officiate therein at an individual [not community] service.<sup>9</sup> Abaye said: We can infer from this the Cell of Hewn Stone was [situated] half on holy ground, half on non-holy ground; that the Cell had two doors, one opening on holy ground, the other opening on non — holy ground. For, if the thought should arise in you that the whole of it was on holy ground — how could the elder sit to the west; has not a Master<sup>10</sup> said: Nobody could sit in the Temple Court except the kings of the House of David.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, if you could think that the whole cell was outside holy ground, how could the count take place on its eastern side, is it not required: 'In the house of God we walked with the throng'<sup>12</sup> and this would not be [the house of God]! Hence [the inference is valid]: It is half on holy ground, half on non-holy ground. And if the thought should arise in you that the Cell has but one door opening on holy ground, how could the elder sit to the west, and we have learnt: If the cells are built on non-holy ground and open on holy ground the space within them is holy.<sup>13</sup> And if the thought should arise in you that it opened into unholy ground how could the count take place in the eastern part [of the Cell];<sup>14</sup> have we not learnt: If they are built on holy ground and open out on non-holy ground, their space within is non-holy, hence you must needs say: the Cell had two doors, one opening on holy ground, the other on non-holy ground.

MISHNAH. THE SECOND COUNT<sup>15</sup> WHO SHOULD SLAUGHTER [THE DAILY REGULAR OFFERING],<sup>16</sup> WHO SHOULD SPRINKLE THE BLOOD, WHO SHOULD REMOVE THE ASHES FROM THE INNER ALTAR,<sup>17</sup> WHO SHOULD REMOVE THE ASHES FROM THE CANDLESTICK,<sup>18</sup> WHO SHOULD TAKE UP TO THE RAMP THE LIMBS [OF THE OFFERING], THE HEAD AND THE [RIGHT]<sup>19</sup> HIND-LEG, THE TWO FORELEGS, THE TAIL AND THE [LEFT]<sup>19</sup> HIND-LEG, THE BREAST AND THE THROAT,<sup>20</sup> THE TWO FLANKS,<sup>21</sup> THE INWARDS, FINE FLOUR,<sup>22</sup> THE CAKES<sup>23</sup> AND THE WINE.<sup>24</sup> ALTOGETHER THIRTEEN PRIESTS OBTAINED A TASK.<sup>25</sup> BEN AZZAI SAID BEFORE R. AKIBA IN THE NAME OF JOSHUA: IT [THE DAILY OFFERING] WAS OFFERED UP IN THE WAY IT WALKS.<sup>26</sup>

GEMARA. The question was asked: When they take the count, do they do so for one service or for each individual task? — Come and hear: Four counts were there.<sup>27</sup> Now if the thought should arise in you that there was a separate count for each task, there would be need of many counts! — R. Nahman b. Isaac said: This is what [the Mishnah] means: Four times they went in for counting, and on each occasion there were many counts.

---

(1) And they were stripped of the common garments which they wore during the count.

(2) They were stripped of the sacred garments which they wore during the count.

(3) V. supra 23b.

(4) Lev. XVI, 4.

(5) R. Nahman.

(6) [The Hall wherein the great Sanhedrin used to sit. Schurer II, p. 264 identifies it with the chamber 'close to the xystus' on the western border of the Temple mount. For the refutation of this view, V. Krauss. J.E. XII, 576.]

(7) Of the Beth din supervising the count (Rashi).

(8) Tosef. Suk. IV, 6.

(9) V. infra 35b.

(10) Infra 69b.

(11) In Deut. XVIII, 5: The Lord hath chosen him out of all thy tribes to stand to minister in the name of the Lord, against which II Sam. VII, 18: Then David the king went in and sat before the Lord.

(12) And this enthusiasm, as explained before, was created by the count.

(13) Ma'as Sh. III, 8.

(14) The count had to take place on holy ground.

(15) V. Mishnah, supra 22a.

(16) The priest with whom the count ended slaughtered the daily regular sacrifice. His right hand neighbour had the next task, his neighbour's right hand neighbour the third, etc.

(17) On the inner altar, every morning and evening, the incense was offered. The glowing coals for that purpose were obtained from the outer altar. The ashes which remained were removed next day. They could be removed by a common priest even on the Day of Atonement.

(18) This too could be performed by any common priest, the high priest had but to do the lighting of the lamps.

(19) The right hindleg. V. Tamid IV, 3.

(20) Larynx with windpipe, lungs and heart.

(21) With milt and liver.

(22) For the meal-offering which accompanied the daily regular sacrifice. Num. XXVIII, 5.

(23) Made on the **מַחֲבֵט** (pan). V. Men.96a. It was the daily sacrifice of the high priest which accompanied the daily regular sacrifice. Lev. VI, 13; Shek. VII, 6.

(24) Num. XXVIII, 7.

(25) Two, that of slaughtering and sprinkling; two, clearing the golden altar and the candlestick; six, taking up the limbs and inwards, three, taking up the flour and wine-offerings.

(26) Lit., 'according to the manner of its gait', i.e., in order of the parts of the body active in the movements; first head and right hind-leg, then breast and neck, then the two fore-legs, then the two flanks, the tail and the left hind-leg.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 25b

Come and hear: R. Judah said: There was no count for the coal-pan, but the priest who had obtained the task of [smoking] the incense said to his assistant: Obtain with me the privilege of serving the coal-pan.<sup>1</sup> — It is different with incense and coal-pan, because they form together one service. Some argue thus: This is the case only with coal-pan and incense, because they form one service, but all other tasks require individual count!<sup>2</sup> — [No.] With regard to the coal-pan it is necessary to inform us [that no separate count is required] for the thought could have arisen that because it takes place rarely and enriches,<sup>3</sup> therefore a special count should be arranged for it, hence we are taught [that it is not so].

Come and hear: R. Hiyya taught: There was no count for each individual task, the priest who secured the task of [the killing of] the daily burnt-offering drew twelve priests to himself [for the tasks involved]. This proves it.

THE SECOND COUNT: The question was asked: Who receives the blood?<sup>4</sup> [Do we say that] he who killed? For if you were to say that the one who sprinkles the blood receives it, perhaps in his enthusiasm<sup>5</sup> he may not receive the whole blood; or does the sprinkler receive it, for if you were to say that he who kills the animal receives the blood, occasionally a non-priest kills [the animal]?<sup>6</sup> — Come and hear: Ben Katin made twelve spigots for the laver so that his twelve brethren, the priests, who are occupied with the daily regular sacrifice, may simultaneously wash their hands and feet.<sup>7</sup> Now, if you were to think that he who kills [the animal] also receives its blood there would be thirteen.<sup>8</sup> Must we not therefore infer therefrom that he who sprinkles receives the blood? This proves it.

R. Aha, the son of Raba said to R. Ashi: We have also learnt thus: He whose lot it was to slaughter it, slaughtered it; he whose lot it was to receive the blood, received it — and then he came to sprinkle it.<sup>9</sup> This proves it.

BEN 'AZZAI SAID BEFORE R. AKIBA, etc.: Our Rabbis taught: What is 'THE WAY OF ITS WALKING'? The head, right hind-leg, breast and neck, the two fore-legs, the two flanks, the tail and the left hind-leg. R. Jose says: It was offered up in the order in which it is flayed. Which is the order of its being flayed? The head, the right hind-leg, the tail, the left hind-leg, the two flanks, the two fore-legs, the breast, and the neck. R. Akiba says: It was offered up in the order in which it was dissected. Which is the order of the dissection? The head, the right hind-leg, the two forelegs, the breast and the neck, the two flanks, the tail and the left hind-leg. R. Jose the Galilean says: It was offered up in the order of its best parts. Which is the order of its best parts? The head, the [right] hind-leg, the breast and neck, the two flanks, the tail and the [left] hind-leg and the two fore-legs. But is it not written: Even every good piece, the thigh and the shoulder?<sup>10</sup> — That refers to a lean animal:<sup>11</sup> Raba said: Both our Tanna<sup>12</sup> and R. Jose the Galilean follow the order of quality of the meat, but one takes into consideration the size [of the limbs], the other the fatness.

Why does the head go together with the [right] hind-leg?<sup>13</sup> Because the head has many bones; one attaches the [meaty] hindleg to it.

All<sup>14</sup> agree at any rate that the head is offered up first. Whence do we derive this rule? Because it has been taught: Whence do we know that the head and the suet come before all other parts [of the animal]? To teach us that, it says: He shall lay it in order with its head and its suet.<sup>15</sup> And as to the other 'suet',<sup>16</sup>

---

- (1) The incense required two priests: one who carried the incense into the Temple and smoked it, the other who took out the coals from the outer altar, brought them into the Temple, and put them on the inner altar to smoke the incense upon them. V. infra 26a. From here it appears that not every task required a count.
- (2) Which proves that every task requires a count.
- (3) V. infra 26a.
- (4) In a basin for sprinkling purposes.
- (5) Lit., 'his love (for the service)'.  
 (6) As deduced from Lev. I, 5; a non-priest may kill the animal, as the priestly functions in connection with an animal-sacrifice begin with the receiving of the blood.
- (7) Infra 37a.
- (8) There were thirteen tasks according to the Mishnah. The slaughtering, however, since even a commoner might perform it, did not require washing of hands and feet even if performed by a priest. But if he who slaughtered it should also receive its blood, he would have to wash his hands too because of the subsequent receiving of the blood.
- (9) Tamid IV, 1.
- (10) Ezek. XXIV, 4. [This shows that the thigh (the hind-leg) and the shoulder (the foreleg) are among the best pieces whereas here they are mentioned last (תום ישנים); v. however p. 119, n. 2.]
- (11) [The verse speaks of the wicked in Israel who plunder the poor and consume the good pieces of their animals which at best could only be lean, whereas the daily sacrifices were offered from the best, Ibid.]
- (12) The Tanna of our Mishnah.
- (13) [Var. lec. transfer here both the question from Ezek. XXIV, 4 and the answer that follows. In this reading these refer to 'our Tanna' who mentions 'the fore-legs' before the hind-legs whereas in Ezekiel the thigh (hind-leg) is given preference, v. Bah.]
- (14) Ben 'Azzai, R. Jose, R. Akiba, R. Jose the Galilean, whilst basing their order on different considerations, all have the head offered up first.
- (15) Lev. I, 12. Infra 26a.
- (16) Ibid. I, 8: The pieces, and the head, and the suet. It was included in the other pieces.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 26a

what does it signify? [It has its meaning] in accordance with what has been taught: How did he do it? He placed the suet upon the open throat and offered it up thus, that being done as a sign of respect for heaven.<sup>1</sup>

MISHNAH. THE THIRD COUNT: NOVICES<sup>2</sup> COME UP AND SUBMIT TO THE COUNT FOR THE INCENSE. THE FOURTH COUNT: NOVICES AND OLD PRIESTS, WHO WILL TAKE UP THE LIMBS<sup>3</sup> FROM THE RAMP TO THE ALTAR.

GEMARA. A Tanna taught: Never did a man repeat that,<sup>4</sup> What is the reason? — Because it enriches. R. Papa said to Abaye: Why [does the incense enrich]? Would one say because Scripture says: They shall put incense before Thee,<sup>5</sup> and soon after: Bless, Lord, his substance?<sup>6</sup> If so, then a burnt-offering should also enrich, for there it is written also: And whole burnt-offering upon Thine altar?<sup>7</sup> He answered: The second is frequent,<sup>8</sup> the first not. Raba said: You will not find any rabbinical scholar giving decision who is not a descendant from the tribe of Levi or Issachar. 'Of Levi', as it is written: They shall teach Jacob Thine ordinances,<sup>5</sup> 'of Issachar', as it is written: And of the children of Issachar, men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do.<sup>9</sup> But mention Judah too, for it is written: Judah is my law-giver?<sup>10</sup> — I am speaking [only] of those [who make conclusions] in accordance with the adopted practice.<sup>11</sup>

R. Johanan said: No count is arranged for the daily continual evening<sup>12</sup> sacrifice, but the priest who secured the task of offering the continual morning sacrifice also obtains the task of the evening sacrifice. An objection was raised: Just as one arranges a count for it in the morning so is a count arranged for it in the evening? — That was taught in application to the incense.<sup>13</sup> — But it has been

taught: Just as one arranges a count for it<sup>14</sup> [masc.], in the morning, so does one arrange for it, a count in the evening. Read:<sup>15</sup> for it [fem. ] — But it has been taught: Just as one arranges a count for it [masc.] in the morning, so is a count arranged for it [masc.] in the evening, and just as one arranges a count for it [fem.] in the morning, so is a count arranged for it<sup>16</sup> [fem.] in the evening! — R. Samuel b. Isaac said: Here we refer to the Sabbath, on which the divisions of the priests are relieved.<sup>17</sup> But on the original assumption<sup>18</sup> there was a larger number of counts? — All came in the morning [for the count]; to some it was allotted for the morning to others, for the evening.

**THE FOURTH COUNT: NOVICES AND OLDER PRIESTS etc.:** Our Mishnah does not agree with the view of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for we have learnt: He who brings the limbs up to the ramp also brings them up to the altar.<sup>19</sup> What principle are they disputing? One holds: In the multitude of the people is the king's glory,<sup>20</sup> whereas the other is of the opinion that [the distribution of duties among too many] is not good form in the abode of the Shechinah.<sup>21</sup> Raba said: R. Eliezer b. Jacob does not agree with the view of R. Judah, nor does the latter agree with the view of the former, for, if that were the case there would be too few counts.<sup>22</sup> And if you find a teacher who teaches 'five [counts]',

---

(1) Because the throat is smeared with blood, it would not look respectful enough to offer it up in such condition. Hul. 27b.

(2) Nothing was more desired than the privilege of offering up incense. Hence priests who had already enjoyed that function were excluded from repetition until all their colleagues had the same task bestowed upon them. Hence the officer calls on novices to present themselves for the count.

(3) The limbs of the sacrifice were first placed on the lower part of the ramp, after having been dissected, (Tamid IV, 1, 2) then later carried thence to the altar and burnt there.

(4) The offering up of incense.

(5) Deut. XXXIII, 10.

(6) Ibid. 11.

(7) Ibid. 10.

(8) Sacrifices may be either private or public, hence very frequent. Incense was a community offering, hence limited by law.

(9) I Chron. XII, 33.

(10) E.V. 'sceptre'.

(11) i.e. of practical interpreters and scholars, not of law-makers.

(12) Strictly speaking 'afternoon'.

(13) Because nobody was permitted to repeat that function until all candidates had that privilege bestowed upon them once.

(14) Ketoreth (incense) is of fem. gender, hence the question asked from a text where the word 'lo' (masculine 'for him', 'to his') is used.

(15) Assume that the personal pronoun may be used loosely, or that the text misreported. 'lah' ('to her', 'to it', fem. instead of 'lo', the masculine) being intended.

(16) So that there is a special text for the incense.

(17) The division (Mishmar, v. Glos.) officiating at the continual offering of morning had left by the time the continual offering of dusk was to be attended to.

(18) That there was a special count for the evening sacrifice.

(19) Tamid V, 2.

(20) Prov. XIV, 28.

(21) It might appear as if the service was considered a burden, so that its function had to be distributed among many.

(22) R. Judah omits the count for the coal-pan; according to R. Eliezer there was no special count for the service of carrying the limbs up to the altar, hence, had both accepted each other's view, there would be only three counts. He who taught there were five counts, contradicted both of these Tannaim, each of whom omitted one, though not the same count.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 26b

he is in accord with neither R. Eliezer b. Jacob, nor with R. Judah.

MISHNAH. THE CONTInual<sup>1</sup> OFFERING WAS OFFERED UP BY NINE, TEN, ELEVEN OR TWELVE [PRIESTS], NEITHER BY MORE [THAN TWELVE], NOR BY LESS [THAN NINE]. HOW THAT? [THE OFFERING] ITSELF [WAS BROUGHT] UP BY NINE;<sup>2</sup> AT THE FEAST [OF SUKKOTH] WHEN ONE CARRIED A BOTTLE OF WATER,<sup>3</sup> THERE WERE TEN. AT DUSK<sup>4</sup> BY ELEVEN: [THE OFFERING] ITSELF BY NINE AND TWO MEN WHO CARRIED TWO LOGS<sup>5</sup> OF WOOD. ON THE SABBATH BY ELEVEN: [THE OFFERING] ITSELF BY NINE WITH TWO MEN HOLDING IN THEIR HAND THE TWO CENSERS OF FRANKINCENSE FOR THE SHEWBREAD.<sup>6</sup> AND ON THE SABBATH WHICH FELL DURING THE FEAST OF SUKKOTH ONE MAN CARRIED IN HIS HAND A BOTTLE OF WATER.

GEMARA. R. Abba, or as some say Rami b. Hama or again as some say R. Johanan, said:<sup>7</sup> The water libation on the Feast of Sukkoth is offered up only at the continual sacrifice of the morning. Whence is this to be inferred? Because [the Mishnah] teaches: AND ON THE SABBATH WHICH FELL DURING THE FEAST OF SUKKOTH ONE MAN CARRIED IN HIS HAND A BOTTLE OF WATER. Now if the thought could arise in you that [also] at the continual offering at dusk is the water of libation offered up,<sup>8</sup> then it would also happen during the weekday.<sup>9</sup> R. Ashi said: We also have learned thus:<sup>10</sup> One said to the priest offering the libation: Hold your hands up! For it happened once that he poured it upon his feet and all the people stoned him with their citrons.<sup>11</sup> This proves it. It was taught: R. Simeon b. Yohai said: Whence do we know that at the continual offering of dusk two logs of wood were to be brought up by two priests? Because it is said: And [the sons of Aaron the priest shall] lay wood in order upon the fire.<sup>12</sup> If it has no bearing on the morning sacrifice because it is written: And the priest shall kindle wood on it every morning, and he shall lay the burnt-offering in order upon it,<sup>13</sup> make it bear on the dusk sacrifice! — But perhaps, say: Both refer to the morning sacrifice, the Divine Law enjoining: Do it! And do it! again.<sup>14</sup> — If that [were intended] the Divine Law should have said: ‘And he shall kindle wood.’ ‘And he shall kindle wood.’<sup>15</sup> But if the Divine Law had stated: ‘And he shall kindle [wood]’ I would have assumed it may be done by one only, not by two, therefore we are taught that both one and two shall do so?<sup>16</sup> — If that were intended the Divine Law should have stated: ‘He shall kindle [wood]’<sup>17</sup> . . . and ‘they shall kindle wood,’ or ‘He shall lay [wood] in order’ and ‘they shall lay [wood] in order.’<sup>18</sup> Why the words ‘He shall kindle’ and ‘They shall lay in order’?<sup>19</sup> That we infer from it as we have said above.

R. Hiyya taught: The [second] count at times [affects] thirteen<sup>20</sup> priests, at times fourteen,<sup>21</sup> fifteen, or sixteen. But has it not been taught: [At times] seventeen?<sup>22</sup> — That teaching is in accord not with R. Eliezer b. Jacob, but with R. Judah.<sup>23</sup> M I S H N A H. A RAM WAS OFFERED BY ELEVEN: THE FLESH BY FIVE, THE INWARDS,<sup>24</sup> THE FINE FLOUR,<sup>25</sup> AND THE WINE BY TWO EACH. A BULLOCK WAS OFFERED BY TWENTY-FOUR: THE HEAD AND [RIGHT] HIND-LEG<sup>26</sup> — THE HEAD BY ONE AND THE [RIGHT] HIND-LEG BY TWO [PRIESTS]. THE TAIL AND [LEFT] HIND-LEG — THE TAIL BY TWO AND THE [LEFT] HIND-LEG BY TWO. THE BREAST AND NECK — THE BREAST BY ONE AND THE NECK BY THREE. THE TWO FORE-LEGS BY TWO, THE TWO FLANKS BY TWO. THE INWARDS, THE FINE FLOUR,<sup>27</sup> AND THE WINE<sup>28</sup> BY THREE EACH. THIS APPLIES ONLY TO OFFERINGS OF THE COMMUNITY. IN PRIVATE OFFERINGS, HOWEVER, IF A SINGLE PRIEST<sup>29</sup> WANTS TO OFFER [ALL], HE MAY DO SO. BUT AS TO THE FLAYING AND DISMEMBERING OF BOTH COMMUNAL, AND PRIVATE OFFERINGS THE SAME REGULATIONS APPLY.<sup>30</sup> GEMARA. A Tanna taught: The law regarding the flaying and the dismembering is alike in both [communal and private sacrifices] in that they may be done by a non-priest. Hezekiah said: Whence do we know that the law regarding flaying and dismembering is alike [with all sacrifices] in that they may be done by a non-priest? Because it is written: And the sons of Aaron the high priest shall put

fire upon the altar,<sup>31</sup> i.e., priesthood is required for the putting of the fire upon the altar, but not for the flaying and dismembering.

---

(1) Beginning with the taking up of the limbs to the ramp.

(2) In the same manner in which the parts of the sacrificial animal were brought up to the ramp, so were they thence carried to the altar, thus six priests were required to carry the lamb's parts, and three to convey the flour and wine-offerings to the altar.

(3) For the water libation, v. Suk. 48a.

(4) Strictly speaking 'in the afternoon'.

(5) They were added to the pile of wood on the altar.

(6) Lev. XXIV, 7-8: And thou shalt put pure frankincense with each row, that it may be to the bread for a memorial-part, even all offering made by the fire unto the Lord. Every Sabbath day he shall set it before the Lord continually, it is from the children of Israel, an everlasting covenant.

(7) The report came in the name of these three, without preponderance of evidence as to the real author.

(8) The Mishnah states that only on the Sabbath of the Feast of Sukkoth was the continual offering offered up by twelve priests. But if the water libation were offered up in connection with the continual dusk offering too, twelve priests would then too be necessary: nine for the lamb itself, two for the logs of wood, one for the bottle of water.

(9) So that on a week-day too, twelve priests would be required for the offering, which contradicts the Mishnah.

(10) V. Suk. 48b.

(11) The Sadducees rejected the water libation, hence, when in charge, they would invalidate the ceremony. The people observant of such sabotage, punished the hypocrite by pelting him with their citrons (ethrog). But these citrons were used only at the morning prayer. The Mishnah in Sukkoth mentions the citrons to indicate that the libation of the water took place only at the time citrons were part of the service, i.e., in the morning. The first proof was textual, the second factual.

(12) Lev. I, 7.

(13) Ibid. VI, 5.

(14) Hence there would be no repetition and the inference as to the dusk sacrifice would be invalid.

(15) In both instances why the change of expression? That has definite significance.

(16) The double form, singular and plural, was thus necessary.

(17) For the water libation, v. Suk. 48a.

(18) In the same manner in which the parts of the sacrificial animal were brought up to the ramp, so were they thence carried to the altar, thus six priests were required to carry the lamb's parts, and three to convey the flour and wine-offerings, to the altar.

(19) But what it is meant to convey, could have been conveyed without change of phrase.

(20) V. Mishnah supra 25a.

(21) On the Sukkoth Festival; on the Sabbath; and on the Sabbath of the Sukkoth Festival, respectively.

(22) [On Sabbath of Sukkoth, cf. Rashi and MS. M. Tosaf. however refers this to ordinary days omitting the words 'at times'. The number 17 can only be arrived at by adding to the 13 priests an additional four: (1) for removal of ashes; (2) for bringing up the limbs from the ramp to the altar; (3) for smoking the incense; (4) for bringing the coal-pan. This would not be in accordance with R. Eliezer b. Jacob; v. R. Hananel's reacting in next note.]

(23) Who as stated supra 26a requests an extra priest for carrying the limbs from the ramp to the altar. Rabbenu Hananel (v. p. 123, n. 11) reads: Neither with R. Eliezer b. Jacob, nor with R. Judah. For R. Judah holds there was  
no count for the coal-pan, the priest

who had secured the task of the incense inviting his assistant to share the function of the coal-pan. Nor with R. Eliezer b. Jacob, who omits the count of the function of the limbs being brought to the altar from the ramp; according to him the priest who carried them up to the ramp, also brought them thence to the altar. V. Rashi, Tosaf. and **סוֹת יְשָׁנִים** .

(24) The lamb for the continual offering must not be older than one year. The ram could be between one and two years of age, hence its inwards were much heavier.

(25) The wine-offering with the ram was heavier by one fourth, the flour-offering was twice as heavy as that of the lamb.

(26) Lit., 'as far as head and hind-leg are concerned', which usually were offered by one person here etc.

(27) Num. XV, 9.

(28) Ibid. 10.

(29) Of the division ministering that week, whom the owner of the sacrifice entrusted with the task.

(30) Non-priests, too, might either flay or dissect the sacrifices. Hence there were no counts for them. The sacrifices of the community, however, although even they could be slaughtered by non-priests, were welcome to, and sought after by priests, whence the necessity of a count in connection with them.

(31) Lev. I, 7.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 27a

But that passage is required for its own information?<sup>1</sup> — R. Shimi b. Ashi said: I found Abaye explaining it to his son: [It was taught]: ‘One shall kill,’<sup>2</sup> hence we infer that even a non-priest may kill [the sacrificial animal]. But whence are you coming?<sup>3</sup> — Because Scripture says: And thou and thy sons with thee shall keep your priesthood, [in everything that pertaineth to the altar].<sup>4</sup> I might have learned that even the killing [must be done by priests alone], therefore it is written: And he shall kill the bullock before the Lord,<sup>5</sup> and Aaron's sons, the priests, shall present the blood,<sup>5</sup> i.e., the work of the priesthood is commanded only from the receiving [‘presenting’] of the blood and so on.<sup>6</sup> And he shall lay his hand . . . and he shall kill,<sup>7</sup> hence we are taught that the killing [of the sacrificial animal] is permissible even to a non-priest. Now, [Abaye went on explaining to his son] since the work obligatory on the priests starts only with the receiving of the blood, what is the purpose of: And the sons of Aaron . . . shall put the fire?<sup>8</sup> To exclude flaying and dismembering.<sup>9</sup> But still that was necessary. For one might have thought since [the putting on of the fire] is not a kind of service, the omission of which prevents atonement, it did not require priesthood, hence we are taught [from this passage] that it requires priesthood? — Rather do we infer it from here: And Aaron's sons, the priests, shall lay it, order the pieces, and the head, and the suet.<sup>10</sup> Now, since the work obligatory upon priests starts with the receiving of the blood, why was the passage: ‘And they shall lay in order’ [etc.] necessary? It meant to exclude the flaying and the dismemberment.<sup>11</sup> But say perhaps that it means to exclude the arranging of the two logs of wood? — It seems logical that the passage excludes [a service relating to the sacrifice itself] which is of the type referred to. On the contrary: [it seems logical that] it excludes the ‘putting in order’ of [wood], which is analogous [to the ‘laying in order’ of the pieces referred to].<sup>12</sup> This thought should not arise in your mind, for a Master taught: ‘And the priest shall offer the whole . . . upon the altar.’ This refers to the bringing up of the limbs to the ramp. Now only the bringing of the limbs to the ramp requires a priest, but not the bringing of the logs of wood, implying that the putting in order of the two logs of wood requires a priest.<sup>13</sup> Why, then, is it necessary to state ‘And they [the priests] shall lay [the pieces] in order’? to exclude flaying and dismembering.<sup>14</sup> But say, perhaps, that this text is necessary for its own meaning?<sup>15</sup> --[In reality so.] What then is the purpose of [the passage], ‘And the priest shall make the whole smoke upon the altar’?<sup>16</sup> To exclude flaying and dismembering. [So that] ‘And the priest shall offer the whole’ refers to the bringing up of the limbs to the ramp; only the bringing up of the limbs to the ramp requires a priest, but not the bringing of the two logs of wood to the ramp. Implying that the putting in order of the two logs of wood that does require the services of a priest and the words: ‘And they shall put’<sup>17</sup> have immediate text meaning;<sup>18</sup> the words ‘And they shall lay in order [the pieces]’<sup>19</sup> indicate it must be two; the words: ‘The sons of Aaron’<sup>19</sup> also indicate two; the words: ‘The priests’<sup>19</sup> also indicate two, together we learn from them that the [offering up of the] lamb requires the services of six priests. R. Hamnuna said: To R. Eleazar it seems difficult, for this passage<sup>19</sup> refers to the young bullock, the service in connection with which required twenty-four priests! But he found it right again, for Scripture says: Upon the wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar<sup>19</sup>; now what thing is it in connection with which ‘wood’, ‘fire’ and ‘altar’ are mentioned?

---

(1) That a priest is required for the putting on of the fire. An inference for other matter is justified only when the text itself, or part of it, appears superfluous.

(2) ‘We-shahat’ Lev. I, 5, may mean ‘and he shall kill’, the most obvious meaning in the context; or ‘one shall kill’, ‘one’ being a term general enough to include a commoner.

(3) On what are you basing your argument, that it is necessary to bring proof that a non-priest may kill the animal; what

basis is there for the assumption that he may not do so?

(4) Num. XVIII, 7. The bracketed portion is interpolated by Bah. and rightly so, for upon it rests the argument.

(5) Lev. I, 5.

(6) [Since the priests are mentioned only in connection with the presenting of the blood and not with the killing.]

(7) Ibid. 4,5. ['He shall kill' has for the subject the same person as 'he shall lay his hand' — the owner of the sacrifice (a non-priest).]

(8) Since the putting on of the fire followed the presenting of the blood, the latter signifying the commencement of the priestly function, why was it necessary to mention that the 'Sons of Aaron' perform it?

(9) That these may be performed by non-priests.

(10) Lev. I, 8.

(11) I.e., flaying and dismembering.

(12) That the putting on of the two logs of wood did not require a priest.

(13) Since the fetching of the wood is especially stated to need no priest, the inference is — obvious that the putting in order of the two logs requires a priest's service.

(14) [V. supra, note 2. The passage that follows up, ' . . . text meaning' is difficult and is omitted by Wilna Gaon. The interpretation attempted here involves no change in the text of cur. edd.]

(15) [To show that the arrangement of the pieces required a priest, as it might have been assumed that 'even a non-priest may perform it since it is not a service' indispensable for effecting an atonement.]

(16) Lev. I, 9.

(17) Ibid. 7.

(18) That a priest is required for putting on the fire, v. supra p. 126.

(19) Lev. I, 8.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 27b**

Say it is the lamb.<sup>1</sup>

R. Assi said in the name of R. Johanan: A non-priest who laid the pile of wood in order [on the altar] incurs the penalty [of death]. What should he do [post facto]? — Let him break it up and then put it in order again. What is the good of that? — Rather: Let the non-priest break it up again and let a priest put it in order afterwards. R. Ze'ira demurred to this: But is there not a service which may be performed also at night and which a non-priest would render invalid? Surely, there is the smoking of the limbs and the fat-pieces.<sup>2</sup> That is but the conclusion of the service of the day. But there is the removing of the ashes? That is the beginning of the work of the day, as R. Assi has reported in the name of R. Johanan: If he has sanctified his hands [by washing] in the morning for the removal of the ashes, he need not sanctify [them] on the morrow, for he has already sanctified them from the beginning of the service.<sup>3</sup> But the difficulty remains!<sup>4</sup> If this statement was made, it was stated thus: R. Assi said in the name of R. Johanan: A non-priest who laid the two logs of wood in order incurs the penalty [of death] because this is a day service. Raba demurred to this: If so, a count should be required for it! — It escaped him what had been taught: He who secured the task of clearing the ashes off the altar, [thereby also] secured the task of putting in order the pile of wood and the two logs of wood.<sup>3</sup> Shall we, then, say that only service performed during the day requires the count but service performed during the night does not require the count? Surely there is the [smoking of the] members and the fat-pieces?<sup>5</sup> — That is the end of the service of the day. But there is the removal of the ashes? — That is due to a certain event.<sup>6</sup> Shall we say that only for service performed during the day and for participation in which a non-priest incurs the penalty of death, a count is required, but that wherever a non-priest does not incur penalty of death for performance of a service, no count is required? But then what of the killing [of the animal]?<sup>7</sup> — It is different with the killing because that is the beginning of the service.

Mar Zutra or R. Ashi said: But we have learned otherwise: The officer said to them: Go forth and see if the time for the killing [of the continual morning sacrifice] has arrived,<sup>8</sup> but he is not teaching

about the laying in order of the two logs of wood?<sup>9</sup> It speaks only of such things as cannot be remedied<sup>10</sup> again, but not such for which there is a remedy.<sup>11</sup> Some say<sup>12</sup> this is what R. Ze'ira asked: Is there any service followed by another service, which would be invalidated if performed by a non-priest?<sup>13</sup>

---

(1) The passage 'Upon the wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar' is superfluous, for v. 7 contains that information already, hence the inference is right that the six priests are suggested here.

(2) V. supra 24a.

(3) V. supra 22a.

(4) Where do we find a service which may be performed at night and which a non-priest renders invalid?

(5) For which a count has been arranged.

(6) Mentioned in Mishnah supra.

(7) Which may be performed by a non-priest and yet requires a count.

(8) Infra 28a.

(9) Hence it took place during the night.

(10) The continual morning offering must not be offered before daybreak; de facto it was invalid, had to be replaced by another and be burnt in a place far from the altar like any invalidated sacrifice.

(11) 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.

(12) [The text from this point to the end of the chapter is in disorder, consisting, according to Rashi and others, of several interpolations. The interpretation that follows is that of Tosaf. on the basis of curr. edd.]

(13) [R. Ze'ira's question has reference to R. Johanan's ruling, that a non-priest who arranges the wood pile on the altar is liable to death. Against this R. Ze'ira raises the objection that since it is followed by another service, i.e., the arranging of the two logs of wood, a non-priest should incur no penalty nor invalidate it by his performance of it. V. Tosaf. s.v. **אֵיכָא**.]

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 28a

Surely there is [the smoking of] the limbs and fat-pieces?<sup>1</sup> — That is the end of the service of the day.<sup>2</sup> But what of the removal of the ashes?<sup>3</sup> — It is the beginning of the service of the day,<sup>4</sup> for R. Johanan said: If he sanctified his hands by washing for the removal of the ashes, in the morning he need not sanctify [his hands] since he had already sanctified them at the beginning of the service. If so the difficulty<sup>5</sup> remains? — Rather if this statement was made it was made thus: R. Assi said in the name of R. Johanan: If a non-priest arranged in order two logs of wood [on the altar] he incurs the penalty of death, because it is a complete service.<sup>6</sup> To this Raba demurred: If this is so let it require a count. But it requires no count? Surely it was taught, He who secures the privilege in respect of the removal of the ashes, secures also the privilege in respect of the arranging of the two logs of wood? This is what he means. It should have a separate count for itself? The [reason is] as we have already stated.

Are we to say that for a service which is complete, and for the performance of which a non-priest incurs the penalty of death, a count is required, but for one, for performance of which a non-priest does not incur such penalty, no count is required — but there is the killing [of the sacrificial animal]? — It is different with that killing, because it is the beginning of the service of the day. Shall we say that only a complete service requires the count, but a service followed by another does not require it — but there is the smoking of the members and the fat-pieces? — That is the end of the service of the day. — But there is the removal of the ashes? — Here [the count is due] because of what happened.

Mar Zutra or R. Ashi said: We too have learnt thus:<sup>7</sup> The officer said to them: GO FORTH AND SET WHETHER THE TIME FOR THE KILLING OF THE MORNING SACRIFICE HAS ARRIVED. But he does not teach anything about the time for the laying in order of the two logs of

wood?<sup>8</sup> — He teaches only concerning such things as cannot be remedied again, but not concerning such for which there is a remedy.<sup>9</sup>

### CHAPTER III

MISHNAH. THE<sup>10</sup> OFFICER SAID TO THEM: GO FORTH AND SEE WHETHER THE TIME FOR KILLING [OF THE MORNING SACRIFICE] HAS ARRIVED. IF IT HAD ARRIVED THEN HE WHO SAW IT SAID: IT IS DAYLIGHT!<sup>11</sup> MATHIA B. SAMUEL SAID: THE WHOLE EAST IS ALIGHT.<sup>12</sup> EVEN UNTO HEBRON?<sup>13</sup> AND HE ANSWERED ‘YES’. AND WHY WAS THAT [CONSIDERED] NECESSARY? BECAUSE ONCE WHEN THE LIGHT OF THE MOON<sup>14</sup> ROSE THEY THOUGHT THAT THE EAST WAS ALIGHT<sup>15</sup> AND SLAUGHTERED THE CONTINUAL OFFERING, WHICH AFTERWARDS THEY HAD TO TAKE AWAY INTO THE PLACE OF BURNING.<sup>16</sup>

THE HIGH PRIEST<sup>17</sup> WAS LED DOWN TO THE PLACE OF IMMERSION. THIS WAS THE RULE IN THE TEMPLE: WHOSOEVER CROSSED HIS FEET<sup>18</sup> REQUIRED AN IMMERSION, AND WHOSOEVER MADE WATER REQUIRED SANCTIFICATION BY WASHING<sup>19</sup> HIS HANDS AND FEET.

### GEMARA.

- 
- (1) [This service, it is now assumed, receives its completion only with the removal of the ashes, and yet must not be performed by a non-priest under the penalty of death (Tosaf.).]
- (2) [The original assumption n. 3. is rejected. The smoking of the limbs is in itself regarded as the completion of the day service (Tosaf.).]
- (3) [Which must be followed by the taking of the ashes outside the camp, v. Lev. VI, 4' and yet is considered a complete service, v. supra 24a (Tosaf.).]
- (4) [Whereas the taking of the ashes outside the camp is not performed daily (v. Tamid II, 2) and consequently it cannot be regarded as completing the removal of the ashes (Tosaf.).]
- (5) Of R. Ze'ira.
- (6) [V. supra 22a. For the reason that no special count has been arranged for the two logs of wood. R. Hananel.]
- (7) That the laying of the two logs of wood is a complete service.
- (8) [Because it is considered a night service completing the arranging of the wood pile on the altar (Rashi), v. also Tosaf.]
- (9) V. supra, p. 128, nn. 8, 9.
- (10) The Mishnah continues the account of the procedure, where it had been interrupted, 26a. This Mishnah refers not only to the Day of Atonement, but to the continual sacrifice on every morning of the year.
- (11) The Mishnaic **בַּרְקַאי** 'barkai' may be a contraction of 'barka hi', i.e. there is a shining. Or: the shining one, i.e., the morning star.
- (12) [Rashi (Men. 100a) regards these words not as reporting the view of Mathia b. Samuel, but as a historical narrative. The passage is consequently to be translated: Mathia b. Samuel (who was a Temple officer v. infra), used to say (in announcing the time in question) The whole east is alight, **תּוֹם יִשְׁנִים** a.l.]
- (13) V. Gemara. For the choice of Hebron, which is too far from Jerusalem to permit one in Jerusalem to see its towers, the Yerushalmi has a plausible suggestion, viz., that that city was mentioned for its historical importance; because of the cave of Machpelah, in which the patriarchs and matriarchs of Israel are buried.
- (14) This could not have happened on a Day of Atonement, because on that day the moon has gone down long before dawn, but on one of the last days of a month, in which the moon, to the west of the sun, rises before dawn.
- (15) When the sky is clouded the light coming from the moon may be confused with that of the sun. But it never reaches as far as the latter, hence the question of the officer whether the horizon is alight even unto Hebron. The officer may have been Mathia. V. Shek. V, 1.
- (16) Possibly a room in the Temple, V. Baneth, Pes. IX, note 49.
- (17) The account of the service on the Day of Atonement is here continued, immediately interrupted again, and

re-continued on 30a.

(18) A euphemism for: to ease oneself, to relieve nature.

(19) In the water of the holy laver. Ex. XXX, 18.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 28b

It was taught: R. Ishmael said: The morning [star] shines. R. Akiba said the morning [star] rose.<sup>1</sup> Nahuma b. Afkashion said: The morning [star] is already in Hebron. Mathia b. Samuel, the officer in charge of the counts, said: The whole east even unto Hebron is alight. R. Judah b. Bathyra said: The whole east even unto Hebron is alight and all the people have gone forth, each to his work. If that were the case, it would be [too much of the day] too late! — Rather: each to hire working men.<sup>2</sup>

R. Safra said: The [afternoon] prayer of Abraham<sup>3</sup> is due when the walls begin to grow dark.<sup>4</sup> R. Joseph said: Shall we indeed learn [our laws] from Abraham?<sup>5</sup> — Raba answered: A Tanna learned from Abraham and we should not learn from him! For it has been taught: And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised,<sup>6</sup> this passage teaches that the whole of the [eighth] day is proper for the circumcision, but the zealots perform their religious duty as early as possible as it is said: And Abraham rose early in the morning and saddled his ass.<sup>7</sup> — Rather, said Raba, is it this that appeared difficult to R. Joseph: For we have learnt: If the eve of Passover falls on the eve of Sabbath, the paschal lamb is to be slaughtered at one half after the sixth hour,<sup>8</sup> and offered up at one half after the seventh hour.<sup>9</sup> — But let it be slaughtered when the walls begin to grow dark!<sup>10</sup> — What is the difficulty? Perhaps the walls of the Sanctuary begin to grow dark half an hour after the sixth hour because they were not exactly straight.<sup>11</sup> Or [one might say]: It was different with Abraham whose heart [mind] knew great astronomical speculation.<sup>12</sup> Or: Because he was an elder [zaken] who had a seat at the scholar's council,<sup>12</sup> for R. Hama b. Hanina said: Our ancestors were never left without the scholars' council. In Egypt they had the scholars' council, as it is said: Go and gather the elders of Israel together;<sup>13</sup> in the wilderness they had the scholars' council, as it is said: Gather unto Me seventy men of the elders of Israel;<sup>14</sup> our father Abraham was an elder and a member of the scholars' council, as it is said: And Abraham was [zaken] an elder well stricken in age;<sup>15</sup> our father Isaac was an elder and a member of the scholars' council, as it is said: And it came to pass when Isaac was an elder [zaken];<sup>16</sup> our father Jacob was an elder and a member of the scholars' council, as it is said: Now the eyes of Israel were dim with age [zoken];<sup>17</sup> [even] Eliezer, the servant of Abraham was an elder and a member of the scholars' council, as it is said: And Abraham said unto his servant, the elder of his house, that ruled over all he had,<sup>18</sup> which R. Eleazar explained to mean that he ruled over [knew, controlled] the Torah of his master.<sup>19</sup> Eliezer of Damascus': R. Eleazar said, He was so called because he drew<sup>20</sup> and gave drink to others of his master's teachings.

Rab said: Our father Abraham kept the whole Torah, as it is said: Because that Abraham hearkened to My voice [kept My charge, My commandments, My statutes, and My laws].<sup>21</sup> R. Shimi b. Hiyya said to Rab: Say, perhaps, that this refers to the seven laws?<sup>22</sup> — Surely there was also that of circumcision!<sup>23</sup> Then say that it refers to the seven laws and circumcision [and not to the whole Torah]? — If that were so, why does Scripture say: 'My commandments and My laws'?

Raba or R. Ashi said: Abraham, our father, kept even the law concerning the 'erub of the dishes,<sup>24</sup> as it is said: 'My Torahs':<sup>25</sup> one being the written Torah, the other the oral Torah.<sup>26</sup>

MATHIA B. SAMUEL SAID etc. . . . AND HE ANSWERED 'YES'. Who was it that said 'yes'? the man standing on the roof! Is he the dreamer and the interpreter?<sup>27</sup> Should it, then, be he who is standing on the ground, whence would he know?<sup>28</sup> — If you like say it is he who stands on the roof, and if you like say it is he who stands on the ground. If you want to say it is he who stands on the roof; he says: THE WHOLE EAST IS ALIGHT, the one standing on the ground answering: EVEN

UNTO HEBRON? whereupon the former says: 'YES'. If you like say that it is he who stands on the ground: He says: THE WHOLE EAST IS ALIGHT? whereupon the other responds: EVEN UNTO HEBRON?<sup>29</sup> and the former answers: 'YES'.<sup>30</sup>

AND WHY WAS THAT CONSIDERED NECESSARY etc. But can it be confused?<sup>31</sup> Has it not been taught: Rabbi says: The rising column of the moon is different from that of the sun. The light column of the moon rises straight like a stick, the light column of the sun [the dawn] irradiates in all directions? — The school of Ishmael taught: It was a cloudy day and the light was scattered in all directions.<sup>32</sup> R. Papa said: We can infer therefrom that on a cloudy day the sun is felt all over. What is the practical difference?<sup>33</sup> — In the spreading<sup>34</sup> of skins, or, as Raba expounded: A woman should not knead<sup>35</sup> either in the sun or in the heat of the sun. R. Nahman said: The sultry air of the sun<sup>36</sup> is more intense than that of direct sunlight, your analogy<sup>37</sup> being: a jar of vinegar,<sup>38</sup> the dazzling sun-light<sup>39</sup> is worse than the uncovered sun, your analogy being drippings [from the roof].<sup>40</sup>

---

(1) A later time.

(2) All the people have gone forth, each to his work, refers not to the workingmen who leave for work at a later hour, but to the contractors, who early in the morning hire their men for the day's work.

(3) The afternoon prayer is by tradition ascribed to Isaac, but since he learned it from his father, Abraham receives here the credit for it. Or, as Tosaf. Ber. 26b s.v. **יצחק** has it, after Isaac had instituted the prayer, Abraham fixed the time for it.

(4) Are no longer shone upon by the sun, that is after the middle of the day.

(5) For Abraham lived before the Torah was given and Israelites should follow the conduct of the prophets, who knew and practised the Torah rather than that of Abraham who, whilst living in its spirit, could not have known all the laws thereof. There are, of course, also views according to which Abraham practised the oral and the written law, v. below. v. Tosaf. Moed Katon, 20a, s.v. **מה חג**.

(6) Lev. XII, 3.

(7) Gen. XXII, 3, the reference may also be ibid. XIX, 27, v. Meg. 20a.

(8) The day was divided into twelve hours of varying duration, in winter an hour may be as short as forty minutes, in summer as long as ninety.

(9) Pes. 58a.

(10) I.e., after the beginning of the seventh hour-after midday.

(11) It was narrower above than below and thus did not cast a shadow till later in the afternoon.

(12) And could hence foretell the exact hour; V. B.B., Sonc. ed., p. 83, n. II.

(13) Ex. III, 16.

(14) Num. XI, 16.

(15) Gen. XXIV, I. E.V. 'was old'.

(16) Ibid. XXVII, 1.

(17) Ibid. XLVIII, 10.

(18) Ibid. XXIV, 2.

(19) Ibid. XV, 2. In all these cases the word zaken (elder) is interpreted in accord with Sifra, Kedoshim. III, 7: (**חכמה**) **קזן זה שקנה** a zaken is he who has acquired wisdom (through study).

(20) This is a play on **דמשק**, as if it were a compositum of **דולף** (one who draws) and **משקה**, (one who gives drink).

(21) Gen. XXVI, 5.

(22) Obligatory upon 'The sons of Noah', i.e., upon all civilized nations and individuals. They include the commandment to promote justice, and the prohibitions of idolatry, immorality, blasphemy, murder, cruelty to animals, and theft.

(23) Which Abraham observed.

(24) Lit., 'mixing of dishes'. One may not prepare food on a holy day, which falls on Friday, for the Sabbath immediately following it. But one may start on the eve of the holy day to prepare such food for the Sabbath, the cooking on the holy day being but a continuation of this weekday work. This provision is not Biblical.

(25) Taking the word Torah in its sense as the sum-total of Jewish Law.

- (26) The written Law, i.e., the Five Books of Moses; the Oral Law, which Moses received on Sinai, handing it down to Joshua, the latter handing it down to the elders, the latter to the prophets, these to the Men of the Great Synod (Aboth I, 1).
- (27) It seems strange that one man should both ask the question and answer it.
- (28) He could not observe it from where he stood.
- (29) ['Is this what you want to know'.]
- (30) ['Indeed this is just what I ask'. The mention of Hebron is to recall the memory of the patriarchs who lie buried there. T. J. Yoma III, 1. V. Rashi. Var. lec.: He (who stands on the roof) says THE WHOLE EAST IS ALIGHT AS EAR AS HEBRON, and the other (who stands on the ground) says 'YES?' i.e., 'Indeed? are you sure it is so?' V. R. Hananel and D.S. a.l.]
- (31) Can the light of the moon be confused with that of the sun?
- (32) On a cloudy day the rising column of the sun is invisible because of the heavy clouds and it is only where the clouds are somewhat scattered that it is visible, hence the confusion is possible.
- (33) That this inference is mentioned here.
- (34) To be dried.
- (35) The dough on the Passover to prepare unleavened cakes. R. Papa's maxim would make the rule more stringent.
- (36) Produced by the passage of the sun-rays through a cloudy atmosphere.
- (37) Lit., 'your sign'.
- (38) Which emits a stronger smell through a small opening than when quite open.
- (39) Coming through cracks or breaks in the clouds.
- (40) It is more agreeable to enter completely (a bath or rainy place) than to get continual drippings on one's body.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 29a

Unchaste imagination is more injurious<sup>1</sup> than the sin itself, your analogy being the odour of meat.<sup>2</sup> The end of the summer is more trying than the summer itself, your analogy being a hot oven.<sup>3</sup> A fever in winter is severer than in summer, your analogy being a cold oven.<sup>4</sup> It is harder to remember well something old than to commit to memory a fresh thing, your analogy being a cement made out of old cement.<sup>5</sup> R. Abbahu said: What is the reason of Rabbi's opinion?<sup>6</sup> — It is written:<sup>7</sup> For the Leader, upon Aijelet ha-Shahar<sup>8</sup> — just as the antlers of the hind branch off this way and that way, so the light of the dawn is scattered in all directions. — R. Zera said: Why was Esther compared to a hind?<sup>9</sup> To tell you that just as a hind has a narrow womb and is desirable to her mate at all times as at the first time, so was Esther precious to King Ahasuerus at all times as at the first time. R. Assi said: Why was Esther compared to the dawn?<sup>10</sup> To tell you that just as the dawn is the end of the whole night, so is the story of Esther the end of all the miracles. But there is Hanukkah? — We refer to those included in Scripture. That will be right according to the opinion that Esther was meant to be written,<sup>11</sup> but what can be said according to him who held that it was not meant to be written? — He could bring it in accord with what R. Benjamin b. Japheth said, for R. Eleazar said in the name of R. Benjamin b. Japheth: Why is the prayer of the righteous compared to a hind? To tell you that just as with the hind, as long as it grows, its antlers form additional branches every year, so with the righteous, the longer they abide in prayer, the more will their prayer be heard.

THEY SLAUGHTERED THE CONTINUAL OFFERING: When?<sup>12</sup> Would you say on one of the remaining days of the year? Had it then to be offered up? Hence [you will say that it happened] on the Day of Atonement, but is there any moon-light visible then?<sup>13</sup> — This is what it means: On the Day of Atonement, when the observer said: It is daylight, they would take the high priest down to the place of immersion.<sup>14</sup> The father of R. Abin learnt:<sup>15</sup> Not only concerning this<sup>16</sup> was it said,<sup>17</sup> but also concerning the pinching of a bird's head and the taking of a fistful of the meal-offering, [was it said] that if it was done during the night, it had to be burnt. That is quite right with regard to the bird designated for a burnt-offering, since the fact can no more be undone, but touching the fistful of the meal offering,

- (1) To health, physical and moral.
- (2) The odour of roast meat is more injurious to the digestive apparatus even than the eating thereof.
- (3) It is easy to kindle a fresh fire in a hot oven, the ground being dry. By the end of summer the atmosphere is very hot so that any additional hot weather makes it well nigh intolerable.
- (4) It requires a great deal of wood and effort to warm up the cold oven in the cold days of winter. Thus must a fever be very severe to afflict one on a cold day.
- (5) That has been used before. It is hard to dissolve it and re-make it.
- (6) Who says that the light column of the sun (dawn) is scattered.
- (7) Ps. XXII, 1.
- (8) Lit., 'The Hind of the Dawn. That may have been a well-known melody, according to which the psalm was to be sung, the direction being meant for the choir-leader. V. the comm. of Delitzsch, Cheyne and Koenig.
- (9) In Meg. 15b, Queen Esther is reported to have sung this psalm as she came before Ahasuerus, hence the comparison.
- (10) 'Er. 54b.
- (11) Meg. 7a. To protect the books of the Bible, they were declared unclean, so that after touching them, one had to wash one's hands. The question hence, as to whether any book defiled the hands, implies the question as to whether it was included in the Canon and has inspiration ascribed to its contents. About the Book of Esther there is a dispute in Meg. 7a, one of the Rabbis ascribing inspiration to it, whence it was to be written and included in the Canon, the other denying it inspiration, hence declaring its touch did not defile the hands. V. Yadaim III, 5.
- (12) Did this error happen, on the basis of which the high priest was taken down to the place of immersion. The questioner takes the second incident reported in the Mishnah as a sequel to the first.
- (13) At dawn.
- (14) The answer indicates that these two incidents are not to be connected. The error happened on an ordinary day. The second passage refers to the Day of Atonement and states that when the observer had said 'It is daylight', then, on a Day of Atonement, the high priest would be taken down, etc.
- (15) Men. 100a.
- (16) Not only a sacrifice that was offered up during the night (instead of in its proper time, after day-break).
- (17) That it is to be burnt.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 29b**

let him put it back and take it again when it is day? — He learnt and explained it: The vessels of ministration render what is in them sacred even outside of the proper time.<sup>1</sup> An objection was raised: This is the rule: Whatsoever is offered<sup>2</sup> up during the day, becomes sanctified by day and whatsoever is offered up during the night becomes sanctified both by day and by night.<sup>3</sup> At any rate it is taught that whatsoever is offered up during the day becomes sanctified by day only, and not by night?<sup>4</sup> — It may not become sanctified [enough] to be offered up, but it may become sanctified enough to be invalidated.<sup>5</sup>

R. Zera raised an objection: If he put in order the shewbread and the [frankincense] clip after the Sabbath and smokes the [contents of] the cups on the [following] Sabbath it is invalid.<sup>6</sup> What should he do? He should leave it for the coming Sabbath, for even if it stayed for many days on the table, that does not matter. But why? It should be sanctified and invalidated?<sup>7</sup> — Raba said: He who raised the objection, raised a valid one, and the father of R. Abin is also quoting a Baraita,<sup>8</sup> but it is of the opinion that the night is not considered a wanting<sup>9</sup> time, the day however is so considered. But when the night of Sabbath approaches, let it then become at once sanctified and invalidated?<sup>10</sup> — Rabina said: We assume that he removed it before then. Mar Zutra, or as some say, R. Ashi said: You may set the case even if he had not removed it before [Sabbath eve], since, however, he had put it in order at variance with the regulation<sup>11</sup> it is as if a monkey had laid it there.<sup>12</sup>

THIS WAS THE RULE IN THE TEMPLE etc.: It is quite right that the feet must be washed because of squirts,<sup>13</sup> but why must the hands be washed? — R. Abba said: This teaches us that it is

- 
- (1) Hence it can no more be put back. Since the vessel has sanctified it for the altar, it must not be put back among the remaining part of the meal-offering.
- (2) E.g., the meal-offerings, the incense.
- (3) The text here corrected in accord with Bah. V. Tem. 14a. [Cur. ed. inserts 'and whatsoever is offered up during the night becomes sanctified by night, and whatsoever is offered up both during the day and during the night becomes sanctified both by day and by night.' As the former can refer only to drink-offerings (V. Ta'an. 2b) which however are offered up also during the day, this passage is omitted and the text corrected accordingly.]
- (4) Which means that there is no sanctification but in the proper time.
- (5) [If it carries overnight without having been offered (V. Zeb. 87a). The fistful accordingly having been placed in the vessel of ministration at night becomes invalidated with daybreak, and can no longer be put back among the remaining part of the meal-offering.]
- (6) [Because it had not been left on the table for seven days as prescribed, v. Lev. XXIV, 5ff. Var. lec. rightly omit: it is invalid, V. Rashi.]
- (7) Through having been set on the table in its proper time.
- (8) It is not the case of all Amoraic opinion, which can be refuted by argument. It is an authoritative Tannaitic teaching and a way must be found to bring the present argument in accord with it.
- (9) The day goes after the night, hence it is part of the night, hence the fistful put into the vessel at night is regarded as having been put therein in the proper time and consequently is sanctified properly. Since, however, it is a day-offering it must be burned with the shewbread; however, where there is a whole day wanting, the bread does not become sanctified.
- (10) Since the night is not considered as 'wanting time', whereas everything that is due during the day and was placed into the sacred vessels in the preceding night, becomes sanctified and invalidated, then, when the eve of second Sabbath comes, let the table sanctify the bread and invalidate it?
- (11) When it was wanting time.
- (12) Without any intention, hence the table does not sanctify it, for we consider that since it was placed there without intention, it was technically not placed there at all, hence it becomes neither sanctified nor invalidated.
- (13) Of urine.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 30a

the right thing to wipe off [squirtings]. This supports the view of R. Ammi who says: A man must not go out with squirtings on his feet, because he may appear as one that has his privy member cut off and he may thus cause evil talk against his children that they are bastards.<sup>1</sup>

R. Papa said: If there be excrement in its place,<sup>2</sup> he must not read the Shema'.<sup>3</sup> How shall we imagine this case? If to say that it is invisible, that is self-evident; if to say that it is not seen surely<sup>4</sup> 'The Torah was not given to the ministering angels!' This has but reference to a situation in which it is obvious when he sits and invisible when he stands. But what is the difference between this and one who has filth on his body, for it has been stated: Where one who has filth on his body, or whose hands are in a privy,<sup>5</sup> R. Huna permits the reading of the Shema' and R. Hisda forbids it?<sup>6</sup> — In its place filth is most execrable, away from it, it is less so. Our Rabbis taught: This is the halachah with regard to meal-time:<sup>7</sup> If a man goes forth to make water, he washes his one<sup>8</sup> hand and re-enters. If he conversed with his neighbour and waited [diverting himself], he washes both his hands [again] and re-enters. When he washes his hands, he should not wash them outside and enter, because of the suspicion,<sup>9</sup> but he should enter, sit at his accustomed place and wash his two hands there, then pass the pitcher<sup>10</sup> around the guests.<sup>11</sup> — R. Hisda said: What we said refers to drinking,<sup>12</sup> but as to eating he may wash his hands outside and re-enter, people know that he is fastidious of taste.<sup>13</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said: I would do the same<sup>14</sup> before drinking as people know me to be fastidious.

MISHNAH. NO MAN EVEN IF HE WERE CLEAN COULD ENTER THE TEMPLE COURT WITHOUT HAVING IMMERSSED HIMSELF. FIVE IMMERSIONS AND TEN SANCTIFICATIONS DID THE HIGH PRIEST UNDERGO ON THAT DAY. AND ALL ON

HOLY GROUND IN THE PARWAH<sup>15</sup> CELL WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THIS ONE<sup>16</sup> ALONE.  
— A LINEN SHEET WAS SPREAD BETWEEN HIM AND THE PEOPLE.

GEMARA. Ben Zoma was asked: What is the purpose of this immersion?<sup>17</sup> He answered: If one<sup>18</sup> who moves from one holy place to another and from one place [the entering of] which [in uncleanness] involves kareth<sup>19</sup> to another place [the entering of] which [in uncleanness] involves kareth, requires immersion, how much more shall he require immersion who moves from profane ground into holy ground, and from a place [the entering of] which [in uncleanness] does not involve kareth, to a place [the entering of] which [in uncleanness] involves kareth! R. Judah said: It is only an immersion required for the sake of uniformity,<sup>20</sup> so that he may remember if there is any uncleanness on him and abstain.<sup>21</sup> In what principle do they differ?

(1) Men afflicted with such blemish are incapable of reproduction, hence people, mistaking him for a man thus afflicted and hearing that he has children, will spread the rumour that they are begotten in adultery.

(2) In the anus.

(3) V. Glos.

(4) Ber. 25b.

(5) He happens to have his hands still in the space of the privy, between its door and the wall which separates it from the next room.

(6) Because the whole body ought to be attuned to prayer, as the psalmist has it: All my bones shall say: Lord, who is like unto Thee, Ps. XXXV, 10.

(7) Hands have to be washed before taking a meal.

(8) The one which may have been touched by the squirts of urine.

(9) That he failed to wash his hands outside.

(10) Which he had used for washing his hands.

(11) V. Tosef. Ber. IV.

(12) [That he does not intend eating any more, but drinking, in which case the washing of the hands a second time is but a matter of precaution in case he does partake of some bread (Rashi).]

(13) The average man is assumed to be fastidious enough not to eat without his fingers having been washed before, esp. since eating with the fingers (rather than with fork and knife) was the general custom. V.T.A. III, p. 43.

(14) And wash my hands outside.

(15) In the southern part of the Temple Court, v. Mid. V, 3.

(16) The first one (mentioned in preceding Mishnah 28a) which he performed on profane ground at the Water-Gate.

(17) For every man who wishes to enter the Temple Court.

(18) The high priest, in the course of his five services on the Day of Atonement, moved from the inner to the outer court, both being sacred and having the special restriction attached, viz., that one who entered them in uncleanness incurred divine penalty of death.

(19) V. Glos.

(20) Lit., 'an attached immersion'. There is no Biblical obligation, but a Rabbinic 'fence' to assure a consciousness of any uncleanness attaching to him who entered the Temple Court.

(21) From entering the Temple Court.

### **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 30b**

As to whether the service is profaned.<sup>1</sup> According to Ben Zoma<sup>2</sup> he profanes the service, according to R. Judah he does not. But does he, in accordance with Ben Zoma's view, profane the service? Has it not been taught: If a high priest did not immerse or sanctify himself between garment and garment or between service and service, his service remains valid.<sup>3</sup> But if either a high priest or a common priest has not washed his hands and feet in the morning and then had officiated at a service, that service is invalidated? — Rather does the dispute concern the question as to whether he transgresses a positive command or not,<sup>1</sup> Ben Zoma holding he transgresses a positive command, R. Judah that he does not. But does R. Judah hold this view? Has it not been taught: A leper<sup>4</sup> immerses himself and

stands in the Nicanor Gate. R. Judah said: He does not need to immerse himself, for he has done so already on the evening before! This has its own reason, as it was taught: 'Because he had immersed himself on the eve before'.<sup>5</sup> What does he ask who asks this?<sup>6</sup> — Because he wants to raise another objection, viz., [why was it called] the cell of the lepers, because lepers immerse themselves therein.<sup>7</sup> R. Judah says: Not only of the lepers did they say [this] but of every man [who enters the Temple Court]?<sup>8</sup> — That is no difficulty. One statement refers to the case that he immersed himself, the other to the case that he did not. But, if he did not immerse himself, he must await the setting of the sun? — Rather: In both cases he is presumed to have immersed himself, but in the one case he is presumed to have ceased to have his mind [on the necessity of preventing defilement],<sup>9</sup> in the other he is presumed to have had his mind thereon all the time. But if he ceased to have his mind on it, he would need to be sprinkled on the third and the seventh day, for R. Dosthai b. Mattun said in the name of R. Johanan: Wherever attention<sup>10</sup> [from the need to prevent uncleanness] is diverted, sprinkling on the third and the seventh day is required?<sup>11</sup> — Rather: In both cases he is presumed not to have diverted the attention, yet there is no contradiction, for in the one case he is presumed to have immersed himself for the purpose of entering the Sanctuary, in the other he is assumed to have done so without that purpose in mind.<sup>12</sup> Or, if you like, say: Read not of lepers did they say [this]<sup>13</sup> but of every man. Rabina said: R. Judah makes his statement only on behalf [of the view] of the Rabbis: As far as my view is concerned, no leper needs [another] immersion. But according to your opinion, admit at least that this was said not of lepers alone but of all people. And the Rabbis?<sup>14</sup> — The leper is accustomed to [his] impurity, all others are unaccustomed to it.<sup>15</sup>

Shall we say that the Rabbis who dispute with R. Judah<sup>16</sup> are of the opinion of Ben Zoma,<sup>17</sup> notwithstanding which they make reference to the leper,<sup>18</sup> to inform you of the far-reaching consequences of R. Judah's opinion; or perhaps the difference in the case of the leper lies in the fact that he is accustomed to the uncleanness?<sup>19</sup> — He answered: It is different with the leper, because he is accustomed to his uncleanness.

Said Abaye to R. Joseph:<sup>20</sup> Would an intervening object

- 
- (1) By officiating without immersing first.
  - (2) Who infers it from an argument a minori which has the force of Biblical law.
  - (3) Zeb. 19b. [Since a high priest does not profane the service by failing to take the intermediary immersions, there could be no profanation of the service in the absence of the first immersion, since on the view of Ben Zoma the latter is inferred from the former.]
  - (4) On the eighth day of his affliction, although he had immersed himself on the seventh, Lev. XIV, 9: And it shall be on the seventh...he shall bathe his flesh in water, and he shall be clean. Yet, when he offers up the prescribed sacrifices on the eighth day, he shall immerse himself again.
  - (5) R. Judah holds the purpose of the immersion of those who enter the Sanctuary in the morning is just to remind them of their former uncleanness, whereas the leper, who by reason of last night's immersion got rid of his uncleanness, is not in need of another reminder, in form of a second immersion.
  - (6) I.e., why ask an apparently unnecessary question? The answer is obvious. Mielziner (Introduction p. 238) cites Frankel MGWJ 1861 for a tradition according to which all passages in the Talmud introduced by this phrase belong to the additions made by the Saboraim.
  - (7) [Before they entered the Temple Court on the eighth day in the morning; when standing at the Nicanor Gate they thrust their thumb and toe into the Temple Court, there to receive an application of the blood of the guilt-offering and of oil; v. Lev. XIV, 14ff and supra 16a and infra p. 143, n. 10.]
  - (8) 'Not only of the lepers' implies the lepers at any rate, hence he would consider a re-immersion necessary, which contradicts his earlier statement.
  - (9) By consistent guarding of his body against touch by agents of ritual uncleanness.
  - (10) For he may have entered the tent in which a corpse lay.
  - (11) For entering the Temple.
  - (12) He therefore requires a second immersion in the morning.

(13) Requiring immersion on entering the Sanctuary.

(14) How would they meet R. Judah's argument?

(15) Hence he will no more pay attention to the dangers of defilement, whereas all others, unaccustomed to uncleanness and not reconciled to it, will be anxious to avoid such risk.

(16) And hold that a leper needs re-immersion on the eighth day.

(17) Who requires no morning immersion even in the case of a leper who is accustomed to uncleanness.

(18) Although they hold with Ben Zoma that every one entering the Sanctuary is by the law of the Torah obliged to immerse himself.

(19) That of leprosy, hence is accustomed to touch things unclean, whence the assumption that even after his immersion he may have done so; but other men require no morning immersion Biblically before entering the Sanctuary.

(20) Text in accord with Maharsha.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 31a

render this immersion<sup>1</sup> invalid or not? — He replied: 'Whatever the Rabbis ordained, they endowed with the authority of a law of the Torah'.<sup>2</sup>

Said Abaye to R. Joseph: Is a partial entrance of the Sanctuary considered an entrance or not? — He answered: The thumb<sup>3</sup> and toe will prove that, for there but a partial entrance is involved, and it was taught: A leper immerses himself and stands in the Nicanor Gate! — The question was asked: What about making for himself a long knife for slaughtering?<sup>4</sup> This question is asked in accord with the view of both Ben Zoma and the Rabbis who oppose R. Judah. This question is asked on the view of Ben Zoma: Perhaps Ben Zoma does not consider the immersion obligatory except in the case of one who actually enters, but not for one who stands outside; or perhaps even for the latter, because he might gradually enter. The question is also asked according to the view of the Rabbis who oppose R. Judah: Perhaps the Rabbis hold their view only there<sup>5</sup> because he does not perform a service,<sup>6</sup> but where he officiates at a service they would agree,<sup>7</sup> or do they make no difference? — The question remains unanswered.

FIVE IMMERSIONS AND TEN SANCTIFICATIONS: Our Rabbis taught: The high priest underwent five immersions and ten sanctifications on that day, all of them on holy ground, in the Parwah Cell, with the exception of the first, which took place on profane ground, on top of the Water Gate, lying at the side of his [private] cell.<sup>8</sup> Abaye said: We infer therefrom that the Etam well was [at least] twenty-three cubits above the ground of the Temple Court.<sup>9</sup> For we have learnt: All the doorways there were twenty cubits in height, ten cubits in breadth, with the exception of that of the Hall<sup>10</sup> and it was taught: And he shall bathe all his flesh in water,<sup>11</sup> I.e., in the waters of a mikweh,<sup>12</sup> in water which covers his whole body. What 'is its quantity? One cubit square, three cubits high, and the Sages have calculated that the required quantity for [the contents of] a mikweh is forty se'ah.<sup>13</sup>

---

(1) An immersion, to be valid, requires utterly undisturbed touch of the water on the body of the person immersing himself, any intervening object rendering the immersion invalid. This, however, in the questioner's mind applies only to such immersion as is commanded by the Torah. R. Judah, who considers it only an immersion for the sake of uniformity, might hence hold that in this case an intervening object might not be considered sufficiently disturbing to render the immersion invalid.

(2) Pes. 30b.

(3) Lev. XIV, 14: And the priest shall take the blood of the guilt-offering and... shall put it upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot. Ibid. 17: And of the rest of the oil . . . the priest shall put . . . upon the thumb of his right hand and upon the great toe of his right foot. It is to receive of the blood and the oil that the leper stands at the Nicanor Gate and puts his hands and feet inside, v. 11 indicating that: And the priest that cleanseth him shall set the man that is to be cleansed . . . at the door of the tent of meeting.

(4) To escape the obligation of an immersion, which is due on entering. With a knife long enough he might slay the sacrificial animal from without.

- (5) In the case of an ordinary man entering the Sanctuary.
- (6) Hence they free him from the obligations of an immersion.
- (7) That such is necessary.
- (8) V. supra.
- (9) From the Etam well was the water supply for the pool on top of the Water Gate, v. Zeb. 55b.
- (10) V. supra 15a.
- (11) [The reference is to Lev. XV, 16 and the text is to be corrected accordingly. The verse in cur. edd. is from Lev. XV, 13.]
- (12) Lit., 'gathering (of water)' then the term. techn. for the pool for ritual immersion. The water therein must not be drawn, i.e., through a vessel, but must come directly from spring, river, sea or rain.
- (13) 'Er. 4b. Forty se'ah correspond roughly to two hundred and sixty-four quarts of water. [The water in the pool on top of the Water Gate had thus to rise to a height of twenty-three cubits above the level of the Temple Court twenty cubits for the height of the doorway and three cubits for the height of the pool, which would have been impossible unless the Etam well was situated on at least a corresponding height.]

### **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 31b**

But there is also one cubit of the ceiling and one cubit of the flooring?<sup>1</sup> — Since the gates of the Sanctuary are made of marble these were made of a small [thickness]. But there is some [additional thickness] however small? — Since it is not even as much as a cubit, he does not count it.

A LINEN SHEET WAS SPREAD BETWEEN HIM AND THE PEOPLE. Why of linen? — As R. Kahana said [elsewhere]:<sup>2</sup> So that he may perceive that the service of the day is to be performed in garments of linen. Thus here too it is that he might perceive that the service of the day is to be performed in garments of linen.

MISHNAH. HE STRIPPED OFF [HIS GARMENTS]<sup>3</sup> WENT DOWN AND IMMersed HIMSELF, CAME UP AND DRIED HIMSELF.<sup>4</sup> THEY BROUGHT HIM THE GOLDEN<sup>5</sup> GARMENTS, HE PUT THEM ON AND SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET. THEY BROUGHT HIM THE CONTINUAL OFFERING, HE MADE THE REQUIRED CUT AND SOME ONE ELSE FINISHED IT FOR HIM.<sup>6</sup> HE RECEIVED THE BLOOD AND SPRINKLED IT. HE WENT INSIDE<sup>7</sup> TO SMOKE THE INCENSE OF THE MORNING<sup>8</sup> AND TO TRIM THE LAMPS;<sup>9</sup> [AFTERWARDS] TO OFFER UP THE HEAD AND THE LIMBS AND THE PANCAKES AND THE WINE-OFFERING. THE MORNING INCENSE WAS OFFERED UP BETWEEN THE BLOOD AND THE LIMBS, THE AFTERNOON [INCENSE] BETWEEN THE LIMBS AND THE DRINK-OFFERINGS. IF THE HIGH PRIEST WAS EITHER OLD OR OF DELICATE HEALTH WARM WATER WOULD BE PREPARED FOR HIM AND Poured INTO THE COLD, TO MITIGATE ITS COLDNESS.

GEMARA. The scholars said in the presence of R. Papa:<sup>10</sup> This [Mishnah]<sup>11</sup> is not in accord with R. Meir, for if it were in accord with him,<sup>12</sup> behold he said: There must be two sanctifications for the putting on of the garments, hence there ought to be here, too,<sup>13</sup> two sanctifications for the putting on of the garments!<sup>14</sup> R. Papa said unto then.: Whether on the view of the Sages or of R. Meir, one sanctification is for the stripping off of the holy garments,<sup>15</sup> and one for the putting on<sup>15</sup> and the reason of their dispute is [the interpretation of these words]: He shall put off, he shall bathe and he shall put on.<sup>16</sup> R. Meir holds that Scripture compares the stripping to the putting on [of the garments], i.e., just as in the case of the putting on of the garments he first puts them on and only afterwards sanctifies himself, so also with the stripping off of the garments, he first strips off and then sanctifies himself; whereas the Rabbis hold that [Scripture] compares the stripping off to the putting on, i.e., just as with the putting on he sanctifies himself whilst dressed in the garments, so with the stripping off, he sanctifies himself whilst the garments are yet on him. Said the scholars to R. Papa: How can you say so, has it not been taught: A sheet of linen was spread between him and

the people, he stripped off [his garments], went down, immersed himself, came up and dried himself. One brought the golden garments before him, he put them on, and sanctified his hands and his feet. R. Meir said: He stripped off [his garments] and sanctified his hands and his feet, went down and immersed himself, came up and dried himself. One brought the golden garments before him, he put them on and sanctified his hands and feet!<sup>17</sup> — He answered them: If there is such teaching, it is a teaching [to be recognized]. According to R. Meir it is right, because we thus account for the

---

(1) [I.e., there must have been an additional cubit for the ceiling of the doorway and one for the flooring of the pool on top?]

(2) Infra 35a.

(3) His non-holy garments.

(4) Lit., 'sponged himself'.

(5) The eight garments, which the high priest puts on for service. They are: tunic, breeches, mitre, girdle, breast-plate, ephod, robe and plate. V. Ex. XXVIII, 2ff.

(6) To enable the high priest to put the knife aside and to take hold of the holy bowl in which he receives the blood. On other days one priest would slaughter, and another receive the blood. Both functions were to be performed by the high priest on the Day of Atonement.

(7) נכנס Lit., 'entered'. The word 'entered', however, does not fit the whole of what follows, as Baneth remarks. For whereas he entered the Sanctuary (Hekal) to smoke the incense and trim the lamps, he cannot be said to have 'entered' to offer up the head etc. which took place outside. Baneth therefore suggests with considerable justification that, as elsewhere, 'נכנס' be translated 'prepared to', 'went on to'. But this change is unnecessary as one could translate: He went in to . . . trim the lamps, (afterwards) to offer up the head . . .

(8) Ex. XXX, 7.

(9) I.e., clean them, provide them with wick and oil, according to Maimonides, also light them.

(10) V. Rashi.

(11) [Which prescribes only one sanctification in connection with the first immersion when he changes from his non-holy garments into the garments of gold.]

(12) [Who teaches infra 34b that in connection with the second immersion, when he changes from the garments of gold into linen garments, he disrobes himself first and then sanctifies himself, in contradistinction to the Rabbis who place the sanctification before the disrobing.]

(13) [It is assumed that the reason of R. Meir for prescribing the disrobing before the sanctification is that he holds that the two sanctifications required on the change of garments are for the putting on of holy vestments. Whereas the Rabbis ascribe one for the stripping of holy garments and the other for the putting on of holy garments.]

(14) [On the other hand, in the view of the Rabbis, there would be no need for more than one sanctification, since the garments of which he strips himself at the first immersion are non-holy.]

(15) So that our Mishnah can be also in accord with R. Meir.

(16) Lev. XVI, 23, 24.

(17) [This shows that R. Meir requires two sanctifications also in connection with the first immersion.]

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 32a

ten sanctifications, but according to the Rabbis, they are only nine? — The Rabbis will answer you: The last sanctification is made when he strips off the holy garments and puts on the profane<sup>1</sup> ones.

Our Rabbis taught: And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting<sup>2</sup> For what purpose does he enter? For no other purpose than that of taking out the censer and the coal-pan, the whole portion being reported in right order with the exception of this passage.<sup>3</sup> For what reason?<sup>4</sup> — R. Hisda said: There is a tradition: Five immersions and ten sanctifications did the high priest undergo on that day. If he had performed them in the order mentioned in the scriptures there could have been no more than three immersions and six sanctifications.<sup>5</sup>

It was taught: R. Judah said: Whence do we know of the five immersions and ten sanctifications which the high priest had to undergo on that day? To teach us that it is said: And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting, and shall put off the linen garments . . . and he shall wash his flesh in water in a holy place and put on his other vestments and come forth and offer [his burnt-offering].<sup>6</sup> Thus you infer that whenever one changes from one service to another,<sup>7</sup> an immersion is required. Rabbi said: Whence do we know that the high priest had to undergo five immersions and ten sanctifications on that day? Because it is said: He shall put on the holy linen tunic, and he shall have the linen breeches upon his flesh, and shall be girded with the linen girdle, and with the linen mitre shall he be attired; they are the holy garments; and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and put them on.<sup>8</sup> Hence you learn that whosoever changes from service to service requires an immersion. Moreover, it says, 'They are the holy garments', thus putting all the garments on the same level. Now there are five services;<sup>9</sup> The continual offering of dawn, [performed] in the golden garments: the service of the day [the Day of Atonement], in linen garments; of his [the high priest's] and the people's ram, in the golden garments; [the taking out] of the censer and coal-pan, in white garments; the continual evening offering in the golden garments — Whence do we know that every immersion required two sanctifications? For it is written: And he shall put off . . . and he shall wash; and he shall wash and he shall put on.<sup>10</sup> — R. Eliezer b. Simeon said: This can be inferred a *minori ad majus*: If in a case where no immersion is required,<sup>11</sup> sanctification is yet required,<sup>12</sup> how much more, in a place in which immersion is required,<sup>13</sup> is sanctification also required — But [perhaps let us also infer] that as there only one sanctification is required, here, too, one only would be necessary? Therefore Scripture says: And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting, and shall put off the linen garments which he put on — what is the meaning of 'which he put on'? Does not a man put off but that which he did put on? Rather [are these superfluous words written] to put the putting off on the same level with the putting on of the garments; just as the putting on of the garments requires sanctification,<sup>14</sup> so does the putting off of the garments require it.

[The master said].<sup>15</sup> 'R. Judah said: Whence do we know of the five immersions and ten sanctifications which the high priest had to undergo on that Day? To teach us that Scripture says: "And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting . . . and shall wash his flesh in water in a holy place." Thus you infer that whenever one changes from one service to another, an immersion is required.' We found [this rule] for the change from the white garments to the golden ones.<sup>16</sup> Whence do we know [that it also applies] for the change from the golden to the linen ones?

---

(1) At the end of the service of the Day of Atonement, as he strips off the holy garments to don profane ones.

(2) Lev. XVI, 23.

(3) *Infra* 70b.

(4) Did Aaron, have to interrupt the service, interpolating the offering up of his and the people's ram, between the incense and the bringing out of censer and coal-pan?

(5) One immersion each for the continual offering of the morning, for the service of the day, which includes censer — and coal-pan — function, and one between that and the offering up of the rams, which includes the additional, and the

continual afternoon offering. Thus there would be three immersions only as against the five traditionally reported. Hence the necessity of a change in the programme, hence the interpolation of the offering of the rams between the service within (the day's service) and the bringing out of censer and coal-pan. So that the censer — and coal-pan — function now interrupts between the offerings of the rams and the continual afternoon-offering, with the result that there are now five immersions necessary; one for the morning's continual offering, in the golden garments; one for the service of the day in white garments; one for the offering of the two rams on the outer altar in the golden garments; one for the taking out of censer and coal-pan in white garments; and the fifth for the additional, and the continual afternoon offering in the golden garments. Thus tradition and text are harmonized, the five immersions implying ten sanctifications, one each, before each putting off, and before each putting on, of the garments required for each service.

(6) Lev. XVI, 23, 24.

(7) I.e., from a service performed within the Tent of Meeting to one performed outside and vice versa.

(8) Ibid. 4.

(9) Whether on the view of Rabbi or of R. Judah.

(10) [This is the continuation of Rabbi's statement and the reference is to Lev. XVI, 23, 24. The words 'he shall wash', being placed between 'he shall put off' and 'he shall put on', are taken by Rabbi as referring both to stripping and the robing, each requiring a separate washing (sanctification), this in contradistinction to R. Judah who derives from it supra the need of all immersion between every change of service v. infra 32b.]

(11) During the rest of the days of the year (as against the Day of Atonement) the law of the Torah does not require immersion before each service, only by Rabbinic ordinance, the purpose of which is to keep the priest conscious of risks to his cleanliness, is such immersion necessary. (V. supra 30a.)

(12) V. Ex. XL, 32.

(13) On the Day of Atonement, at every change of garment.

(14) As is inferred a minori.

(15) [To be inserted with some MSS. V. D.S.]

(16) The verses in question (Lev. XVI, 23, 24) occurring in connection with the stripping of the white garments.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 32b**

The school of R. Ishmael taught: That can be inferred a minori: If the golden garments in which the high priest does not enter the Holy of Holies require immersion, how much more do the linen garments, in which he enters the Holy of Holies, require it? But this argument can be demolished: The case of the golden garments is different, because much atonement is obtained in them.<sup>1</sup> Rather, he infers it from what Rabbi said.<sup>2</sup>

[The Master said]<sup>3</sup> 'Rabbi said, Whence do we know of the five immersions and the ten sanctifications which the high priest had to undergo on that day? To teach us that it is said: "He shall put on the holy linen tunic . . ." Hence you learn that whosoever changes from service to service requires an immersion.' We have found that [required for a change] from the golden,<sup>4</sup> to the white garments. Whence do we know that [the same rule obtains for a change] from the white to the golden garments? The school of R. Ishmael taught: That can be inferred a minori: If the white garments, in which but little atonement is obtained, require an immersion, how much more will the golden garments, in which much atonement is obtained, require it? This argument can be demolished: The case of the white garments is different, because the high priest, dressed in them, enters the Holy of Holies? It is for this reason that he [Rabbi, in his statement] teaches: And it also says: 'They are the holy garments, and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and put them on'.<sup>5</sup>

'Now there are five services'. That of the continual afternoon offering [performed] in the golden garments; the service of the day in white garments; [the offering up of] his, and the people's ram in the golden garments; the [taking out of] the censer and coal-pan in white garments; and the continual offering at dusk, in the golden garments — And whence do we know that every immersion requires two sanctifications? To teach us that Scripture says: 'And he shall put off . . . and he shall wash . . . and he shall wash . . . and he shall put on'. But this [passage] refers to the immersions?<sup>6</sup> — Since it

has no reference to the immersion [the requirement of] which we infer from ‘They are the holy garments,<sup>7</sup> apply it to the sanctifications . Then the Divine Law should have written the term of ‘sanctification’?<sup>8</sup> — [Scripture chooses that term] to let us know that immersion is even as sanctification, i.e., just as immersion must take place on holy ground, so must sanctification take place on holy ground. Whence does R. Judah<sup>9</sup> infer [that] the sanctification [must take place on holy ground]? — He infers it from the teaching of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon.

R. Hisda said: Rabbi's view excludes that of R. Meir and that of the Rabbis.<sup>10</sup> It excludes that of the Rabbis, for according to them he sanctifies himself [first] while he is still dressed, whereas Rabbi holds that he sanctifies himself after he is stripped; and it also excludes the view of R. Meir, for R. Meir holds that the second sanctification takes place when he is [already] dressed, whereas, according to Rabbi, he sanctifies himself whilst still stripped of the garments.<sup>11</sup> R. Aha b. Jacob said: All agree that at the second sanctification he first dons [the garments] and then sanctifies himself. What is the reason? Because Scripture said: Or when they come near to the altar,<sup>12</sup> i.e., only he who lacks nothing but the approach,<sup>13</sup> that excludes him who lacks both dressing and approach. R. Aha, the son of Raba, said to R. Ashi: R. Hisda does not agree with R. Aha, nor does R. Aha agree with R. Hisda, for else there would be fifteen sanctifications required according to Rabbi.<sup>14</sup>

ONE BROUGHT HIM THE CONTINUAL OFFERING, HE MADE THE REQUIRED CUT etc. What does ‘KERAZO’<sup>15</sup> mean? ‘Ulla said: It is a synonym for ‘slaying’ — R. Nahman b. Isaac said: What is the scriptural evidence? Egypt is a very fair heifer. But the kerez [gadfly] out of the north is come, it is come.<sup>16</sup> What is the intimation?<sup>17</sup> — As R. Joseph interpreted it: A fair kingdom is Egypt but murderous nations from the north will come upon it.<sup>18</sup>

How far shall he cut? — ‘Ulla said: The bigger part of both organs.<sup>19</sup> Thus also said R. Johanan: The bigger part of the two organs. Resh Lakish also holds that he cuts through the bigger part of the two organs, for Resh Lakish said:<sup>20</sup> Since we have learned that the cutting through of the bigger part of an organ is as good as the cutting through the whole of it, why did we learn that ‘the bigger part of one organ [is required to be cut through] in case of a fowl ‘and the bigger part of the two organs [are required to be cut through] in case of an animal? Because we have learned: ONE BROUGHT HIM THE CONTINUAL OFFERING, HE MADE THE REQUIRED CUT AND SOMEONE ELSE FINISHED IT FOR HIM, HE RECEIVED THE BLOOD AND SPRINKLED IT—one might assume, if another one did not complete the killing for him, it would be invalid. — [You say that] ‘one could assume that if the other did not complete the killing for him, it would be invalid,’ then it would mean that the service is performed by someone<sup>21</sup> else and we have learnt: All the services of the Day of Atonement are valid only if performed by him [the high priest]?<sup>22</sup> — Rather: This is what he says: One might have assumed that it shall be considered invalidated by Rabbinic ordinance,<sup>23</sup>

---

(1) They are used every day for services, whereas the white garments are used only for the service in the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement and obtain atonement for the Sanctuary and its sacred things, if defilement had occurred there; v. Shebu. 7b.

(2) From Lev. XVI, 4.

(3) [Inserted by one MS. cf. Rashi.]

(4) The verse in question occurring in connection with the changing from the gold garments into the linen ones.

(5) The additional passage adduced by Rabbi intimates that Scripture makes the fact that they are the holy garments the reason for the need of immersion, so that one shall infer that all changes of holy garments on the Day of Atonement require immersion, thus also the golden garments.

(6) Since it says ‘his flesh’.

(7) Cf. n. 1.

(8) [I.e., it should have been written ‘he shall wash his hands and feet’, R. Hananel.]

(9) Who interprets the above passage differently, who therefore lacks a source for this information.

(10) Mentioned supra p.146, n. 6.

- (11) [Rabbi holds that both sanctifications are performed whilst he is stripped, one before the immersion and the other after the immersion.]
- (12) Ex. XXX, 20.
- (13) May perform the sanctification.
- (14) According to R. Hisda, Rabbi requires two sanctifications between stripping and dressing; and according to R. Aha, Rabbi requires the sanctification after being dressed before the service, for if their views were not incompatible, Rabbi would be found to require fifteen sanctifications.
- (15) Why a change of the usual wording? ‘Shehato’ would have been the normal way of putting it.
- (16) Jer. XLVI, 20.
- (17) The word ‘kerez’ here, meaning ‘gadfly’, does not suggest explanation of the incision.
- (18) The question has the Hebrew text in mind, the answer the Aramaic paraphrase. Since ‘kerez’ is interpreted as ‘murderous’, ‘karaz’ may fitly be used for ‘shahat’, to kill.
- (19) The windpipe and the gullet.
- (20) Hul. 29b.
- (21) That would render the service of the other essential, hence would mean someone else's participation in the service of the Day of Atonement, which is against the law.
- (22) Infra 73a.
- (23) Making a distinction between profane slaughter, where the bigger part of an organ is on the same level as the whole organ, i.e., the cutting through of the bigger part completes the slaughtering effectively, as against sacred animals, which would have their organ (or organs) completely cut through.

### **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 33a**

therefore we have learnt: The bigger part of an organ with a fowl, the bigger part of two organs with an animal — But since, even by Rabbinic ordinance, it would be considered not invalidated,<sup>1</sup> why does he [the other one] have to finish it? — It is the proper thing [a command] to finish it.<sup>2</sup>

Abaye related the order of the [daily] priestly functions in the name of tradition and in accordance with Abba Saul:<sup>3</sup> The large pile comes before the second pile for the incense; the second pile for the incense comes before the laying in order of the two logs of wood; the laying in order of the two logs of wood precedes the removing of the ashes from the inner altar; the removing of the ashes from the inner altar precedes the trimming of the five lamps; the trimming of the five lamps precedes the blood<sup>4</sup> of the continual offering; the blood of the continual offering precedes the trimming of the two lamps; the trimming of the two lamps precedes the incense; the incense precedes the limbs;<sup>5</sup> the limbs come before the meal-offering; the meal-offering precedes the pancakes; the pancakes come before the drink-offerings; the drink-offerings precede the additional offerings; the additional offerings come before the [frankincense] censers, and the [frankincense] censers precede the continual afternoon-offering, as it is said: And he shall make smoke thereon the fat of the peace-offerings,<sup>6</sup> i.e., herewith all the offerings are completed —<sup>7</sup> The Master said: ‘The great pile precedes the second pile for the incense.’ Whence do we know that? Because it has been taught:<sup>8</sup> This is the law of the burnt-offering: it is that which goeth up on its fire-wood upon the altar all night<sup>9</sup> — this passage refers to the great pile. And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereby<sup>10</sup> — this refers to the second pile for the incense.<sup>11</sup> But perhaps I should reverse it?<sup>12</sup> — It seems more logical that the great pile have preference because it brings more<sup>13</sup> atonement — On the contrary: the second pile is of greater value, for it is introduced within [the Sanctuary].<sup>14</sup> — Nevertheless, the one which causes more atonement is of greater value. And, if you like, say: If there be no wood found for the second pile, would one not bring it into [the Sanctuary] from the great pile?<sup>15</sup>

‘The second pile for the incense precedes the laying in order of the two logs of wood.’ Whence do we know that? — Because it is written: And the priest shall kindle wood<sup>16</sup> upon it every morning,<sup>17</sup> i.e., ‘upon it’,<sup>18</sup> but not upon the other pile,<sup>19</sup> hence we can infer that the other pile is arranged already. But the word ‘upon it’ has its own text meaning? — ‘Upon it’ is written twice.<sup>20</sup> ‘The laying

in order of the two logs of wood precedes the removing of the ashes from the inner altar.’ Although touching the one it is written: ‘In the morning, in the morning’<sup>21</sup> and touching the other it is also written: ‘In the morning, in the morning’<sup>22</sup> nevertheless that which is preparatory [to the incense burning] has preference,<sup>23</sup> What would be preparatory [according to their reply], are the two logs of wood, but surely you said that the two logs of wood belong to the great pile!<sup>24</sup> — R. Jeremiah said: It is the laying in order of the wood.<sup>25</sup> — Rabina said:<sup>26</sup> Since he started with the laying in order [of the wood], he completes it also. R. Ashi said:<sup>26</sup> If he found no wood in the second pile, would he not bring it in from the great pile?

‘And the removal of the ashes from the inner altar precedes the trimming of the five lamps.’ Why? — Abaye said: I know it<sup>27</sup> by tradition, but I do not know the reason. Raba said: it is in accord with Resh Lakish, for Resh Lakish said: ‘One must not forego the occasion of performing a religious command’<sup>28</sup>

- 
- (1) If the other priest did not finish the cutting of the organs.
  - (2) In order to obtain a proper supply of blood for the services of the day.
  - (3) V. supra 14b.
  - (4) Actually: the slaying of the animal and the receiving of the blood.
  - (5) Smoking of the limbs of the continual morning-offering.
  - (6) Lev. VI, 5.
  - (7) Connecting ad hoc שלמים peace-offerings’ with the root שלם meaning to be complete, thus: And he shall make smoke thereon the fat of the peace-offerings is made to mean: And he shall . . . the complete sacrifice, the conclusion of the sacrifices.
  - (8) Infra 45a.
  - (9) Lev. VI, 2.
  - (10) Ibid.
  - (11) A special pile of wood, away from the main great pile, was kindled to provide embers for the daily burning of incense on the golden altar; v. Tam. 29a.
  - (12) So that the pile for the incense should come first.
  - (13) Because every smoking, with the exception of that of the incense, smoked on the inner altar, is performed thereon.
  - (14) For incense burning.
  - (15) So that some of the great pile, too, may be introduced within the Sanctuary.
  - (16) This is taken to refer to the two logs of wood.
  - (17) Lev. VI, 5.
  - (18) I.e., the large pile.
  - (19) The second pile for incense.
  - (20) Ibid. In this very same verse, once it has its text meaning, the surplus word intimates the inference.
  - (21) Ex. XXX, 7, E. V., ‘every morning’. [With reference to the smoking of incense, which also includes the removal of the ashes from the inner altar which must precede the incense offering.]
  - (22) Lev. VI, 5.
  - (23) The embers of the wood are essential, for without them no incense can be smoked.
  - (24) And are thus not preparatory to the incense.
  - (25) Lit., ‘the name of’ is wood, and wood is essential for the incense, even though not this wood.
  - (26) The reason why the laying of the two logs precedes the removal of the ashes from the inner altar.
  - (27) That this was the order according to Abba Saul.
  - (28) Infra 58b.

### **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 33b**

and as he [the priest] enters the Hekal [Sanctuary], he comes first upon the altar.<sup>1</sup> For it was taught: The table was to the north two and one half cubits away from the wall, the candlestick was to the south, two and one half cubits away from the wall, the altar stood in the exact middle, extending

somewhat outward.<sup>2</sup> But let it stand with them?<sup>3</sup> — Since it is written: And the candlestick over against the table,<sup>4</sup> it is required that they<sup>5</sup> see each other. Said Raba: From what Resh Lakish said we infer that it is forbidden to forego the arm in favour of the forehead.<sup>6</sup> How shall he do it? From the arm [he shall] proceed to the forehead.<sup>7</sup>

‘And the trimming of the five lamps is to precede the blood of the continual offering, and the blood of the continual offering is to come before the trimming of the two lamps.’ What is the reason? — Abaye said: [The phrases] ‘In the morning, in the morning’, [written] in connection with the two logs of wood,<sup>8</sup> which are not necessary [there]:<sup>9</sup> one<sup>10</sup> applies to the trimming of the five lamps which shall precede the blood of the continual offering; the other applies to the blood of the continual offering which is to come before the trimming of the two lamps.<sup>11</sup> ‘One applies to the trimming of the five lamps which should precede the blood of the continual offering’, for here<sup>12</sup> are three<sup>13</sup> [words], there only two. ‘And the other applies to the blood of the continual offering which should come before the trimming of the two lamps’, for, although in each case there are two,<sup>14</sup> yet, that which obtains atonement<sup>15</sup> has preference.

R. Papa said to Abaye: But say, perhaps, that one is to be applied to the removing of the ashes of the inner altar, which is to precede the blood of the continual offering, for here are three words,<sup>16</sup> there but two; and one applies to the blood of the continual offering that should come before the trimming of the five lamps, for, although in both cases there are but two, the one that obtains atonement is to have preference? — If so, what shall he interrupt it with?<sup>17</sup> It would be quite right according to Resh Lakish who said: The lamps were trimmed and [after interruption] trimmed again.<sup>18</sup> in order to keep the whole Temple Court animated, but according to R. Johanan who interprets ‘In the morning, in the morning’,<sup>19</sup> i.e., divide it into two mornings,<sup>20</sup> what could be said?<sup>21</sup> Said Rabina to R. Ashi: Are the words ‘In the morning, in the morning’ in connection with the wood at all superfluous? Surely they are really necessary for their text meaning, the Divine Law saying that they should precede the second pile for the incense? He replied: Have we not explained: ‘Upon it’ but not upon the other pile, which indicated that the other must have been there already!<sup>22</sup>

Why does he trim the five lamps first, let him trim the two lamps first! — Having started already, let him do the bigger part. Then let him trim six? — Scripture says: When he dresseth the lamps, he shall burn it,<sup>19</sup> and ‘lamps’ is no less than two. — ‘And the trimming of the lamps is to come before the incense’, for Scripture says: ‘When he dresseth the lamps’, and afterwards [it says]. ‘He shall burn it’ [the incense].<sup>19</sup>

‘And the incense [shall precede] the limbs’ — For it was taught: Let that, in connection with which it is said ‘In the morning, in the morning’, precede that, in connection with which Scripture said only, ‘In the morning’ [once].<sup>23</sup>

‘And the limbs [come before] the meal-offering’, for it was taught:<sup>24</sup> Whence do we know that nothing may precede<sup>25</sup> the continual offering of the dawn?

---

(1) Before he reaches the candlestick.

(2) Men. 99a. Eastward towards the entrance into the Hekal,

(3) Between them, i.e., in the exact middle.

(4) Ex. XXVI, 35.

(5) The candlestick and table.

(6) To reverse the order of putting on the tefillin (v. Glos.).

(7) In Deut. VI, 8 it reads: And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thy hand, and they shall be for frontlets between thy eyes. Tosaf. s.v. **עבורי** would have Raba's remark apply to the obligation to touch the tefillin as a preventive of diversion from a prayerful mood.

(8) Lev. VI, 5, v. supra p. 156, n. 2.

- (9) For as preparatory they have preference and come every morning first; v. supra.
- (10) 'In the morning'.
- (11) On the principle that if a certain expression is superfluous in its own context it is applied for hermeneutical purposes to another (אם אינו ענין).
- (12) With reference to the trimming of the lamps.
- (13) I.e., three times 'in the morning': twice in Ex. XXX, 7, and one which we apply as above, whereas the continual offering has but once 'in the morning', Ex. XXIX, 39, to which the one applied from the two logs of wood is to be added.
- (14) Twice in Ex. XXX, 7, which apply to the two lamps equally as to the five, and twice in connection with the continual offering as explained in n. 8.
- (15) V. infra 36a.
- (16) The applied and the two in their own passage. Lev. VI, 5.
- (17) The trimming of the lamps, which according to Abba Saul had to take place before the incense-offering. Since the order would be: the blood of the continual offering, the trimming of the lamps, the incense.
- (18) First five lamps were trimmed and two after a break.
- (19) Ex. XXX, 7.
- (20) By interrupting it through the interpolation of another service in the midst of the original order.
- (21) Hence R. Papa's supposition cannot be admitted.
- (22) V. supra p. 154. nn. 13, 14.
- (23) Ex. XXIX, 39. [Although it has been stated supra that one 'in the morning' is applied to the continual offering from elsewhere, this is only as far as the blood rituals are concerned, but does not apply to the smoking of the limbs (Rashi).]
- (24) Tamid 28b.
- (25) I.e., may be burnt on the main pile of the altar.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 34a

To teach us that it said: And he shall lay the burnt-offering in order upon it,<sup>1</sup> and Raba said 'the burnt-offering' [means] this is the first burnt-offering.<sup>2</sup>

'And the meal-offering [shall precede] the pancakes' — [For Scripture reads]: Burnt-offering and meal-offering.<sup>3</sup>

'And the pancakes precede the drink-offerings', they, too, are considered a species of a meal-offering.

'And the drink-offerings [come before] the additional offerings as is written: A sacrifice and drink-offerings.<sup>4</sup>

'And the additional sacrifices [come before] the [frankincense] censers' — But has it not been taught: The [frankincense] censers come before the additional sacrifices? — This is a matter concerning which Tannaim are disputing.<sup>5</sup> Abaye said: The view that the additional offerings precede the [frankincense] censers seems more logical, for did you not say that the words 'In the morning, in the morning' imply that it is to receive preference before all, thus do the words 'on the day . . . on the day'<sup>6</sup> indicate that it is to be [offered up] last [in the day]. What is the reason of him who holds that the [frankincense] censers come before the additional offerings? — He infers it from the identical expression 'statute'<sup>7</sup> which occurs with the pancakes. If he infers it hence, let him do so complete?<sup>8</sup> — Here [the words] 'on the day . . . on the day' come in to intimate that they [the frankincense censers] are offered up last [in the day].

THE INCENSE OF THE MORNING WAS OFFERED UP BETWEEN THE LIMBS AND THE DRINK-OFFERINGS. According to whom [is this teaching]? If according to the Rabbis,<sup>9</sup> it should come between the blood and the lamps;<sup>10</sup> if according to Abba Saul, it should come between the

lamps and the limbs?<sup>11</sup> — In truth it is in accord with the Rabbis, but he does not treat of the order here.<sup>12</sup>

THE INCENSE OF THE AFTERNOON WAS OFFERED UP BETWEEN THE [SMOKING OF THE] LIMBS AND THE DRINK-OFFERINGS. Whence do we know these things? — R. Johanan said: Because Scripture said: As the meal-offering of the morning, and as the drink-offering thereof, thou shalt present it,<sup>13</sup> i.e., just as with the meal-offering of the morning the incense precedes the drink-offerings, so also here the incense shall come before the drink-offerings. But then, just as there the incense precedes the [smoking] of the limbs, here too the incense should come before the limbs? Is it written: ‘As the limbs of the morning’? It is written: ‘As the meal-offering of the morning’, which means: As the meal-offering of the morning, but not as the [smoking of the] limbs of the morning.

Our Rabbis taught: And the drink-offering thereof shall be the fourth part of a hin:<sup>14</sup> let him infer [the need of a drink-offering] for the morning sacrifice from the evening sacrifice.

---

(1) Lev. VI, 5.

(2) Cf. Hor. 12a.

(3) Lev. XXIII, 37: These are the appointed seasons of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to bring an offering made by fire unto the Lord, a burnt-offering, and a meal-offering, a sacrifice, and drink-offerings, each on its own day. This is the prescribed order, not to be interfered with.

(4) Ibid.

(5) Pes. 58a.

(6) Ibid. XXIV, 8: on the day of the Sabbath, on the day of the Sabbath, shall he set it in order before the Lord, continually. Just as In the morning, in the morning’ was accepted as an intimation that it shall be early in the morning, so ‘On the day, on the day’ may fitly be assumed to be an indication that it is to be offered last in the day.

(7) Concerning the pancakes, the word ‘statute’ is used in Lev. VI, 15, as in connection with the frankincense censers, ibid. XXIV, 9. Just as pancakes take precedence over additional offerings, so do the frankincense censers.

(8) That the frankincense censers should have precedence over the the drink-offerings too.

(9) [That the incense was offered between the trimming of the five lamps and the two lamps, v. supra 15a.]

(10) [I.e., before completing the trimming of the lamps.]

(11) V. supra 33a.

(12) [He was not too particular in regard to the details of the order (Rashi). On this view it could be also in accord with Abba Saul, but it is preferable to make the Mishnah in agreement with the majority of Rabbis (Rashi).]

(13) Num. XXVIII, 8.

(14) Ibid. 7.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 34b

Rabbi said: For the evening sacrifice from the morning sacrifice!<sup>1</sup> It is quite right according to the Rabbis, for that is written [specifically] in connection with the continual offering of the evening,<sup>2</sup> but what is the ground of Rabbi's statement? — Rabbah b. ‘Ulla said: Scripture said: ‘For the one lamb’.<sup>3</sup> Now which is the lamb in connection with which the word ehad [one] is used? Say: It is the lamb of the continual offering of the morning.<sup>4</sup> And what do the Rabbis [reply]? — ‘Ehad’, i.e., the unique, the best of the flock. And [what is] Rabbi's [answer]? — He infers that<sup>5</sup> from: And all your choice vows.<sup>6</sup> And the Rabbis? — One speaks of freewill-[offerings], the other of obligatory [offerings] and both need special mention.<sup>7</sup>

IF THE HIGH PRIEST WAS OLD OR OF DELICATE HEALTH etc. It was taught: R. Judah said: Lumps of wrought iron were heated on the eve of the Day of Atonement and were cast into the cold water to mitigate the coldness. But was [one] not thereby hardening them?<sup>8</sup> — R. Bibi said: [The heat] did not reach the hardening point. Abaye said: Even assume it did reach the hardening

point, [a forbidden] act<sup>9</sup> which was produced without intent, is permitted. But did Abaye say that? Has it not been taught:<sup>10</sup> The flesh of his foreskin<sup>11</sup> — even though a white spot<sup>12</sup> is there may he cut it off,<sup>13</sup> these are the words of R. Josiah. And we asked investigatively concerning it: Why is a Scriptural statement necessary for that,<sup>14</sup> and Abaye said: This was in accord with R. Judah who said: A forbidden act produced without intent, remains forbidden!<sup>15</sup> That applies only to forbidden things in the whole Torah,<sup>16</sup> but here<sup>17</sup> hardening is [forbidden] only by Rabbinic ordination. MISHNAH. THEY BROUGHT HIM TO THE PARVAH CELL-WHICH WAS ON HOLY GROUND.<sup>18</sup> THEY SPREAD A SHEET OF BYSSUS [LINEN] BETWEEN HIM AND THE PEOPLE. HE SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND HIS FEET AND STRIPPED. R. MEIR SAID: HE STRIPPED, SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND HIS FEET. HE WENT DOWN AND IMMERSED HIMSELF, CAME UP AND DRIED HIMSELF. AFTERWARDS THEY BROUGHT HIM WHITE GARMENTS.<sup>19</sup> HE PUT THEM ON AND SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND HIS FEET. IN THE MORNING HE PUT ON PELUSIUM LINEN WORTH TWELVE MINAS,<sup>20</sup> IN THE AFTERNOON INDIAN LINEN WORTH EIGHT HUNDRED ZUZ. THESE ARE THE WORDS OF R. MEIR. THE SAGES SAY: IN THE MORNING HE PUT ON [GARMENTS] WORTH EIGHTEEN MINAS AND IN THE AFTERNOON [GARMENTS] WORTH TWELVE MINAS, ALTOGETHER THIRTY MINAS.<sup>21</sup> ALL THAT AT THE CHARGE OF THE COMMUNITY<sup>22</sup> AND IF HE WANTED TO SPEND MORE OF HIS OWN HE COULD DO SO.

---

(1) Just as the one requires drink-offering, so does the other. The practical difference: The case of a community who had enough for only one drink-offering. According to the opinion that one must infer the regulation for the afternoon-offering from the morning-offering, the latter is more important and the drink-offering would have to be allotted to the morning-offering. (Tosaf. s.v. 'גרי.) The basis of the discussion: To which of the two continual offerings does the phrase 'for the one lamb' (Num. XXVIII, 7) refer? The Sages hold it refers to the last named, the afternoon-offering, whereas Rabbi holds that it recalls the morning-offering, where the same phrase ('one') is used (verse 4).

(2) The last named of the two.

(3) Num. XXVIII, 7.

(4) V. Ibid. 4.

(5) That particular meaning of 'ehad', as applied to the continual offering.

(6) Deut. XII, 11.

(7) As arguments may be advanced in favour of each requiring to be of the best, to the exclusion of the other.

(8) Which is forbidden on any holy day, how much more on the solemn Day of Atonement.

(9) Shab. 41b.

(10) Shab. 133a.

(11) Lev. XII, 3.

(12) Of leprosy, which normally must not be removed by surgery.

(13) The word 'flesh' here is superfluous, hence we infer therefrom that no matter how the flesh be (even leprosy) he may circumcise it.

(14) Since it was a forbidden act produced without intent, it seems self-evident that it would be permitted. Why, then, was the Scriptural intimation necessary?

(15) Abaye, who held that this intimation supported the view of R. Judah, evidently agrees with him.

(16) By the Torah proper, the Five Books of Moses, as against the Torah in general, the sum total of the Jewish law and tradition. Prohibitions of the Torah are more serious, hence even unintended transgression remains forbidden.

(17) The prohibition dealt with here.

(18) The first immersion, on top of the Water Gate, took place on profane ground; this, however, had to be performed on holy ground, as part of the service of the Day of Atonement.

(19) The four garments prescribed for the special service of the Day of Atonement: the tunic, the breeches, the girdle and the mitre, Lev. XVI, 4.

(20) One mina is worth about £ 3.

(21) As long as one spends more for the morning garments than for the evening garments, there is no regulation to enforce the exact sum mentioned in the Mishnah. V. infra. The evening garment was put on by the high priest for the

sole purpose of removing spoon and coal-pan from the Holy of Holies, whereas the rest of the special service of the Day of Atonement was performed by him in the morning garment, hence it has to be the better of the two.

(22) Var. lec.: So much he received from the Temple treasury. V. Bah.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 35a

GEMARA. What does 'Parwah' mean? — R. Joseph said: Parwah is [the name of] a [Persian] Magus.<sup>1</sup>

THEY SPREAD A SHEET OF BYSSUS [LINEN] BETWEEN HIM AND THE PEOPLE. Why was it of Byssus [linen]? R. Kahana said: That he may perceive that the service of the day was [to be performed] in garments of Byssus [linen].

IN THE MORNING HE PUT ON PELUSIUM LINEN WORTH EIGHTEEN MINAS: Does the Tanna wish to teach us summing up?<sup>2</sup> — This is what he teaches us: One should spend neither more nor less than the sum total, but it does not matter whether one spends less for the one or more for the other. Now everybody, at any rate, agrees that the garments for the morning are more important, whence do we know that? — R. Huna, the son of R. Elai said: Scripture said: Linen . . . linen . . . linen . . . linen,<sup>3</sup> i.e., the choicest linen.

---

(1) Rabbenu Hananel reported that according to some scholars, Parwah had dug a cave under the ground of the Sanctuary, so that he might be able to watch the high priest at the service of the Day of Atonement. The Sages, noticing the digging, sought and found the cave, and hence called the cell after him.

(2) The summing up seems superfluous, it is too simple to warrant the statement by the Tanna.

(3) Lev. XVI, 4, in connection with the putting on of the garments in the morning. Four times, as if to indicate the best of all possible linen.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 35b

An objection was raised: And they shall put on other garments and they shall not sanctify the people with their garments.<sup>1</sup> Would you not say that 'other' implies better garments? — No, 'other' implies inferior ones.

R. Huna b. Judah, or, as some say, R. Samuel b. Judah learnt: After the community service is over, a priest for whom his mother made a tunic, may put it on and perform therein private service,<sup>2</sup> provided he hands it over to the community. Is that not self-evident?<sup>3</sup> You might have said: Let us fear he may not hand it over properly,<sup>4</sup> therefore he teaches us that we have no such fear.

They told about R. Ishmael b. Phabi<sup>5</sup> that his mother made him a tunic worth one hundred minas which he put on to officiate at a 'private' service and then handed it over to the community. They told about R. Eleazar b. Harsom<sup>6</sup> that his mother made him a tunic worth twenty thousand minas and his brethren, the priests, would not suffer him to put it on because he looked like one naked. But how could it be transparent, did not a Master say the thread [of the priestly garments] was six times twisted? — Abaye said: [It was visible] even as wine shines through a [glass] cup.<sup>7</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: The poor, the rich, the sensual<sup>8</sup> come before the [heavenly] court — They say to the poor: Why have you not occupied yourself with the Torah? If he says: I was poor and worried about my sustenance, they would say to him: Were you poorer than Hillel? It was reported about Hillel the Elder that every day he used to work and earn one tropaik,<sup>9</sup> half of which he would give to the guard at the House of Learning, the other half being spent for his food and for that of his family. One day he found nothing to earn and the guard at the House of Learning would not permit him to enter. He climbed up and sat upon the window,<sup>10</sup> to hear the words of the living God from the mouth

of Shemayah and Abtalion — They say, that day was the eve of Sabbath in the winter solstice and snow fell down upon him from heaven. When the dawn rose,<sup>11</sup> Shemayah said to Abtalion: Brother Abtalion, on every day this house is light and to-day it is dark, is it perhaps a cloudy day. They looked up and saw the figure of a man in the window. They went up and found him covered by three cubits of snow. They removed him, bathed and anointed him and placed him opposite the fire and they said: This man deserves that the Sabbath be profaned on his behalf.

To the rich man they said: Why have you not occupied yourself with the Torah? If he said: I was rich and occupied with my possessions, they would say to him: Were you perchance richer than R. Eleazar? It was reported about R. Eleazar b. Harsom that his father left him a thousand cities on the continent and over against that one thousand boats on the sea. Every day he would take a sack of flour on his shoulder and go from city to city and from province to province to study the Torah. One day his servants found him<sup>12</sup> and seized him for public service. He said to them: I beg of you, let me go to study the Torah. They said: By the life of R. Eleazar b. Harsom, we shall not let you go. [He gave them much money so that they let him go].<sup>13</sup> He had never seen them, for he was sitting all day and night, occupying himself with the Torah. To the sensual person they would say: Why have you not occupied yourself with the Torah? If he said: I was beautiful and upset by sensual passion, they would say to him: Were you perchance more beautiful than Joseph? It was told of Joseph the virtuous that the wife of Potiphar every day endeavoured to entice him with words — The garments she put on for him in the morning, she did not wear in the evening, those she had put on in the evening, she did not wear in the morning. She said to him: Yield to me! He said: No. She said: I shall have you imprisoned. He said: The Lord releases the bound.<sup>14</sup> She said: I shall bend thy proud stature.<sup>15</sup> He replied: The Lord raises those who are bowed down.<sup>16</sup> She said: I shall blind your eyes. He replied: The Lord opens the eyes of the blind.<sup>16</sup> She offered him a thousand talents of silver to make him yield to her, to lie with her, to be near her,<sup>17</sup> but he would not listen to her; not to 'lie with her' in this world, not 'to be with her' in the world to come. — Thus [the example of] Hillel condemns the poor, [the example of] R. Eleazar b. Harsom condemns the rich, and Joseph the virtuous condemns the sensual.

**MISHNAH. HE CAME TO HIS<sup>18</sup> BULLOCK AND HIS BULLOCK WAS STANDING BETWEEN THE HALL<sup>19</sup> AND THE ALTAR,<sup>20</sup> ITS HEAD TO THE SOUTH AND ITS FACE TO THE WEST.<sup>21</sup> AND THE PRIEST STOOD IN THE EAST WITH HIS FACE TO THE WEST.<sup>22</sup> AND HE PRESSED BOTH HIS HANDS UPON IT<sup>23</sup> AND MADE Confession. AND THUS HE WOULD SAY: O LORD!<sup>24</sup> I HAVE DONE WRONG, I HAVE TRANSGRESSED, I HAVE SINNED BEFORE THEE, I AND MY HOUSE. O LORD! FORGIVE THE WRONGDOINGS, THE TRANSGRESSIONS, THE SINS WHICH I HAVE COMMITTED AND TRANSGRESSED AND SINNED BEFORE THEE, I AND MY HOUSE, AS IT IS WRITTEN IN THE TORAH OF MOSES THY SERVANT: FOR ON THIS DAY SHALL ATONEMENT BE MADE FOR YOU [TO CLEANSE YOU; FROM ALL YOUR SINS SHALL YE BE CLEAN BEFORE THE LORD].<sup>25</sup> AND THEY<sup>26</sup> ANSWERED AFTER HIM: BLESSED BE THE NAME OF HIS GLORIOUS KINGDOM FOR EVER AND EVER!**

---

(1) Ezek. XLIV, 19. [The prohibition of the use of woolen garments in verse 17 shows that the reference is to the Day of Atonement, as on other days some of the priestly garments were made of wool; further, the words 'and they shall put on other garments' are taken as applying to their return in the afternoon into the inner court after they had gone forth into the outer court to put off their garments with which they ministered in the morning, and the words 'they shall not sanctify the people with their garments' are taken as a separate command forbidding the use by the priests of the garments of ministry when not in actual service (Rashi).]

(2) The removal of the spoon and coal-pan, which may be done even when the community is absent, hence is called 'individual or private service.

(3) That he may perform therein a 'private' service once he hands it over to the community.

(4) I.e., without reservation.

- (5) V. supra p. 37, n. 5.
- (6) V. supra p. 37, n. 5.
- (7) Be it ever so thick. Thus was the flax of his garments transparent and his body visible.
- (8) Lit., 'wicked'.
- (9) Corresponding to \*\* (Victoriatu) — Quinariu, half a denar, Jast.
- (10) An aperture in the roof looking down to the ground floor.
- (11) Lit., 'the pillar of the morning'.
- (12) Not knowing who he was.
- (13) This is a marginal addition.
- (14) Ps. CXLVI, 7.
- (15) I.e., humiliate you with a slave's labour.
- (16) Ibid. 8.
- (17) Gen. XXXIX, 10.
- (18) Two bullocks were offered up on that day, one from community funds at the additional sacrifice (Num. XXIX, 8), the other from the high priest's means; the latter, here dealt with, is therefore called 'his' bullock.
- (19) The Ulam leading to the interior of the Temple connecting the Hekal with the Temple court.
- (20) The outer altar in the Temple court.
- (21) The priest turned its head in the direction of the Hekal, so that the horns, between which the priest pressed his hands on its head, faced the Hekal, v. Gemara.
- (22) The priest thus stood at the side of his bullock, his back to the altar, his face towards the Holy of Holies.
- (23) I.e., upon its head, between the horns.
- (24) Lit., 'O, the Name'.
- (25) Lev. XVI, 30.
- (26) The priests and the people who stood in the Temple court and who, on hearing him pronounce the ineffable Name of God, prostrated themselves.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 36a

GEMARA. Whom did you hear saying that the place between Hall and altar was [considered] north?<sup>1</sup> R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon, for it was taught: What is [considered] north? From the northern wall of the altar up to the [northern] wall of the Temple court and opposite the whole altar on the north,<sup>2</sup> this is the opinion of R. Jose son of R. Judah. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon adds also the space between the Hall and the altar.<sup>3</sup> Rabbi adds also the space for the treading of the priests and the place for the treading of the Israelites within,<sup>4</sup> and all agree that from the inside of the knives' cell<sup>5</sup> it was illegitimate.<sup>6</sup> Shall we [then] say that the Mishnah is in accord with R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon, but not with Rabbi? — You can even say that it is in accord with Rabbi, for if he adds even<sup>7</sup> to what R. Jose son of R. Judah says, will he not add to [the space defined by] R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon!<sup>8</sup> This is what we mean: If it were in accord with Rabbi, it<sup>9</sup> could be placed anywhere in the whole Temple court! What, then [would you maintain] that [the Mishnah] is in accord with R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon! But then it ought to be placed anywhere between altar and wall?<sup>10</sup> You must consequently say that the reason<sup>11</sup> is to avoid the high priest getting tired;<sup>12</sup> thus also, on the view of Rabbi, the reason<sup>11</sup> is to avoid the high priest getting tired.

ITS HEAD TO THE SOUTH, AND ITS FACE TO THE WEST. How is that possible?— Rab answered: The priest turns its head — But let him place it straight?<sup>13</sup> — Abaye said: We are afraid it might drop excrements. Our Rabbis taught:<sup>14</sup> How does one press [the hands on the head of the sacrifice]?<sup>15</sup> The sacrifice stands to the north,<sup>16</sup> with its face to the west, and he who presses<sup>17</sup> [the hands] stands to the east, with his face to the west, and lays his two hands between the two horns of the sacrifice, that nothing may intervene between him and the sacrifice<sup>18</sup> — and he makes confession. With a sin-offering [he makes confession] of the sin [committed]; with a guilt-offering, of the guilt incurred; with a burnt-offering, of the transgressions in connection with gleanings,<sup>19</sup> the forgotten sheaf,<sup>20</sup> the corner of the field,<sup>19</sup> and the poor tithe<sup>21</sup> — these are the words of R. Jose the

Galilean. R. Akiba said: A burnt-offering is offered up exclusively for transgression of a positive command or of a prohibition transformed into a command.<sup>22</sup> In what do they differ? R. Jeremiah said:

(1) [For the purposes of slaughtering the sacrifice of the high priest, which, as belonging to the highest grade of sanctity had to be slaughtered on the north side. Such must be the view of the Mishnah which states that the bullock was placed between the Hall and the altar for confession as well as for slaughtering purposes, v. infra 41b: 'At the place where the confession was made there it was slaughtered'.]

(2) Only the thirty-two cubits to the north and facing the altar are considered part of the north, where the slaughtering of sacrifices of the highest grade of sanctity is legitimate, but not the space east and west of the altar, although lying to the north of the Temple court, for the biblical command states: And he shall kill it on the side of the altar northward before the Lord. (Lev. I, 11), for though these parts are to the north of the Temple court, they are not to the north of the altar.

(3) [He includes the space on the north side of the Temple court extending westwards, although not exactly facing the northern wall of the altar.]

(4) Eleven cubits each. He includes the whole north of the Temple court, even to the eastern wall.

(5) V. Mid. IV, 7, to the north and south of the Temple court. This cell, fifteen cubits to the north, fifteen to the south, ten from east to west, had twenty-four apertures where the twenty-four divisions of priests kept their knives.

(6) From the knives' cell within it was impossible to see the wall altar, hence it was forbidden to slaughter it there, Zeb. 20a.

(7) Surely when he declares that space which, is further away is legitimate he will not declare forbidden that which is nearer!

(8) [The text is difficult. MS. M. omits 'You can even say it is in accord with Rabbi'.]

(9) The high priest's bullock.

(10) On the north of the Temple court.

(11) For placing it between the Hall and the altar.

(12) To prevent his becoming over-tired by carrying the bowl with the blood a long distance.

(13) With its back to the altar and its face to the Hekal.

(14) Tosef. Men. X, 12.

(15) Of the highest grade of sanctity.

(16) The side on which it is to be slain.

(17) The owner of the sacrifice.

(18) Men. 93b, the text in the Tosef. differs somewhat.

(19) Lev. XIX, 9: Neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest.

(20) Deut. XXIV, 19.

(21) Ibid. XXVI, 12.

(22) I.e., a prohibition the transgression of which must be repaired by a succeeding act, as e.g., Ex. XII, 10: You shall let nothing of it remain until the morning (prohibition); But that which remaineth... you shall burn in fire (remedial action).

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 36b

They differ concerning the prohibition of carrion,<sup>1</sup> R. Akiba holding it to be a proper prohibition,<sup>2</sup> whilst R. Jose the Galilean does not consider it a proper prohibition.<sup>3</sup> Abaye said: Everybody agrees that the prohibition of carrion is a proper prohibition, what they differ in is the laws touching 'Thou shalt leave',<sup>4</sup> R. Akiba holding 'Thou shalt leave' means from the very beginning,<sup>5</sup> whilst R. Jose the Galilean holds it means 'now'.<sup>6</sup> Our Rabbis taught:<sup>7</sup> How does he make confession: I have done wrong, I have transgressed I have sinned — Similarly, in connection with the he-goat to be sent away Scripture says: And he shall confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions even in their sins.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, with Moses, it says: Forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin<sup>9</sup> — these are the words of R. Meir. The Sages, however, say: 'Wrongs' are deliberate misdeeds, thus also does Scripture say: That soul shall be utterly cut off, his wrong shall be upon him,<sup>10</sup> 'transgressions' are rebellious deeds, as it is said: The King of Moab hath transgressed against me;<sup>11</sup> furthermore: Then did Libnah transgress at the same time; 'sins'<sup>12</sup> are

inadvertent omissions, as it is said: If any one shall sin through error.<sup>13</sup> — Should he then, after having confessed the deliberate misdeeds and the rebellious deeds, turn back and confess inadvertent omissions?<sup>14</sup> Rather, thus did he make confession: I have sinned, I have done wrong, I have transgressed before Thee, I and my house etc. Thus also does Scripture say in connection with David: We have sinned with our fathers, we have done wrong, we have dealt wickedly.<sup>15</sup> Thus also with Solomon: We have sinned, and have done wrong, we have dealt wickedly.<sup>16</sup> Thus also with Daniel: We have sinned, and have dealt wrong, and have done wickedly.<sup>17</sup> — What is the meaning, then, of Moses' saying: 'Forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin'?<sup>18</sup> Moses said before the Holy One, blessed be He: Lord of the Universe, when Israel sin before Thee and then do penance, account their premeditated sins as errors! Rabbah b. Samuel said in the name of Rab: The halachah is in accord with the Sages. But [that is] self-evident, for 'Where the opinion of one individual is opposed to the opinion of a majority, the law follows the majority'?<sup>19</sup> — You might have said: The reason of R. Meir appears more logical because the scriptural verse of Moses<sup>20</sup> supports it, therefore we are taught [as above].

Once a man went down<sup>21</sup> before Rabbah and arranged his prayer in accord with R. Meir's view. He said to him: Do you forsake the Sages and act like R. Meir? — He answered: I hold as R. Meir, for thus it is written in the Torah of Moses.

Our Rabbis taught:<sup>22</sup> And shall make atonement<sup>23</sup> — Scripture speaks of atonement through words.<sup>24</sup> You say it refers to atonement through words. But perhaps it refers to atonement [obtained] through [sacrificial] blood? I infer it thus: Here 'atonement is mentioned and there<sup>25</sup> 'atonement' is mentioned — Just as the atonement mentioned in connection with the he-goat is one through words, so the atonement mentioned with the bullock is one obtained through words. And if you wish to argue against it, then [learn from]: And Aaron shall present the bullock for the sin-offering, which is for himself and shall make atonement for himself and for his house,<sup>23</sup> yet the bullock has not been slaughtered!<sup>26</sup> What does 'And if you wish to argue against it' imply? — This: And if you would say: Let us infer from the he-goat prepared within the Temple, the atonement of which is obtained through blood, behold [against that argument] Scripture says: 'And he shall make atonement', and the bullock has not been slaughtered yet!

---

(1) Carrion-an animal that has died a natural death; also whatever has become unfit through faulty slaughtering.

(2) [For which lashes are inflicted, and for which a burnt-offering does not atone.]

(3) Because once one has eaten the carrion, it is no more possible to sell it to the stranger or give it to the sojourner as prescribed in Deut. XIV, 21, R. Akiba holding it a proper prohibition, for the transgression of which one would be punished with the prescribed thirty-nine lashes, the fact that one cannot repair the transgression notwithstanding. According to R. Jose no such punishment would here be inflicted, hence it is not a proper prohibition.

(4) Thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither gather the fallen fruit of thy vineyard. Thou shalt leave them for the poor and for the stranger. (Lev. XIX, 9.)

(5) V. next note.

(6) Here is another instance of a prohibition transformed into a command: Thou shalt not glean . . . thou shalt leave them. R. Akiba holds the positive commandment is enjoined from the very first, that is, thus: do not glean but leave; hence it is not a prohibition transformed into a command, but a command from the beginning; whilst R. Jose assumes that it is a de facto command: Don't glean, but having gleaned, undo your transgression by leaving it etc.

(7) Tosef. Yoma, II, 1.

(8) Lev. XVI, 21.

(9) Ex. XXXIV, 7.

(10) Num. XV, 31.

(11) II Kings III, 7.

(12) Ibid. VIII, 22.

(13) Lev. IV, 2.

(14) It is illogical to ask forgiveness for the gravest offences first and then for the lighter ones.

- (15) Ps. CVI, 6.  
 (16) I Kings VIII, 47.  
 (17) Dan. IX, 5. In all these cases the logical order is maintained, forgiveness being asked, first, for the sins due to inadvertence, then for those deliberate misdeeds, at last for rebellious acts.  
 (18) Where the order appears reversed.  
 (19) Ber. 9".  
 (20) Which agrees, as to the order, with R. Meir.  
 (21) To the prayer desk.  
 (22) Meg. 20b.  
 (23) Lev. XVI, 11.  
 (24) I.e., confession.  
 (25) In connection with the he-goat that is sent away. Lev. XVI, 10.  
 (26) How then is atonement possible? It can be obtained through confession.

### **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 37a**

— Whence do we know that [the confession] starts with ‘O’? — Here the expression ‘atonement’ is used and there, in connection with Mount Horeb,<sup>1</sup> the expression ‘atonement’ is used, [hence the inference that] just as it started there with ‘O’<sup>2</sup> so must it start here with ‘O’ Whence do we know that the Name<sup>3</sup> is to be pronounced here?—Here the word ‘atonement’ is used and in connection with the heifer whose neck is to be broken<sup>4</sup> the word ‘atonement’ is used, [hence the inference that] just as there the Name is pronounced, so is it to be pronounced here. Abaye said: It is quite right that we cannot make inference for Horeb from the heifer whose neck is to be broken,<sup>5</sup> because that is a past affair, but why should one not infer for the heifer whose neck is to be broken from what happened at [Mount] Horeb?<sup>6</sup> — And if you will say ‘indeed so’, but have we not learned:<sup>7</sup> ‘The priests say: Forgive Thy people Israel’,<sup>8</sup> but they mention nothing about ‘O!’- This is a difficulty.

AND THEY ANSWERED AFTER HIM: It was taught: Rabbi said, [commenting on]: For I will proclaim the name of the Lord; Ascribe ye greatness unto our God:<sup>9</sup> Moses said to Israel: When I mention the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, ascribe greatness [unto Him]; Hananyah, the son of the brother of R. Joshua said [commenting on]: The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing:<sup>10</sup> The prophet said to Israel: When I make reference to the Righteous One of all the Worlds, say a blessing!

MISHNAH. HE THEN WENT BACK TO THE EAST OF THE TEMPLE COURT, TO THE NORTH OF THE ALTAR, THE DEPUTY HIGH PRIEST<sup>11</sup> AT HIS RIGHT AND THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY<sup>12</sup> [MINISTERING THAT WEEK] AT HIS LEFT. THERE WERE TWO HE-GOATS<sup>13</sup> AND AN URN<sup>14</sup> CONTAINING TWO LOTS. THEY WERE OF BOX-WOOD. BEN GAMALA MADE THEM OF GOLD AND THEREFORE HE WAS PRAISED. BEN KATIN MADE TWELVE SPIGOTS FOR THE LAVER,<sup>15</sup> FOR THERE HAD BEEN BEFORE BUT TWO. HE ALSO MADE A MACHINE FOR THE LAVER, IN ORDER THAT ITS WATER SHOULD NOT BECOME UNFIT BY REMAINING OVERNIGHT.<sup>16</sup> KING MONOBAZ<sup>17</sup> HAD ALL THE HANDLES OF ALL THE VESSELS USED ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT MADE OF GOLD. HIS MOTHER HELENA<sup>18</sup> HAD A GOLDEN CANDLESTICK MADE OVER THE DOOR OF THE HEKAL. SHE ALSO HAD A GOLDEN TABLET MADE, ON WHICH THE PORTION TOUCHING THE SUSPECTED ADULTERESS<sup>19</sup> WAS INSCRIBED. NICANOR<sup>20</sup> EXPERIENCED MIRACLES WITH HIS GATES AND HIS MONEY WAS PRAISED.

GEMARA. Since [the Mishnah] reads: TO THE NORTH OF THE ALTAR, one infers that the altar was not standing in the north.<sup>21</sup> Whose opinion represents our Mishnah? The opinion of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for it was taught: Northward before the Lord,<sup>22</sup> i.e., the north must be fully unoccupied — this is the opinion of R. Eliezer b. Jacob.<sup>23</sup> But the first part of the Mishnah is in

accord with R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon? — The whole of the Mishnah is in accord with R. Eliezer b. Jacob,<sup>24</sup> but read there: In the space between Hall and altar.

THE DEPUTY HIGH PRIEST AT HIS RIGHT AND THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY AT HIS LEFT: Rab Judah said:<sup>25</sup> One who walks at his master's right hand is a boor. [But] we have learnt: THE DEPUTY HIGH PRIEST AT HIS RIGHT AND THE HEAD OF THE [MINISTERING] FAMILY AT HIS LEFT; and furthermore, it was taught:<sup>26</sup> Of three walking along, the teacher should walk in the middle, the greater of his disciples to his right, the smaller one at his left, and thus do we find that of the three angels who came to visit Abraham, Michael went in the middle, Gabriel at his right,<sup>27</sup> Raphael at his left? — R. Samuel b. Papa interpreted [the first saying] before R. Adda: [It is wrong only, if] he [the teacher] be hidden by him — But has it not been taught: One who walks in front of his teacher is a boor, one who walks behind him is arrogant? — [It is assumed here] that he turns sideways.

AND THERE WAS A CASKET WHEREIN THERE WERE TWO LOTS: Our Rabbis taught: [with reference to] And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats<sup>28</sup> — ‘lots’, i.e., made of any material. One might have assumed that he should cast two lots on the head of each,<sup>29</sup> therefore [Scripture repeats]: One lot for the Lord and the other lot for Azazel,<sup>28</sup> i.e., there is but one lot ‘for the Lord’, and there is but one lot ‘for Azazel’ — One might have assumed that he shall give upon the head of each<sup>29</sup> a lot each ‘for the Lord’ and ‘for Azazel’, therefore Scripture says: ‘One lot for the Lord’, i.e., there is but one lot ‘for the Lord’ and but one lot ‘for Azazel’ — Why then does Scripture say: [he shall cast] ‘lots’? [That means to say] that they must be alike: he must not make one of gold and the other of silver, one large, the other small; ‘lots’ [means they may be made] of any material. But that is self-evident? — No, it is necessary [to state that], as it was taught: Since we find that the [high priest's] front-plate had the name of the Lord inscribed thereon and was made of gold, I might have assumed that this too must be made of gold, hence it says [twice] ‘lot’ . . . ‘lot’, to include [permission to make it of] olive-wood, nut-wood or box-wood.<sup>30</sup> BEN KATIN MADE TWELVE SPIGOTS FOR THE LAVER: A Tanna taught: In order that his twelve brethren, the priests, who were occupied with the continual offering, may be able to sanctify their hands and feet simultaneously.<sup>31</sup>

A Tanna taught:<sup>32</sup> In the morning, when the laver was full, he sanctified his hands and feet from the upper spigot; in the evening, when [the water] was low, he sanctified his hands and feet from the lower spigot.

HE ALSO MADE A MACHINE FOR THE LAVER: What machine was that? — Abaye said: A wheel which let it go down [to the pit].

KING MONOBAZ MADE ALL THE HANDLES FOR THE VESSELS etc.: He should have made [the vessels] them[selves] of gold?

---

(1) Ex. XXXII, 30. The similarity of expression indicates some similarity of procedure, hence the inference is legitimate. Thus also below.

(2) Ibid. v. 31.

(3) The ineffable name of God. ‘**י**’ may be ‘B essentiae’.

(4) Deut. XXI, 8.

(5) To pronounce the Name also here.

(6) To start with ‘O’.

(7) Sot. 47b.

(8) Deut. XXI, 8.

(9) Deut. XXXII, 3.

(10) Prov. X, 7.

- (11) Segan. V. Glos.  
 (12) Beth Ab. V. Glos.  
 (13) Lev. XVI, 5,7.  
 (14) The Greek \*\*.  
 (15) The priests washed (sanctified) their hands and feet with the water of that laver, before entering the Sanctuary or preparing a service. They turned the spigots and the water came over their hands and feet.  
 (16) The sacred vessels sanctify everything that comes in contact with them (Zeb. 86a), and whatever has thus been sanctified becomes invalid by remaining overnight. Ben Katin's machine (\*\*\*) connected the laver with the well, thus retaining for it the undisturbable freshness of the well, hence, when drawn up in the morning, by means of the wheel, it remained valid for sacred use. The heavy laver, until then, had to be filled every morning afresh, after being emptied of last night's water — a laborious, time-wasting effort.  
 (17) He was king of Adiabene in the last years before the destruction of the second Temple.  
 (18) She was queen of Adiabene.  
 (19) Num. V, 11-31. V. Git. 60a.  
 (20) V. Tosef. II, 4, and with slight modifications, the account infra 38a.  
 (21) [I.e., that no part of the altar extended to the north half of the Temple court, so that on retracing his steps from the Temple proper to the Temple court, and reaching the altar, he was on the north of it.]  
 (22) Lev. I, 11.  
 (23) Zeb. 59a.  
 (24) Who said: Part of the altar extended to the north, whence he permitted the bullock to be slaughtered between Hall and altar. V. supra 36a and note. (10) In the preceding Mishnah: The bullock was standing near the place between Hall and altar, about the northern corner of the latter, not in the north exactly'.  
 (25) Hul. 91a.  
 (26) 'Er. 54b.  
 (27) To the right, somewhat behind him, not next to him, because in the latter case he would cover him and that is unseemly.  
 (28) Lev. XVI, 8.  
 (29) Since Scripture says 'lots' instead of 'a lot each'.  
 (30) [Since the repetition of 'lot' intimates that they can be made of any material, the word 'lots' must likewise mean of any material, Tosef. s.v. יְרוֹטִים  
 (31) V. supra 25b.  
 (32) [What follows gives the reason why formerly there had been, as stated in the Mishnah, two spigots; v. D.S. a.l.]

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 37b

— Abaye said: [Reference here is made to] the handles of the knives.

The following objection was raised: He also made of gold the base of the vessels, the rims of the vessels, the handles of the vessels and the handles of the knives [used on the Day of Atonement]? — Abaye explained: These are the helms of axes and adzes.

HIS MOTHER HELENA MADE A CANDLESTICK OF GOLD etc.: A Tanna taught:<sup>1</sup> When the sun was shining, sparkling rays proceeded from it and all knew then that the time had arrived for the reading of the [morning] Shema'.<sup>2</sup> An objection was raised: One who reads the Shema' in the morning together with the linen of the [priestly] Mishmar or the [laymen] Ma'amad,<sup>3</sup> has not fulfilled his duty, because the men of the Mishmar read it early and the men of the Ma'amad read it too late.<sup>4</sup> — Abaye said: It was for the rest of the people of Jerusalem.

SHE ALSO MADE A TABLET: Do you not conclude from this that one may write a scroll for a child for practising purposes?<sup>5</sup> — Resh Lakish said in the name of R. Jannai: Alphabetically.<sup>6</sup> An objection was raised: Whilst writing he<sup>7</sup> looks unto the tablet and copies what is written on the tablet?<sup>8</sup> — Say: He looks and writes as it is written on the tablet.<sup>9</sup> He raised this objection: When he

writes he looks and copies what is written on the tablet, and what is written thereon? And if some man have lain with thee . . . if no man have lain with thee; if thou hast gone aside . . . and if thou hast not gone aside!<sup>10</sup> — There it was written

---

(1) Tosef. II, 3.

(2) V. Ber. 26a.

(3) V. Glos.

(4) They postponed the reading of the Shema' until their service in connection with the continual offering had been completed. How then did the sparks inform them when this information for practical purposes was useless?

(5) In Git. 60a there is a discussion on this matter, one view permitting the writing of individual portions, the other holding only the whole Torah may be written out. Our Mishnah might settle the dispute there.

(6) What is involved here is not the real copying of a chapter of the Torah, but a kind of mnemotechnic device, with the initial letters only written out, the complete text to be supplied by memory, with the guidance of these hints.

(7) The priest who writes the scroll which the suspected adulteress must drink up.

(8) Indicating that the complete text was contained thereon.

(9) I.e., the initial letters serve him as guide.

(10) Num. V, 19, 20.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 38a**

by sections.<sup>1</sup>

**NICANOR EXPERIENCED MIRACLES WITH HIS DOORS:** Our Rabbis taught: What miracles happened to his doors? It was reported that when Nicanor had gone to fetch doors<sup>2</sup> from Alexandria of Egypt, on his return a gale arose in the sea to drown him. Thereupon they took one of his doors and cast it into the sea and yet the sea would not stop its rage. When, thereupon, they prepared to cast the other into the sea, he rose and clung to it, saying: 'Cast me in with it!' [They did so, and] the sea stopped Immediately its raging. He was deeply grieved about the other [door]. As he arrived at the harbour of Acco, it broke through and came up from under the sides of the boat. — Others say: A monster of the sea swallowed it and spat it out on the dry land Touching this, Solomon said: The beams of our houses are cedars, and our panels are berothim [cypresses].<sup>3</sup> Do not read 'berothim [cypresses] but 'brith yam',<sup>4</sup> I.e., covenant of the sea'. — Therefore all the gates in the Sanctuary were changed for golden ones with the exception of the Nicanor gates because of the miracles wrought with them. But some say: Because the bronze of which they were made had a golden hue.<sup>5</sup> R. Eliezer b. Jacob said: It was Corinthian bronze,<sup>6</sup> which shone like gold.

**MISHNAH. AND THESE WERE MENTIONED TO THEIR SHAME: THEY OF THE HOUSE OF GARMU WOULD NOT TEACH ANYTHING ABOUT THE PREPARATION OF THE SHEWBREAD;<sup>7</sup> THEY OF THE HOUSE OF ABTINAS WOULD NOT TEACH ANYTHING ABOUT THE PREPARATION OF THE INCENSE; HYGROS, SON [OF THE TRIBE] OF LEVI KNEW A CADENCE<sup>8</sup> IN SONG BUT WOULD NOT TEACH IT; BEN KAMZAR WOULD NOT TEACH ANYONE HIS ART OF WRITING.<sup>9</sup> CONCERNING THE FORMER IT IS SAID: THE MEMORY OF THE RIGHTEOUS SHALL BE FOR A BLESSING;<sup>10</sup> CONCERNING THE OTHERS IT IS SAID: BUT THE NAME OF THE WICKED SHALL ROT.**

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis taught: The house of Garmu was expert in preparing the shewbread, but would not teach it — The Sages sent for specialists from Alexandria of Egypt, who knew how to bake as well as they, but they did not know how to take [the loaves] down [from the oven] as well as the former, for they were heating the oven from without and baked from within, whereas the latter heated the oven from within and baked from within [with the result] that the bread of the latter became mouldy, whereas the bread of the former did not grow mouldy. When the Sages heard that, they quoted: Everyone that is called by My name [and whom] I have created for My glory,<sup>11</sup> and

said: Let the house of Garmu return to their office. The Sages sent for them, but they would not come. Then they doubled their hire and they came. [Until now] they used to get twelve minas for the day, [from] that day, twenty-four minas. R. Judah said: [Until then] they received twenty-four minas per day, [from] that day they received forty-eight minas. The Sages said to them: What ground did you see for refusing to teach [your art]? They said to them: In our father's house they knew that this House will be destroyed, and perhaps an unworthy man would learn it and then proceed to serve an idol with it. — For the following was their memory honoured: Never was fine bread to be found in their children's hand, lest people say: These feed from the [preparation of]<sup>12</sup> the shewbread — Thus [they endeavoured] to fulfil [the command]: Ye shall be clear before the Lord and before Israel.<sup>13</sup>

THEY OF THE HOUSE OF ABTINAS WOULD NOT TEACH ANYTHING ABOUT THE PREPARATION OF THE INCENSE. Our Rabbis taught: The house of Abtinah were expert in preparing the incense but would not teach [their art]. The Sages sent for specialists from Alexandria of Egypt, who knew how to compound incense as well as they, but did not know how to make the smoke ascend as well as they. The smoke of the former ascended [as straight] as a stick, whereas the smoke of the latter was scattered in every direction. When the Sages heard thereof, they quoted: 'Everyone that is called by My name, I have created for My glory',<sup>14</sup> as it is said: The Lord hath made everything for His own purpose,<sup>15</sup> and [said]: The house of Abtinah may return to their [wonted] place. The Sages sent for them, but they would not come. Then they doubled their hire and they came. Every day [thitherto] they would receive twelve minas, [from] that day twenty-four. The Sages said to them: What reason did you have for not teaching [your art]? They said: They knew in our father's house that this House is going to be destroyed and they said: Perhaps an unworthy man will learn [this art] and will serve an idol therewith. — And for the following reason was their memory kept in honour: Never did a bride of their house go forth perfumed and when they married a woman from elsewhere they expressly forbade her to do so lest people say: From [the preparation of] the incense they are perfuming themselves. [They did so] to fulfil the command: 'Ye shall be clear before the Lord and before Israel.'<sup>16</sup>

It was taught: R. Ishmael said: Once I was walking on the way and I came upon one of their children's children and I said to him: Your forefathers sought to increase their glory and to reduce the glory of the Creator, now the glory of the Creator is at its wonted place, and He has reduced their glory. R. Akiba said: R. Ishmael b. Luga related to me: One day I and one of their descendants went to the field to gather herbs and I saw him crying and laughing. I said to him: 'Why did you cry?' He answered: 'I recalled the glory of my ancestors' — 'And why did you laugh happily?' He replied: 'Because the Holy One, blessed be He, will restore it to us' — 'And what caused you to remember?' He said: 'There is smoke-raiser<sup>17</sup> before me'. 'Show it to me!' He said to me: 'We are bound by oath not to show it to any person' — R. Johanan b. Nuri said: Once I came upon an old man, who had a scroll [containing prescriptions] for frankincense in his hand. I asked him: 'Whence are you [derived]?' He said: 'I come from the house of Abtinah' — 'What have you in your hand?' He replied: 'A scroll [containing prescriptions] for frankincense.' 'Show it to me!' He said: 'As long as my father's house was alive they would not surrender it to any one, but now here it is, but be very careful about it — When I came and told thereof to R. Akiba he said: 'Henceforth it is forbidden to speak of them in dispraise' — Referring to this<sup>18</sup> Ben 'Azzai said: By your name you will be called, to your place you will be restored

---

(1) Not the initial letters of the words, but the initial words of the verses: The headings of sections were written out, the rest intimated by initial letters.

(2) The doors for the great eastern gate of the Temple Court.

(3) Cant. I, 17.

(4) Without any radical change of the text, except the division of the words, which in the original was hardly noticeable. V. Blau, *Einleitung in die Schrift*, p. 119f. [Aliter: Do not read 'berothim' (ברותים) but berithim (בריתים), 'covenants', the doors having made a covenant with each other to be together. V. Rashi and D.S. a.l.]

(5) Mid. II, 3.

(6) Corinthian bronze was refined, hence the light weight, hence the golden hue, as against the duller tone of the heavier bronze.

(7) The twelve shewbread loaves, resting in the Hekal on the golden table from Sabbath to Sabbath (Ex. XXV, 30 and Lev. XXIV, 5-9) were very thin and fragile. Made of some four quarts of flour, they were about one half inch in thickness, some twenty-eight inches in length, some twelve inches in breadth. There were some artistic devices at the corners, which made the preparation a highly difficult art. They would be baked on Friday, often on Wednesday, to be eaten on the Sabbath of the following week, and extraordinary skill was required to keep them fresh and well-tasting. The secret of the baking and removing them, from the oven without breaking them was kept by the house of Garmu, for failure to reveal which they are branded here. The Talmud, however, adduces some mitigating reasons for this apparent niggardliness.

(8) A somewhat difficult phrase. Evidently in connection with the Temple songs. It may have been a specially composed finale, allowing for individual margins of musical ingenuity (Baneth).

(9) V. Gemara.

(10) Prov. X, 17.

(11) Isa. XLIII, 7; hence the best should be available for the Sanctuary, even if cost is involved.

(12) Profits, remainders, at any rate not from their own. One must avoid giving the appearance of unrighteous action, even when acting rightly.

(13) Num. XXXII, 22.

(14) V. p. 176, n. 1.

(15) Prov. XVI, 4; thus that skill must not be allowed to remain unused.

(16) Num. XXXII, 22.

(17) The name of a plant whose identity had to be hidden from all but the members of the house of Abtinas.

(18) Their re-instatement into the original office.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 38b**

and from what belongs<sup>1</sup> to you will you be given. No man can touch what is prepared for his fellow and 'One kingdom does not interfere with the other<sup>2</sup> even to the extent of one hair's breadth'.<sup>3</sup>

HYGROS OF THE TRIBE OF LEVI etc. It was taught: When he tuned his voice to a trill, he would put his thumb into his mouth and place his finger [on the division line] between the two parts of the moustache, so that his brethren, the priests, staggered backward with a sudden movement.<sup>4</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Ben Kamzar would not teach anything about [his art of] writing. It was said about him that he would take four pens between his fingers and if there was a word of four letters<sup>5</sup> he would write it at once. They said to him: 'What reason have you for refusing to teach it?' All found an answer for their matter [attitude]. Ben Kamzar could not find one. Concerning [all] former ones it is said: 'The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing', with regard to Ben Kamzar and his like it is said: 'But the name of the wicked shall rot' — What is the meaning of 'But the name of the wicked shall rot'? — R. Eleazar said: Rottenness enters their names, none name their children after them.

Rabina raised an objection: The story of Doeg b. Joseph whom his father left to his mother when he was a young child: Every day his mother would measure him by handbreadths<sup>6</sup> and would give his [extra] weight in gold to the Sanctuary. And when the enemy prevailed, she slaughtered him and ate him, and concerning her Jeremiah lamented: Shall the women eat their fruit, their children that are handled in the hands?<sup>7</sup> Whereupon the Holy Spirit replied: Shall the priest and the prophet be slain in the Sanctuary of the Lord?<sup>8</sup> — See what happened to him!<sup>9</sup>

R. Eleazar said: The righteous man is remembered by his own [good deeds], the wicked [also] by those of his fellow. [Proof that] the righteous [is remembered] by his own [good deeds], for it is

written: 'The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing'. The wicked [is remembered also] by his associate[*'s wickedness*], for it is written: 'But the name of the wicked [pl.] shall rot.' — Rabina said to one of the Rabbis who expounded Aggada before him: Whence is this statement, which the Rabbis mention: The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing? — He replied: It is a scriptural verse: 'The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing.' Whence, in the Torah, may that teaching be derived? — From what is written: Shall I hide from Abraham that which I am doing?<sup>10</sup> And it is [there] also written: Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation.<sup>11</sup> [He asked further]: Whence do we know this matter, which the Rabbis mention: But the name of the wicked shall rot? — He replied: It is a scriptural verse: 'But the name of the wicked shall rot'. Whence, in the Torah, may this teaching be derived?—From what is written: And he moved his tent as far as Sodom,<sup>12</sup> and it is written: Now the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners against the Lord exceedingly.<sup>13</sup>

R. Eleazar said: A righteous man once lived between two wicked men and did not learn from their deeds, a wicked man lived between two righteous men and did not learn from their ways — The righteous who lived between two wicked men and did not learn from their wicked ways was Obadiah.<sup>14</sup> The wicked man living between two righteous men and not learning from their ways was Esau.

R. Eleazar [also] said: From the blessing of the righteous you can infer the curse for the wicked and from the curse of the wicked you may infer the blessing for the righteous — From the blessing of the righteous you can infer the curse for the wicked, as it is written: For I have known him, to the end that he may command,<sup>15</sup> and [soon] after that it is written: And the Lord said: Verily the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great.<sup>16</sup> From the curse of the wicked you can infer the blessing for the righteous, for it is written: Now the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners against the Lord exceedingly.<sup>17</sup> And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him . . . [all the land, which thou seest, to thee will I give . . .]<sup>18</sup>

R. Eleazar further said: Even for the sake of a single righteous man would this world have been created for it is said: And God saw the light that it was [for one who is] good,<sup>19</sup> and 'good' means but the righteous, as it is said: Say ye of the righteous that he is the good one.<sup>20</sup>

R. Eleazar said also: Whoever forgets [through neglect] any part of his study, causes his children to go into exile, as it is said: Seeing that thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I also will forget thy children.<sup>21</sup> R. Abbahu said: Such a one is deprived of his greatness, as it is said: Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me.<sup>22</sup>

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan: No righteous man dies out of this world, before another, like himself, is created,<sup>23</sup> as it is said: The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down<sup>24</sup> , — before the sun of Eli set, the sun of Samuel of Ramathaim rose. R. Hiyya b. Abba also said in the name of R. Johanan: The Holy One, blessed be He, saw that the righteous are but few, therefore He planted them throughout all generations, as it is said: For the pillars of the earth are the Lord's, and He hath set the world upon them.<sup>25</sup>

R. Hiyya b. Abba said also in the name of R. Johanan: Even for the sake of a single righteous man does the world endure, as it is said: But the righteous is the foundation of the world.<sup>26</sup> R. Hiyya himself infers this from here: He will keep the feet of His holy ones<sup>27</sup> 'Holy ones' means many? — R. Nahman b. Isaac said: It is written: His holy' one.<sup>27</sup>

R. Hiyya b. Abba said further in the name of R. Johanan: When the majority of a man's years have passed without sin, he will no more sin, as it is said: 'He will keep the feet of His holy ones'. In the school of Shila it was taught that if the opportunity for sin has come to a man the first and the second

time and he resisted, he will never sin, as it is said: 'He will keep the feet of His holy ones'.<sup>28</sup>

Resh Lakish said: What is the meaning of: If it concerneth the scorers He scorneth them, but unto the humble He giveth grace?<sup>29</sup> i.e., if a man comes to defile himself, the doors are opened to him, but if he comes to purify himself, he is helped. In the school of R. Ishmael it was taught: It is as when a man sells naphtha and balm

- 
- (1) What is predestined as your lawful source of income.
  - (2) In either time or place.
  - (3) Ber. 48b.
  - (4) Enchanted with the beauty of the music, or startled by the power of his voice.
  - (5) [The Tetragrammaton. V. Rashi on the Mishnah.]
  - (6) With her handbreadth, on her hand, to know how much he had gained since yesterday.
  - (7) Lam. II, 20.
  - (8) The reference is to the Prophet Zechariah b. Jehoiadah, the priest. The text in Lam. may refer to that as well; its original meaning, not unknown to the answerer, lamented the destruction by the enemy, of priest and prophet alike. At any rate someone was called Doeg in spite of the first Doeg's bad reputation (I Sam. XXI, 8.)
  - (9) Normally, none would do that, because of a bad omen, or because one should help the name of the wicked to 'rot' by being forgotten. Look what this deviation from custom brought upon the child.
  - (10) Gen. XVIII, 17.
  - (11) Ibid. XVIII, 18.
  - (12) Ibid. XIII, 12.
  - (13) Ibid. 13.
  - (14) Who lived between Ahab and Jezebel. V. Sanh. 12b.
  - (15) Gen. XVIII, 19.
  - (16) Ibid. 20.
  - (17) Ibid. XIII, 13.
  - (18) Ibid. 15.
  - (19) Ibid. I, 4.
  - (20) Isa. III, 10. E.V., 'Say ye of the righteous, that it shall be well with him.' V. Hag. 12b.
  - (21) Hosea IV, 6.
  - (22) Ibid.
  - (23) Kid. 72b.
  - (24) Eccl. I, 5.
  - (25) I Sam. II, 8.
  - (26) Prov. X, 25. E.V., 'Is an everlasting foundation'.
  - (27) I Sam. II, 9. Although the kere (the traditional reading) is in the plural the kethib (הַסִּידִיּוֹ), (the written form) הַסִּידוֹ is in the singular.
  - (28) [Taking לְרַגְלֵי in the sense of רַגְלֵי, cf. Gen. XXX, 30, 'at the foot of', 'at the guidance of', 'on account of', he renders the verse, He preserves (the world) on account of His holy ones (Rashi).]
  - (29) Prov. III, 34.

### Talmud - Mas. Yoma 39a

: If [a purchaser] comes to measure naphtha, he [the shopkeeper] says to him: Measure it out for yourself; but to one who would measure out balm he says: Wait, till I measure together with you, so that both I and you, may become perfumed.

The school of R. Ishmael taught: Sin dulls the heart of man, as it is said: Neither shall ye make yourselves unclean with them, that ye should be defiled thereby.<sup>1</sup> Read not we-nitmethem [that you should be defiled], but u-netamothem [that you should become dullhearted].<sup>2</sup> Our Rabbis taught: 'Neither shall you make yourselves unclean that you should be defiled thereby.' If a man defiles

himself a little, he becomes much defiled: [if he defile himself] below, he becomes defiled from above; if he defile himself in this world, he becomes defiled in the world to come. Our Rabbis taught: Sanctify yourselves, therefore, and be ye holy:<sup>3</sup> If a man sanctify himself a little, he becomes much sanctified. [If he sanctify himself] below, he becomes sanctified from above; if he sanctify himself in this world, he becomes sanctified in the world to come.

#### CHAPTER IV

MISHNAH. HE SHOOK<sup>4</sup> THE URN AND BROUGHT UP THE TWO LOTS. ON ONE WAS INSCRIBED: 'FOR THE LORD', AND ON THE OTHER: 'FOR AZAZEL'. THE DEPUTY HIGH PRIEST WAS AT HIS RIGHT HAND, THE HEAD OF THE [MINISTERING] FAMILY AT HIS LEFT. IF THE LOT [HAVING] 'FOR THE LORD' [INSCRIBED THEREON] CAME UP IN HIS RIGHT HAND, THE DEPUTY HIGH PRIEST WOULD SAY TO HIM: SIR HIGH PRIEST, RAISE THY RIGHT HAND! AND IF THE LOT [WITH THE INSCRIPTION] 'FOR THE LORD' CAME UP IN HIS LEFT HAND, THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY WOULD SAY: SIR HIGH PRIEST, RAISE THY LEFT HAND! THEN HE PLACED THEM ON THE TWO HE-GOATS AND SAID: A SIN-OFFERING 'UNTO THE LORD!' R. ISHMAEL SAID: HE DID NOT NEED TO SAY: A SIN-OFFERING, BUT 'UNTO THE LORD'. AND THEY ANSWERED AFTER HIM: BLESSED BE THE NAME OF HIS GLORIOUS KINGDOM FOR EVER AND EVER!<sup>5</sup>

GEMARA. Why was it necessary to shake the urn? — Lest he take one intentionally.<sup>6</sup> Raba said: The urn was of wood and profane and could hold no more than the two hands [at its mouth]. — Rabina demurred to this: It is quite right that [its mouth] could contain no more than his two hands, i.e., to prevent his taking one intentionally [through manipulation] but why should it be profane? Let it be sanctified? — That would result in our having a ministering vessel of wood, and we do not make ministering vessels of wood. Then let it be made of silver, or of gold? — 'The Torah has consideration for the money of Israel'.<sup>7</sup>

Our Mishnah is not in accordance with the following Tanna, for it was taught: R. Judah said in the name of R. Eliezer: The deputy high priest and the high priest put their hand into the urn. If the lot ['For the Lord'] comes up in the hand of the high priest, the deputy high priest said to him: Sir high priest, raise thy hand! And if it came up in the right hand of the deputy high priest, the head of the [ministering] family says to him: Say your word!<sup>8</sup> -Let the deputy high priest address him? — Since it did not come up in his hand, he might feel discouraged.<sup>9</sup> In what [principle] do they<sup>10</sup> differ? — One holds, the right hand of the deputy high priest is better than the left hand of the high priest, the other holding, they are of even importance. Who is the Tanna disputing R. Judah? — It is R. Hanina, deputy high priest. For it was taught: R. Hanina, deputy high priest, says: Why does the deputy high priest stand at the right? In order that if an invalidating accident should happen to the high priest, the deputy high priest may enter [the Sanctuary] and officiate in his stead.<sup>11</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Throughout the forty years that Simeon the Righteous ministered, the lot ['For the Lord'] would always come up in the right hand; from that time on, it would come up now in the right hand, now in the left. And [during the same time] the crimson-coloured strap<sup>12</sup> would become white. From that time on it would at times become white, at others not. Also: Throughout those forty years the westernmost light<sup>13</sup> was shining, from that time on, it was now shining, now failing; also the fire of the pile of wood kept burning strong,<sup>14</sup> so that the priests did not have to bring to the pile any other wood besides the two logs,<sup>15</sup> in order to fulfil the command about providing the wood unintermittently; from that time on, it would occasionally keep burning strongly, at other times not, so that the priests could not do without bringing throughout the day wood for the pile [on the altar]. [During the whole period] a blessing was bestowed upon the 'omer,<sup>16</sup> the two breads,<sup>17</sup> and the shewbread, so that every priest, who obtained a piece thereof as big as an olive, ate it and became satisfied with some eating thereof and even leaving something over. From that time on a curse was

sent upon ‘omer, two breads, and shewbread, so that every priest received a piece as small as a bean: the well-bred<sup>18</sup> ones withdrew their hands from it, whilst voracious folk took and devoured it. Once one [of the latter] grabbed his portion as well as that of his fellow, wherefore they would call him ‘ben

---

(1) Lev. XI, 43.

(2) ונטמתם for ונטמתם MS.M. cur. ed. ונטמתם.

(3) Lev. XVI, 44.

(4) Continuing the account of Mishnah (supra 37a); or ‘shook hastily’ (because of eagerness, anxiety).

(5) The J.T. states that when the high priest pronounced the Ineffable Name those near prostrated themselves, those afar responding with ‘Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom for ever and ever’.

(6) It was considered a happy omen when it came up in the right hand, and the temptation was as great as near to improve upon chance by dexterous manipulation.

(7) V. infra 44b.

(8) Viz., ‘A sin-offering unto the Lord’.

(9) If the deputy high priest, in whose hand it came up, gave him the command, he might easily read into his words the arrogance of the successful.

(10) R. Judah and the Tanna of our Mishnah.

(11) Nazir 47b, which implies that as long as the high priest is fit for service the deputy high priest performs no priestly service whatsoever, in opposition to R. Judah.

(12) Which was tied between the horns of the bullock. If that became white, it signified that the Holy One, blessed be He, had forgiven Israel's sin. Cf. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow (Isa. I, 18, Rashi).

(13) The westernmost light on the candlestick in the Temple, into which as much oil was put as into the others. Although all the other lights were extinguished, that light buried oil, in spite of the fact that it had been kindled first. This miracle was taken as a sign that the Shechinah rested over Israel. V. Shab. 22b and Men. 86b.

(14) On the altar, on which it was kindled in the morning.

(15) V. supra 26b.

(16) V. Glos.

(17) V. Lev. XXIII, 17ff

(18) Lit., ‘modest’, ‘decorous’.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 39b

hamzan’ [grasper] until his dying day. Rabbah b. R. Shela said: What Scriptural basis [is there for this appellation]? — O my God, rescue me out of the hand of the wicked, out of the grasp of the unrighteous and homez [ruthless] man.<sup>1</sup> Raba said, From here [is the basis obtained]: Learn to do well, seek justice, strengthen hamoz [the oppressed]<sup>2</sup> i.e., strengthen him hamoz [who is oppressed], but strengthen not homez [the oppressor].<sup>3</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: In the year in which Simeon the Righteous died, he foretold them that he would die. They said: Whence do you know that? He replied: On every Day of Atonement an old man, dressed in white, wrapped in white, would join me, entering [the Holy of Holies] and leaving [it] with me, but today I was joined by an old man, dressed in black, wrapped in black, who entered, but did not leave, with me. After the festival [of Sukkoth] he was sick for seven days and [then] died. His brethren [that year] the priests forbore to mention the Ineffable Name in pronouncing the [priestly] blessing.<sup>4</sup> Our Rabbis taught: During the last forty years before the destruction of the Temple the lot [‘For the Lord’] did not come up in the right hand; nor did the crimson-coloured strap become white; nor did the westernmost light shine; and the doors of the Hekal would open by themselves, until R. Johanan b. Zakkai rebuked them, saying: Hekal, Hekal, why wilt thou be the alarmer thyself?<sup>5</sup> I know about thee that thou wilt be destroyed, for Zechariah ben Ido has already prophesied concerning thee:<sup>6</sup> Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars.<sup>7</sup>

R. Isaac b. Tablai said: Why is its<sup>8</sup> name called Lebanon? Because it makes white the sins of Israel. R. Zutra b. Tobiah said: Why is it called 'Forest', as it is written: The house of the forest of Lebanon?<sup>9</sup> To tell you that just as a forest produces sprouts, so does the Temple. For R. Hosea said:<sup>10</sup> When Solomon built the Sanctuary, he planted therein all sorts of precious golden trees, which brought forth fruit in their season. When the wind blew against them, their fruits would fall down, as it is said: May his fruit rustle like Lebanon.<sup>11</sup> They were a source of income for the priesthood. But as soon as the idolaters entered the Hekal, they dried up, as it is said: And the flower of Lebanon languisheth.<sup>12</sup> And the Holy One, blessed be He, will restore it to us, as it is said: It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice, even with joy and singing, the glory of Lebanon shall be given to it.<sup>13</sup> Our Rabbis taught:<sup>14</sup> Ten times did the high priest pronounce the [Ineffable] Name on that day: Three times at the first confession, thrice at the second confession, thrice in connection with the he-goat to be sent away, and once in connection with the lots. And it already happened that when he pronounced the Name, his voice was heard even unto Jericho.<sup>15</sup> Rabbah b. Bar Hana said: From Jerusalem to Jericho it is a distance of ten parasangs. The turning hinges of the Temple doors were heard throughout eight Sabbath limits.<sup>16</sup> The goats in Jericho used to sneeze because of the odour of the incense. The women in Jericho did not have to perfume themselves, because of the odour of the incense. The bride in Jerusalem did not have to perfume herself because of the odour of the incense. R. Jose b. Diglai said: My father had goats on the mountains of Mikwar<sup>17</sup> and they used to sneeze because of the odour of the incense. R. Hiyya b. Abin said in the name of R. Joshua b. Karhah: An old man told me: Once I walked towards Shiloh<sup>18</sup> and I could smell the odour of the incense [coming] from its walls.

R. Jannai said: To bring the lot up out of the casket is indispensable,<sup>19</sup> but to place [it on the bullock's head] is not.<sup>20</sup> R. Johanan said: Even to bring up the lot is not indispensable.<sup>21</sup> On the opinion of R. Judah who said that services performed in the white garments outside the Holy of Holies are not indispensable there is no dispute, [all agreeing] that [the bringing up of lots] is not indispensable; they dispute only the opinion of R. Nehemiah:<sup>22</sup> He who says it is indispensable, holds even as R. Nehemiah [does]; whereas the other who holds it is dispensable, explains [R. Nehemiah to refer to] an actual service, whereas the casting of the lots is no service. — Others say: On the opinion of R. Nehemiah, who says it is indispensable, there is no dispute, [all agreeing that] it is indispensable; the dispute touches only the opinion of R. Judah: he who holds it is dispensable, agrees with R. Judah; whereas he who holds it is indispensable [explains] that it is different here because Scripture repeats twice: On which [the lot] fell.<sup>23</sup> — An objection: was raised 'It is a command to cast the lots but if he has failed to do so, [the service] is, nevertheless, valid. Now that will be quite right according to the version that none disputes that on R. Judah's view it is dispensable, so that this [teaching]<sup>24</sup> is in accordance with R. Judah

---

(1) Ps. LXXI, 4.

(2) Isa. 1, 17.

(3) V. Sanh. 35a.

(4) Men. 109b. Tosaf Sotah 38a suggests that the Ineffable Name could be pronounced only when there was some indication that the Shechinah rested on the Sanctuary. When Simeon the Righteous died, with many indications that such glory was no more enjoyed, his brethren no more dared utter the Ineffable Name.

(5) Predict thy own destruction.

(6) I.e., concerning this significant omen of the destruction of the Temple.

(7) Zech. XI, 1. Ido was his grandfather, but it occurs occasionally that a man is called 'the son after a distinguished ancestor.

(8) The Sanctuary. A play on **לַבְנוֹת**, connected with **לֵבֶן**.

(9) I Kings X, 21.

(10) V. supra 21b.

(11) Ps. LXXII, 16.

(12) Nahum I, 4.

(13) Isa. XXXV, 2.

(14) Tosef. Yoma II, 2.

(15) V. supra 20b.

(16) The marked-off area around a town or place within which it is permitted to move on the Sabbath. Sabbath limits i.e., two thousand cubits in every direction. The turning hinges, then, created a sound, according to this scholar, audible beyond sixteen thousand cubits.

(17) The name varies: Mikmar, Mikwar, Makvar (a district of Peraea). One version omits reference to a place, and reads 'on the mountains', which may have appropriated the **מ** from the next word and omitted it for want of clarity. It should be reasonably near Jerusalem to suit the context. See D.S., p. 110.

(18) The place of the tent of meeting. In the mind of the narrator the odour of incense must have been well-nigh imperishable.

(19) Without the casting of the lots no choice could be made as to the destination of the two he-goats, i.e., the service could not go on.

(20) This view considers the service of the high priest dependent on the decision of the lots, the decisive factor being the lots and not the formal putting of the lot on the animal's head.

(21) R. Johanan considers the action of the high priest the determining factor, independent of his having either had lots or having placed them on the head. His declaration as to which animal is for the Lord and for Azazel resp., validates the service.

(22) Infra 60a contains the dispute between R. Judah and R. Nehemiah as to whether any change in the prescribed order renders the service invalid. It hinges on the question as to whether the word 'hukkah' (statute) i.e., binding order, applies to the service in the Holy of Holies only, independent as to the garments wherein they are performed (R. Judah) or whether it applies to any service in the white garments, performed either in the Holy of Holies or elsewhere (R. Nehemiah). A sub-question would be whether anything in connection with the Day of Atonement, or only a service proper is covered by R. Nehemiah's view. If e.g., the casting of the lots is not considered a service, though an action in connection with it, it may not be indispensable since it is performed outside the Holy of Holies, although in white garments.

(23) Lev. XVI, 9,10 which repetition emphasizes the indispensable nature of this service.

(24) That it is a command to cast the lots, but that failure to do so does not invalidate the service.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 40a**

. But according to the version that they are disputing on R. Judah's view it would again be quite right according to him who holds it is dispensable, for then [the authority for this teaching] would be R. Judah; but according to him who considers it indispensable [the question is asked]: Who [will be the authority] for this [teaching]? Read: It is a command to place [the lots on the bullock's head].<sup>1</sup>

Come and hear: It is a command to cast the lots and to make confession. But if he had not cast the lots<sup>2</sup> or made confession, [the service is] valid.<sup>3</sup> And should you reply that here, too' [you would read] 'to place [the lot on the bullock's head]', say then the second part: R. Simeon said: If he has not cast the lots, the service is still valid, but if he has failed to make confession, it is invalidated. Now what does 'If he has not cast the lots' mean? Would you say it means, 'He has not placed the lots',<sup>4</sup> this would imply [would it not] that R. Simeon holds the casting of the lots is indispensable? But surely it was taught: If one of the two [bullocks] died, he brings the other without [new] casting of lots — these are the words of R. Simeon?<sup>5</sup> — R. Simeon did not know what the Sages meant [with the Phrase 'lo higril']<sup>6</sup> and thus he said to them: If by 'hagralah' you mean casting of the lots itself, I dispute with you on one matter, but if by 'hagralah' you mean the placing of the lots then I disagree with you on two counts.<sup>7</sup>

Come and hear: With regard to the sprinkling of the blood within the veil, [the regular service of] the bullock is indispensable for the service of the he-goat [to be valid]; but the regular service of the he-goat is not indispensable for the service of the bullock to be valid.<sup>8</sup> Now, it is quite right that the regular service of the bullock is indispensable for the he-goat, e.g., if he performed the rites of the

he-goat before those of the bullock, he has done nothing.<sup>9</sup> But that [the regular service of] the he-goat is not indispensable to the bullock, what does it mean? Would you say [it means] that if he sprinkled the blood of the bullock in the Hekal before the sprinkling of the he-goat within [the veil]?<sup>10</sup> But surely Scripture says 'statute'!<sup>11</sup> Rather must you say [it means that] if he sprinkled the blood of the bullock within, before the casting of the lots<sup>12</sup> [it is valid]. Now since the order is not indispensable [is it not to be inferred that] the casting of the lots itself is not indispensable!<sup>13</sup> — No, [it means that] he made the sprinkling of the blood of the bullock on the altar before sprinkling the blood of the he-goat in the Hekal<sup>14</sup> and this [teaching] is in accord with R. Judah, who says that anything done in the white garments outside [the Holy of Holies] is dispensable. But does it not state 'with regard to the sprinklings within'?<sup>15</sup> Rather: It is in accord with R. Simeon who holds the casting of the lots is dispensable. Or, if you like, say: Still I say it is in accord with R. Judah,<sup>16</sup> and although the order of the service is not indispensable, the casting of the lots is indispensable. And they follow their own principle.<sup>17</sup> For it was taught:

(1) This ruling is generally accepted: Dejure the placing of the lots is obligatory. De facto failure to do so does not render the ceremony invalid, Scripture repeating twice 'on which the lot fell', thus creating a precedent for the casting of the lots, but it refers only once to the placing of the lots on the bullock's head.

(2) לֹא הִגְרִיל infra n. 6.

(3) Hence the casting of the lots is dispensable — a refutation of R. Jannai.

(4) Only the placing of the lots does R. Simeon consider dispensable, but the casting he considers indispensable.

(5) Infra 63b.

(6) Lit., 'He did not perform the hagralah' and rendered supra 'he has not cast lots' cf. n. 3. 'Hagralah', 'acting with lots' may mean causing lots 'to be cast' or 'to be placed', hence grammatically either application is justified: 'lo higril' he did not cause the lots 'to be cast' or 'to be placed' (on the head etc.). R. Simeon did not know which interpretation had been offered by the Sages. He knew however that both are possible.

(7) If you mean by 'hagralah' the casting of the lots, I dispute only your stand touching confession, agreeing with you that the casting of the lots is not indispensable, but if you mean by 'hagralah' the placing of the lots on the head etc. but the casting itself you consider indispensable, then I disagree with you on two counts: you hold casting indispensable, I do not; you hold confession not indispensable, I consider it indispensable.

(8) [The order of the service prescribed in Lev. XVI for the bullock and the he-goat which is offered within is as follows: (i) First confession over the bullock; (ii) Casting lots over the he-goats; (iii) second confession over the bullock; (iv) Slaughtering of the bullock; (v) Bringing the spoon and fire pan into the Holy of Holies; (vi) Burning of incense; (vii) Sprinkling of blood of the bullock on the mercy-seat; (viii) Confession over and slaughtering of the he-goat; (ix) Sprinkling of the he-goat's blood on the mercy-seat; (x) Sprinkling of the blood of the bullock on the Veil, separating the Holy, the Hekal, from the Holy of Holies; (xi) Sprinkling of the blood of the he-goat on the Veil; (xii) Mixing together the blood of the he-goat and the bullock and applying the mixture on the golden altar. Here the rule is laid down that if he performed any one of the rites in connection with the he-goat before such of the bullock as should have preceded it, that rite is invalid and must be performed again in its proper order. If, however, he performed any of the rites in connection with the bullock before such of the he-goat as should have preceded it, that rite is not invalid.]

(9) It has no validity.

(10) [I.e., he performed rite (x) before rite (ix), v. n. 1].

(11) Which has reference to the rites performed within the Veil, and which implies an inflexible rule invalidating the irregularity of the service.

(12) [I.e., he performed rite (vii) before (ii).]

(13) Hence there is one who holds that the casting of the lots is not indispensable. That contradicts the above statement that even R. Judah (and all the more R. Nehemiah) considers it indispensable.

(14) [I.e., he performed rite (xii) before rite (xi). The blood of the bullock here means that which he mixed with the blood of the he-goat.]

(15) Whereas this irregularity in connection with the bullock concerned a service performed outside the Holy of Holies.

(16) [And the irregularity consequently concerned rites (vii) and (ii), v. p. 190, n. 5.]

(17) This refers to the dispute of R. Judah and R. Simeon where he failed to make confession.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 40b

[With reference to] It shall be set alive before the Lord, to make atonement over him<sup>1</sup> — how long must it stay alive? Until the blood of its fellow-sacrifice is sprinkled, this is the opinion of R. Judah.<sup>2</sup> R. Simeon holds: Until the confession [of sin].<sup>3</sup> Wherein do they differ? — As it was taught: ‘To make atonement over him’ — Scripture speaks of atonement through blood, thus does it also say: And when he hath made an end to atoning for the holy place,<sup>4</sup> just as there it refers to atonement by blood, so does it refer here to atonement by blood this is the opinion of R. Judah. R. Simeon says: ‘To make atonement over him’ — Scripture speaks of atonement by words [confession].

Come and hear:<sup>5</sup> The disciples of R. Akiba asked him: If it [the lot ‘for the Lord’] came up in the left hand, may he turn it to the right? He replied: Do not give all occasion for the Sadducees to rebel!<sup>6</sup> The reason, then, [of his negative answer] is so as not to give an occasion for the Sadducees to rebel, but, without that, we would turn it, yet you said that the casting of the lots is indispensable, and since the left hand has determined its destination,<sup>7</sup> how can we turn it? — Raba answered: This is what they said: If the lot had come up in the left hand, may one change it and the he-goat to the right?<sup>8</sup> Whereupon he answered: Give no occasion to the Sadducees to rebel.

Come and hear: If [Scripture] has said: The goat, ‘upon which it [the lot] is’<sup>9</sup> I would have said he must place it thereon. Therefore it says: ‘[on which it] fell’, i.e., once it has fallen upon it, he no more need [place it on its head]. Now in respect of what [was this said]?<sup>10</sup> Would you say: In respect of a command,<sup>11</sup> which would imply that the placing of the lots is not even a command!<sup>12</sup> Rather must you say it means that it is in respect of indispensability;<sup>13</sup> hence we learn that the casting is indispensable, and the placing of the lot [upon the head] is dispensable.<sup>14</sup> Raba said: This is what he means: If it had said: ‘Upon which it is’, I would have said: let him leave it there until the time for the slaughtering; therefore it says: [upon which it] fell, to intimate that once it had fallen upon it, it needs nothing else.<sup>15</sup>

Come and hear: And offer him for a sin-offering<sup>16</sup> i.e., the lot designates it for the sin-offering, but the naming<sup>17</sup> [alone] does not designate it a sin-offering. For I might have assumed, this could be inferred a minori: If in a case where the lot does not sanctify,<sup>18</sup> the naming does sanctify, how much more will the naming sanctify where the lot also does so sanctify? Therefore [Scripture] says: ‘And offer him for a sin-offering’ [to intimate] it is the lot which designates it a sin-offering, but the naming does not make it a sin-offering.

---

(1) With reference to the he-goat that is to be sent away. Lev. XVI, 10.

(2) [In accordance with his view that confession is not indispensable so that if the he-goat died after the sprinkling of the blood of the bullock (rite vii) before the confession over the he-goat (rite viii) the service is valid.]

(3) Infra 65a.

(4) Ibid. 20.

(5) Tosef. III, 2, the version in the Talmud is somewhat modified.

(6) The substitution of Sadducees for ‘Minim’ (Judeo-Christian heretics) is undoubtedly due to the censors’ dislike of any word that may appear as even an implied attack on the Church. The heretics will claim this manipulation an ‘additional proof’ of the Pharisees’ doing with the law whatever pleased them. Thus they would be helped to rebel, arguing at once in favour of their heresy and against the Pharisees.

(7) For the Lord, even before the lot was actually placed on the he-goat.

(8) If the lot ‘For the Lord’ came up in the left hand so that the he-goat standing opposite the priest at his left hand was thereby designated a sin-offering for the Lord, that on the right being designated for Azazel, may he exchange the he-goats and the lots so that whereas the lot decided which is which, the manipulation will have afforded him the comfort of knowing that without formally changing the lots, the ‘right one’ will be designated for the Lord.

(9) Intimating that it lies there for a considerable time.

(10) That once the lots are cast nothing more is necessary.

(11) I.e., there is no longer any command to be fulfilled after the casting of the lots.

(12) Surely this is impossible!

(13) I.e., that once the lots are cast there is nothing else deemed indispensable for determining the destination of the he-goats.

(14) A refutation of R. Johanan.

(15) The verse serves to indicate that once it 'fell upon it' there is not even a command to be placed there, as a sign or assurance that it will be offered up for the purpose designated.

(16) Lev. XVI, 9: And Aaron shall present the goat upon which the lot fell for the Lord, and offer it for a sin-offering.

(17) By the high priest. The above verse, in which the offering-up follows immediately 'upon which the lot fell' indicates that the coming up of the lot decides the matter, not the naming by the priest.

(18) As with the sacrificial couples of birds, where either owner or priest by verbal statement makes the designation, where, however, the casting of lots would be useless.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 41a

Now whose is the anonymous opinion in the Sifra?<sup>1</sup> R. Judah's, and he teaches: The lot designates the sin-offering and the naming does not make it a sin-offering. Hence we see that the casting of the lots is indispensable. This will be a refutation of the opinion that it is not indispensable. It is a refutation.

R. Hisda said: The special designation of the couples<sup>2</sup> is made either by the owner<sup>3</sup> or by the priest's action.<sup>4</sup> R. Shimi b. Ashi said: What is the basis of R. Hisda's dictum? Because it is written: She shall take [. . . for a burnt-offering]<sup>5</sup> and And the priest shall offer one [as a sin-offering]<sup>6</sup> i.e., [the designation is made] either at the [owner's] taking [purchasing] or at the offering-up [by the priest].

They raised the following objection: 'And make it a sin-offering'<sup>7</sup> -i.e., the lot makes it a sin-offering, but the naming [alone] does not make it a sin-offering. For I might have assumed, this could be inferred a minori: If in a case where a lot does not sanctify, the naming does, how much more should the naming sanctify, where the lot does? Therefore [Scripture] says: 'And make it for a sin-offering' [to intimate] it is the lot which makes it a sin-offering, but the naming does not make it a sin-offering. Here it is neither the time<sup>8</sup> of its purchase, nor of its being offered, and yet he states that it should designate? — Raba said: This is what he said: If in a case where the lot does not sanctify even at the time of the purchase and even at the time of the offering, the naming does sanctify it at the time of either purchase or offering, how much more shall the naming, at either the time of purchase or of offering, sanctify it in a case where the lot sanctifies outside the time of either purchase or offering? Therefore [Scripture] says: 'And make it a sin-offering', i.e., the lot makes it a sin-offering but the naming does not make it a sin-offering.

Come and hear: If someone defiled the Sanctuary<sup>9</sup> whilst poor and put aside money for his bird-couple-offering, and afterwards became rich,<sup>10</sup> and said thereupon: This [money] be for the sin-offering and that for the burnt-offering he adds to the money for the sin-offering to bring his obligatory offering, but he may not add to his burnt<sup>11</sup> -offering to bring his obligatory offering. Now here<sup>12</sup> it is neither the time of the purchase, nor the time of the offering and yet he teaches that it is designated?<sup>13</sup> — R. Shesheth said: How do you reason?<sup>14</sup> Surely R.. Eleazar said in the name of R. Hoshai: If someone defiled the Sanctuary whilst rich, and brought the offering of a poor person, he has not done his duty. Now, since he has not done his duty, how could he have designated<sup>15</sup> it? Must you not, rather, say that he had designated it when already poor? Thus here,<sup>16</sup> too, the case is that he said it from the time when he set [the money] aside.<sup>17</sup> But according to R. Hagga in the name of R. Josiah who said: He has done his duty<sup>18</sup> —

---

(1) A Tannaitic commentary (Midrash) on Leviticus.

- (2) Of sacrificial birds (Lev. XII, 8 and XV, 30), as to which is to be the burnt-offering and which the sin-offering.
- (3) At the purchase the owner can decide which is to serve for either sacrifice.
- (4) If not designated by the owner, the priest has the right to name each bird for the sacrifice he chooses, i.e., either sin- or burnt-offering.
- (5) Lev. XII, 8.
- (6) Ibid. XV, 30.
- (7) Lev. XVI, 9. So literally. E.V. 'offer it for a sin-offering'.
- (8) The designation by naming, which now is assumed to take place at the time of the sanctification by the lot, i.e., neither at the time of the purchase, nor at that of the offering.
- (9) By entering it in uncleanness, Lev. V, 2.
- (10) With the consequence that he must offer the contingent sacrifice of a rich person: a lamb as a sin-offering, whereas a poor person had to offer up two turtledoves or two young pigeons as sin- and burnt-offering resp. (Lev. V, 6 and 11.)
- (11) Ker. 28a. He may add to the original money designated for the poor man's sin-offering for his new sin-offering, but he may not use the money designated for the poor man's burnt-offering to add thereto the sum necessary for the purchase of the rich man's sin-offering (his lamb). The latter is forbidden, because once he had designated, the money for the burnt-offering, it may no more be changed for any other offering.
- (12) After the designation.
- (13) And that he may no more change it.
- (14) Do you consider the Baraitha to be in order?
- (15) The poor man's sin-offering no more applies to him, how could he have designated it a burnt-offering after becoming rich, since he does not have to bring a burnt-offering at all (only the poor man brings a burnt- and sin-offering, one pigeon each, the rich man's lamb serving as sin-offering only).
- (16) In reply to the objection raised against R. Hisda.
- (17) Correct the Baraitha to read: If someone defiled the Sanctuary whilst poor and put aside money for his couple and said at the time when he set the money aside 'This be etc.' and afterwards became rich.
- (18) So that the Baraitha as it stands need not be corrected.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 41b

what is there to be said?<sup>1</sup> — Do not read: 'And said thereupon', but 'And thereupon he bought and said'.<sup>2</sup>

But if 'thereupon he bought' [then it states] 'he may add and bring his obligatory sacrifice', it must mean<sup>3</sup> that he redeems<sup>4</sup> [the bird-offering]? But surely a bird-offering may not be redeemed?<sup>5</sup> — R. Papa said: For instance, if he bought one single pigeon. If he bought it as the burnt-offering, then he adds to the money for his sin-offering the money for his [new] obligatory sacrifice, the burnt-offering [of the bird] becoming a freewill-offering; if he bought it as the sin-offering he may not add to the money for the burnt-offering for the purchase of his [new] obligatory sacrifice and that sin-offering is left to perish.

The text [above] states: R. Eleazar said in the name of R. Hoshai: 'If one defiled the Sanctuary whilst being rich and brought the offering prescribed for a poor person, he has not done his duty, R. Haggai in the name of R. Josiah says: He did perform it.' The following objection was raised: If a poor leper brought the offering prescribed for a rich person, he has performed his duty; if a rich person brought the offering prescribed for a poor one, he has not performed his duty?<sup>6</sup> — There it is different because it is written: This [shall be the law of the leper].<sup>7</sup> If that is so, then [let it apply] in the first part [of the Mishnah] too? — Surely the Divine Law includes that case through the word Torath ['law']!<sup>8</sup> As it was taught: the word Torath ['the law']<sup>7</sup> includes a poor leper, who brought a rich [leper's] sacrifice. One might have assumed that even a rich leper who brought a poor leper's sacrifice [might be included so as to have performed his duty], therefore it says: 'This'. Let us infer from it [for one who defiled the Sanctuary]? — The Divine Law [by saying]: And if he be poor,<sup>9</sup> excludes [all but the leper].<sup>10</sup>

MISHNAH. HE BOUND<sup>11</sup> A THREAD OF CRIMSON WOOL ON THE HEAD OF THE HE-GOAT WHICH WAS TO BE SENT AWAY,<sup>12</sup> AND [MEANTIME] HE PLACED IT [AT THE GATE] WHENCE IT WAS TO BE SENT AWAY; AND THE HE-GOAT THAT WAS TO BE SLAUGHTERED, AT THE PLACE OF THE SLAUGHTERING.<sup>13</sup> HE CAME TO HIS BULLOCK A SECOND<sup>14</sup> TIME, PRESSED HIS TWO HANDS UPON IT AND MADE CONFESSION. AND THUS HE WOULD SAY: O LORD, I HAVE DEALT WRONGFULLY, I HAVE TRANSGRESSED, I HAVE SINNED BEFORE THEE, I AND MY HOUSE, AND THE CHILDREN OF AARON, THY HOLY PEOPLE, O LORD, PRAY FORGIVE THE WRONGDOINGS, THE TRANSGRESSION, AND THE SINS, WHICH I HAVE COMMITTED, TRANSGRESSED, AND SINNED BEFORE THEE, I AND MY HOUSE, AND THE CHILDREN OF AARON, THY HOLY PEOPLE. AS IT IS WRITTEN IN THE TORAH OF MOSES, THY SERVANT: FOR ON THIS DAY ATONEMENT BE MADE FOR YOU, TO CLEANSE YOU; FROM ALL THE SINS SHALL YE BE CLEAN BEFORE THE LORD. AND THEY RESPONDED: BLESSED BE THE NAME OF HIS GLORIOUS KINGDOM FOR EVER AND EVER.

GEMARA. They raised the question: AND THE HE-GOAT THAT WAS TO BE SLAUGHTERED AT THE PLACE OF THE SLAUGHTERING — does this refer to the tying [of the strap]<sup>15</sup> or to the placing [of the animal]?<sup>16</sup> Come and hear: For R. Joseph learned: He bound a crimson-coloured strap on the head of the he-goat which was to be sent away and placed it against the gate whence it was to be sent away; and the he-goat which was to be slaughtered at the place where it was to be slaughtered, lest they become mixed up one with the other, or with others. It will be quite right if you say it refers to the binding [of the strap], but If you say it refers to the placing [of the animal], granted that it would not be mixed up with its fellow [he-goat] because the one had a strap, whilst the other had none, but it could surely be mixed up with other he-goats?<sup>17</sup> Hence we learn from here that It refers to the tying [of the strap]. This proves it. R. Isaac said: I have heard of two straps, one in connection with the [red] heifer,<sup>18</sup> the other with the he-goat-to-be-sent-away, one requiring a definite size, the other not requiring it, but I do not know which [requires the size]. R. Joseph said: Let us see: The strap of the he-goat which required division,<sup>19</sup> hence also required a definite size, whereas that of the heifer which does not need to be divided, does not require a definite size, either. Rami b. Hama demurred to this: That of the heifer also requires weight?<sup>20</sup> — Raba said: The matter of this weight is disputed by Tannaim.<sup>21</sup> But does the strap of the heifer not have to be divided? [Against this] Abaye raised the following objection: How does he do it?<sup>22</sup> He wraps them<sup>23</sup> together with the remnants<sup>24</sup> of the strips [of scarlet wool]! Say: with the tail<sup>25</sup> of the strip.

R. Hanin said in the name of Rab: If the cedar-wood and the scarlet thread were [merely] caught by the flame,<sup>26</sup> they are usable [for the ceremony]. — They raised the following objection: If the strap caught fire, another strap is brought and the water of lustration prepared.<sup>27</sup> Abaye said: This is no contradiction; one speaks of a flame which blazes<sup>28</sup> up, the other of one which is subdued.<sup>29</sup>

Raba said: Concerning the weight of [the heifer's strap] there is a division of opinion among Tannaim, for it was taught: Why does he wrap them<sup>30</sup> together? In order that they form together one bunch — this is the opinion of Rabbi. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon says: In order that they have [sufficient] weight to fall into the midst of the burning heifer. — When R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he said in the name of R. Johanan: I heard of: three [different] straps, one, that of the [red] heifer, the other, that of the he-goat-to-be-sent-away, the third of the leper; one having a weight of ten zuz,<sup>31</sup> the other a weight of two sela's,<sup>31</sup> the third a weight of one shekel,<sup>31</sup> and I do not know how to specify it. When Rabin came, he specified it in the name of R. Jonathan:

---

(1) How will R. Hisda meet the objection raised against him from the Baraita?

(2) The change implies only that one word had been omitted. Thus the question against R. Hisda is answered.

- (3) Lit., 'what is it?'
- (4) Divesting it of its sacred character by changing its purpose and adding thereto the money required for the lamb.
- (5) Tem. 23b.
- (6) Neg. XIV, 12. An objection against R. Hagga.
- (7) Lev. XIV, 2 indicating there must be no duration.
- (8) Indicating that there is ultimately one Torah, one law governing all lepers.
- (9) Ibid. 21.
- (10) 'If he be poor'; the 'he' is emphatic, indicating that this law applies only to a leper; but any other person, obliged to bring an offering of higher or lesser value, according to pecuniary condition, may bring the 'poor man's offering' and yet have its duty performed although he be rich himself.
- (11) To prevent any confusion between the he-goats, or between them and the third he-goat, to be offered up at the additional service (Num. XXIX, 11).
- (12) Destined for Azazel, in the wilderness, whence it was hurled to its death from a rock. The word Azazel has been variously interpreted, but it seems to be the name of a place (a rough rock) rather than that of a demon.
- (13) To be explained in the Gemara.
- (14) V. supra 35b: HE CAME TO HIS BULLOCK, that was the first time.
- (15) I.e., he tied the strap about its neck, the place of the slaughtering.
- (16) I.e., he placed it where it had to be slaughtered.
- (17) At the place where sacrifices were slaughtered, since it had no distinguishing mark.
- (18) v. Num. XIX, 1ff
- (19) Infra 67a: What did he (who sent the he-goat away) do. He divided the strap of crimson wool, tying one half to the rock, the other half between his horns.
- (20) To fall right into the midst of the burning heifer' as Scripture (Num. XIX, 6) requires it.
- (21) V. infra.
- (22) With reference to the red heifer v. Parah III, 13.
- (23) The hyssop and cedar-wood.
- (24) There are, then, remnants of strips, hence there must have been division here, too.
- (25) Simply the end of the strap, thinned out like a tail, hence no evidence of a division.
- (26) Cf. supra n. 1.
- (27) Lit., 'and he sanctifies'.
- (28) A fire which unexpectedly rises and spreads; a fire diverted from its course. Or: a fire which unexpectedly rises and spreads;
- (29) In the former case another strap is to be brought since it did not come in contact with the fire itself; but not in the latter case.
- (30) Cedar-wood, hyssop and scarlet, Num. XIX, 6.
- (31) Zuz — the smallest silver coin corresponds to either one quarter or one half of a shekel. Sela' — is either five or ten zuzim. The shekel weighs about twelve grams. V. Krauss, T.A. II, 404.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 42a**

That of the heifer had the weight of ten zuz, that of the he-goat-to-be-sent-away had the weight of two sela's, and that of the leper weighed one shekel. R. Johanan said: About the [strap used in connection with] the heifer R. Simeon b. Halafta and the Sages are disputing, one saying it weighed ten shekels, the other it weighed but one shekel. As a mnemotechnic [sign use]:<sup>1</sup> 'Whether one gives much, or one gives little'.<sup>2</sup> — R. Jeremiah of Difti said to Rabina: They are not disputing in regard to [the strap of] the heifer, but in regard [to that of] the he-goat-to-be-sent-away; and on the day [of their dispute] died Rabia b. Kisi, and as a sign to remember this coincidence they uttered: [The death of the righteous], Rabia b. Kisi, obtains atonement, even as the he-goat-to-be-sent-away. — R. Isaac said: I heard of two slaughterings, one of the [red] heifer, the other of his bullock,<sup>3</sup> one being permissible to a lay Israelite,<sup>4</sup> the other being invalidated if performed by a lay Israelite, and I do not know which is which. It is reported: Concerning the slaughtering of the heifer and of his bullock [there is a dispute between] Rab and Samuel, one holding the heifer to be invalidated [if killed by a

lay Israelite], but that his bullock [so slaughtered] is fit, while the other holds that his bullock is invalidated [if a commoner killed], but [so killed] the heifer is fit. It may be ascertained that it is Rab who holds that [the slaughtering of] the heifer [by a lay Israelite] renders it invalid. For R. Zei'ra<sup>5</sup> said: The slaughtering of the heifer by a lay Israelite is invalid and Rab said thereupon: 'Eleazar' and 'Statute'<sup>6</sup> we learned in connection therewith. — But as for Rab, wherefore the difference between [the law] in the case of the heifer, because 'Eleazar' and 'Statute' is written in connection therewith, when also in connection with 'his' bullock 'Aaron'<sup>7</sup> and 'Statute' is written? The slaughtering is not [regarded as a Temple] service.<sup>8</sup> Then this ought to apply to the heifer as well? — It is different with the heifer, because it is [in the category of] offerings for Temple repair.<sup>9</sup> — So much the more then!<sup>10</sup> -R. Shisha son of R. Idi said: It is the same as with the [inspection of] appearances of leprosy,<sup>11</sup> which is not a service, yet requires a priest's service. Now according to Samuel, who holds the killing of 'his' bullock by a lay Israelite is invalid, wherefore the difference [in law] in the case of 'his' bullock, in connection with which 'Aaron' and 'Statute' are written, when also in connection with the heifer 'Eleazar' and 'Statute' are written? — It is different there, because it is written: And he shall slay it before him,<sup>12</sup> which means that a lay Israelite may slaughter and Eleazar should watch it.<sup>13</sup> And [how does] Rab [explain this]? — [It means] he<sup>14</sup> must not divert his attention from it. Whence does Samuel know that he must not divert his attention from it? — He infers that from And the heifer shall be burnt in his sight.<sup>15</sup> And [why the repetition according to] Rab? — One refers to the slaughtering, the other to the burning;<sup>16</sup> and it was necessary to mention both. For if the Divine Law had written it concerning the slaughtering [alone, I would have said]: There [attention is necessary] because it is the beginning of the service, but with the burning [one could] say: 'No [attention is necessary]' therefore it was necessary [for the Divine Law] to mention [it also touching burning]. And if the Divine Law had written it [only] touching the burning, one would have said [attention is necessary there], because just now the heifer is being made ready,<sup>17</sup> but [during] slaughtering no [attention is necessary]. Therefore it was necessary [for the Divine Law] to mention [that too]. — What does this exclude?<sup>18</sup> Is it to say to exclude the gathering of its ashes and the drawing of the water for the putting in of the ashes?

---

(1) Ber. 5b.

(2) The usual meaning: Whether one gives much or little, the main matter is that he direct his heart to our Father who is in heaven, is irrelevant here, the accent being put, for mnemotechnic reasons, on: the one (stands for) much, the other for little, i.e., one of the disputants ascribes the maximum, the other the minimum weight.

(3) The bullock which the high priest had to bring for himself on the Day of Atonement.

(4) I.e., a non-priest.

(5) Var. lec. 'Rab'.

(6) Num. XIX, 3: And ye shall give her to Eleazar the priest i.e., it requires a priest's service; ibid. 21: And it shall be a perpetual statute i.e., it is indispensable that the priest do so, as prescribed.

(7) Lev. XVI, 3: Herewith shall Aaron come . . . with a young bullock; and ibid. 34: And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you.

(8) Since a lay Israelite may perform it, the word 'statute', mentioned in connection with his bullock, does not refer to the slaughtering.

(9) The heifer is not offered up on the altar, as any other sacrifice, hence there is no distinction as to the services to be performed in connection with it, and all alike require a priest.

(10) On the contrary, how much more ought a lay Israelite to be permitted to slay the red heifer.

(11) Lev. XIII, 2.

(12) Num. XIX, 3.

(13) 'He' referring to a lay Israelite; 'before him' (lit., 'before his face'), to Eleazar.

(14) 'He' refers to Eleazar i.e., he shall slaughter it and keep his mind on this important ceremony.

(15) Num. XIX, 5.

(16) That is that both rites require attention.

(17) The burning for the purposes of the ashes is the central part of the ceremony, to 'prepare' the heifer for her cleansing purpose.

(18) I.e., with regard to what function is no attention essential.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 42b

Surely Scripture says: [And it shall be kept for the congregation of the children of Israel] for a water of sprinkling?<sup>1</sup> — Rather it excludes the casting in of cedarwood, hyssop, and scarlet, because they are not part of the heifer itself.

It was reported: If the heifer was slaughtered by a lay Israelite, R. Ammi said it is valid. R. Isaac, the Smith, said it was invalid. ‘Ulla said it is valid, whilst some there are who say [that he said] it was invalid.

R. Joshua b. Abba raised an objection in support of Rab: I know only that the sprinkling of its water is not valid if performed by a woman, as [when done] by a man; and that it is valid only [if done] by day.<sup>2</sup> Whence do I know that the slaughtering of the heifer, the reception of its blood, the sprinkling of its blood, the burning of the heifer, and the casting into the burning heifer of cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet [may not be done by night]?<sup>3</sup> To teach us that Scripture said: [This is the statute of] the law.<sup>4</sup> I might have assumed that this should include also the gathering of its ashes and the drawing of the water for the putting-in of the ashes, to teach us that Scripture said: ‘This’.<sup>5</sup> — What causes you to include those, and to exclude these? — Since Scripture both extends and limits, say, we shall infer everything from the [regulations touching] the sprinkling of its water: Just as the sprinkling of its water is not proper if done by a woman, as it is [if performed] by a man, and not valid except if done by day, thus<sup>6</sup> include also the slaughtering of the heifer, the reception of its blood, the sprinkling of its blood, the burning of the heifer, and the casting into the burning heifer of cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet. Since these [functions] may not be performed by a woman, so may they be performed only by day; but I exclude the gathering of its ashes and the drawing of the water for the putting-in of its ashes, which, since they may be performed by either man or woman, hence may also be performed by night. But how is this a refutation?<sup>6</sup> Will you say that because [the slaughtering is stated to be] invalid [if performed] by a woman, it must be invalid, also, if performed by a lay Israelite,<sup>7</sup> there would be as counterproof the sprinkling of its waters, which, whilst invalid [if performed] by a woman, yet may be done by a lay Israelite! Said Abaye: This is the refutation: Why is the woman excluded [from the slaughtering], because [Scripture said]: ‘Eleazar’, [implying] but not a woman; that [must be applied to] the lay Israelite also, for [the analogue inference]: ‘Eleazar’ [the priest], [implies] but not a lay Israelite.

‘Ulla said: In that whole section [of the red heifer] there are [texts] implying an exception from a preceding implication, and [texts] independent [of preceding or following] implications: And ye shall give her unto Eleazar the priest<sup>8</sup> [implies] only this one to Eleazar, but not [the heifers] in later generations to Eleazar;<sup>9</sup> some say: In later generations [you shall give it] to the high priest, others: In later generations to a common priest. It is quite right according to him who holds that in later generations [the heifer is to be handed over] to a common priest,<sup>10</sup> but whence does he infer who holds that in later generations [it is to be given] to the high priest? — He infers it from [the identical word] ‘Statute’, ‘Statute’, used [also]<sup>11</sup> in connection with the Day of Atonement.<sup>12</sup>

And he shall bring it forth<sup>13</sup> [implies] that he must not bring forth another one with her, as we have learnt:<sup>14</sup> If the heifer refused to go forth, one may not send a black one with her, lest people say: They slaughtered a black [heifer], nor may another red heifer be brought forth with her, lest people say: They slaughtered two. — R. Jose said: This comes not under this title,<sup>15</sup> but because it is written: [And he shall<sup>16</sup> bring it forth]; ‘it’, [implies] by itself. And the [anonymous] first Tanna [surely wrote] ‘it’.<sup>17</sup> — Who is this first Tanna? It is R. Simeon who ‘interprets<sup>18</sup> the reason of biblical law’. What is the difference between them? — There is a difference

- (1) Num. XIX,9 which implies that special watch must be kept with these till the sprinkling.
- (2) Because day is stated specifically, Num. XIX, 12.
- (3) No special verse is required that these may not be performed by a woman since 'Eleazar' or 'priest' is written throughout the section (Rashi).
- (4) Ibid 2, 'law' implying uniform regulations for the whole ceremony.
- (5) I.e., 'Do what is written here, but do not add to these regulations' (Rashi).
- (6) Of Samuel, 42a, who holds that a lay Israelite may slaughter the heifer, for since the objection was raised in support of Rab, it must needs be an attack on Samuel's view.
- (7) Whereas Samuel is said supra to declare it valid.
- (8) Num. XIX, 3.
- (9) Eleazar at that time was deputy high priest, and that heifer, by express statement of Scripture, was entrusted to him. In future, however, it would be given either to the high priest, or to a common priest (R. Hananel).
- (10) For, since Scripture did not expressly state that it be handed over to the high priest, or his deputy, but merely by implication, the assumption seems justified that any priest could officiate at the ceremony.
- (11) Lev. XVI, 29 and Num. XIX, 21, on which this analogy is based.
- (12) Where the service is to be performed by the high priest.
- (13) Num. XIX, 3.
- (14) Parah III, 7.
- (15) I.e., this is not the real reason, rather etc.
- (16) The bracketed portion is omitted in the Talmud and supplied from the Mishnah, Parah III, 7.
- (17) Which seemingly justified the excluding interpretation.
- (18) Kid. 68b: Such interpretation will accordingly modify the law, extending or limiting it.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 43a

if one should bring forth an ass with her.<sup>1</sup>

And he shall slay it [implies] that one must not slaughter any other [heifer] with it. Before him<sup>1</sup> [implies] according to Rab that he must not divert his attention from her; according to Samuel, that a lay Israelite may slaughter, and Eleazar look on.<sup>2</sup> And Eleazar the priest shall take of its blood with his finger<sup>3</sup> [is written] according to Samuel in order to refer it [the rite] back to Eleazar;<sup>4</sup> according to Rab:<sup>5</sup> this is a limitation following a limitation and a double limitation serves to widen the scope, viz., that even a common priest may do it. And the priest shall take cedar-wood, and hyssop, and scarlet,<sup>6</sup> [is written] according to Samuel, that even a common priest [may take and cast it] according to Rab:<sup>7</sup> it is necessary [to mention it], for you might have thought and said: Since these things do not belong to the heifer itself, they do not require any priest's service, therefore Scripture informs us [that they do]. Then the priest shall wash his clothes,<sup>8</sup> [implies] in his priestly<sup>9</sup> garments. And the priest shall be unclean until the even,<sup>8</sup> [implies] that he shall be in his priestly garments<sup>10</sup> even in future generations. That will be quite right according to him who holds that [the heifer ceremony] will in future generations be performed by a common priest,<sup>11</sup> but according to him who holds that in future generations [the heifer ceremony will be performed by] the high priest, now, since a high priest is required, is it necessary to state that he must be in his priestly garments? — Yes, Scripture does [occasionally] take the trouble to mention things which might have been inferred a minori.

And a man that is clean shall gather up the ashes of the heifer and lay them up<sup>12</sup> — 'a man,' [is written] to declare fit a lay Israelite;<sup>13</sup> 'that is clean' — to declare fit a woman; and 'lay them up' [implies] one who has understanding how to lay them up, that excludes one deaf and dumb, an idiot, and a minor, who have not the understanding of how to lay them up. We learned elsewhere:<sup>14</sup> All are fit to prepare [the waters of lustration]<sup>15</sup> with the exception of the deaf and dumb, the idiot, and the minor. R. Judah declares fit a minor and disqualifies a woman and an hermaphrodite. What is the reason for the Rabbis' view? — Because it is written: And for the unclean they shall take of the ashes of the burning of the purification from sin [and put upon them running water in a vessel],<sup>16</sup> i.e.,

they<sup>17</sup> whom I declared unto thee unfit for the gathering [of the ashes] I also declared unto thee unfit for the preparation [of the waters of lustration], but they whom I declared fit to thee for the gathering, I have also declared unto thee fit for the preparation. And [what does] R. Judah [say]? — If that were so,<sup>18</sup> Scripture should have said: ‘He shall take [we-lakah ]’;<sup>19</sup> what is the meaning of they shall take?’ To intimate that even a minor whom I declared unto thee unfit there, is fit to act here.<sup>20</sup> — Whence does he know that a woman is unfit? — Because Scripture says: [‘he shall put’] i.e., he, but not she, shall put. — And the Rabbis? — If the Divine Law had written ‘He shall take’, ‘he shall put’, one might have assumed the same man must both give and put, therefore Scripture wrote ‘and they shall take’. And if the Divine Law had stated ‘they shall take’ and [also] ‘they shall put’, one might have assumed that there must be two to take and put, therefore Scripture wrote: ‘they shall take’ and ‘he shall put’, to indicate that even if [it is right] two take [the ashes] and one puts [the running water in a vessel]. — And a clean man shall take hyssop, and cup it in the water [and sprinkle],<sup>21</sup> according to the Rabbis:<sup>22</sup> ‘A man’ [implies] but not a woman; ‘clean’ is [written] to declare fit<sup>23</sup> even a minor; according to R. Judah:<sup>24</sup> ‘a man’ [implies] but not a minor; ‘clean’ to declare fit a woman.

An objection<sup>25</sup> was raised: ‘All are qualified to sprinkle except one whose sex is unknown, an hermaphrodite and a woman; but a child that is without<sup>26</sup> understanding, a woman may aid in sprinkling’

---

(1) According to the first Tanna that would be permitted, because the presence of the ass could not mislead people into the assumption that it was he who is sacrificed; according to Rabbi, it would be forbidden, for ‘it’ excludes permission for any other animal to be brought forth together with her.

(2) V. supra 42a.

(3) Ibid. 4.

(4) Since ‘he shall slay’ refers, according to Samuel, to the lay Israelite, it was necessary to emphasize that the sprinkling had to be done by ‘Eleazar’, otherwise it might have been assumed that it could be performed by the lay Israelite who did the slaughtering.

(5) Who refers ‘he shall slay’ to the priest, the repetition of ‘Eleazar’ here is apparently superfluous.

(6) The repetition indicating that no limitation is intended, but only exemplification.

(7) Who permits a common priest to receive the blood, this passage being independent of the preceding implication.

(8) Lev. XIX, 7.

(9) It was superfluous to state ‘the priest’ again, since we are dealing but with him, the implication therefore is that he must do it in his priestly garments.

(10) When performing the red heifer ritual.

(11) Who does not draw an analogy from the identical words ‘statute’, occurring both in connection with the Day of Atonement and with the heifer; hence it is necessary to state that in the future, nonetheless, he must then wear his official garb.

(12) Num. XIX, 9.

(13) For gathering up the ashes.

(14) Parah V, 4.

(15) I.e., to put water over the ashes.

(16) Num. XIX, 17.

(17) ‘They’ referring to such as were declared fit for the immediately preceding rite of gathering the ashes mentioned in verse 9.

(18) That ‘they’ refers to such as are mentioned in verse 9.

(19) Just as in verse 9 the singular is used.

(20) A minor is not permitted to gather the ashes, but he may put the water in the ashes.

(21) Num. XIX, 18.

(22) Who hold that the mixing of the ashes and water may be done only by such as are fit to gather the ashes, thus excluding a minor.

(23) Had the same regulation implied in verse 9 applied also to sprinkling, the phrase ‘a clean man’ would have been

superfluous here.

(24) Who disqualifies a woman and declares fit a minor for the mixing of the ashes with the water.

(25) Parah XII, 10.

(26) Corrected according to the Mishnah. The Talmud here reads: a child that has understanding.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 43b**

and here R. Judah does not dispute?<sup>1</sup> — Abaye said: Since the Master said that this chapter contains [texts] implying an exception from a preceding implication, and [texts] independent of preceding or following implications he surely disputes.

And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean,<sup>2</sup> ‘clean’ implies that he was unclean before,<sup>3</sup> that informs us that a tebul-yom is qualified [to officiate] at the heifer [ceremony]. R. Assi said: When R. Johanan and Resh Lakish engaged in investigating questions about the heifer, they were unable to produce more than what a fox can bring up from a ploughed field, but they said this chapter contains [texts] implying an exception from a preceding implication, and [texts] independent of preceding or following implications.<sup>4</sup>

A tanna<sup>5</sup> recited before R. Johanan: All the slaughterings may be performed by a lay Israelite with the exception of that of the [red] heifer. R. Johanan said to him: Go out and teach it in the street!<sup>6</sup> We do not find that slaughtering is disqualified [if performed] by a lay Israelite. Nor would R. Johanan not listen only to a tanna [in this matter] he would not even listen to his own master, for, whereas R. Johanan said in the name of R. Simeon b. Jehozadak: The slaughtering of the heifer by a lay Israelite is invalid [he added]: But I say, it is valid, for we do not find that slaughtering [of sacrifices] by a lay Israelite is invalid.

**HE CAME TO HIS SECOND BULLOCK:** Why is it that in the first confession he does not say ‘And the children of Aaron, Thy holy people’ and in the second confession he mentions: ‘The children of Aaron, Thy holy people’? — The school of R. Ishmael taught: Common sense dictates<sup>7</sup> this: It is better that one innocent<sup>8</sup> obtain atonement for the guilty, than that one guilty obtain atonement for the guilty.

**MISHNAH. HE KILLED IT [THE BULLOCK] AND RECEIVED ITS BLOOD IN A BOWL. AND HE GAVE IT TO THE ONE WHO SHOULD STIR IT UP ON THE FOURTH TERRACE WITHIN THE SANCTUARY<sup>9</sup> LEST IT CONGEAL.<sup>10</sup> HE TOOK THE COAL-PAN AND WENT UP TO THE TOP OF THE ALTAR, CLEARING THE COALS TO BOTH SIDES, TOOK A PANFUL OF THE GLOWING CINDERS FROM BELOW, CAME DOWN AND PLACED THE COAL-PAN ON THE FOURTH TERRACE IN THE TEMPLE COURT.<sup>11</sup> ON OTHER DAYS HE WOULD TAKE OUT [THE CINDERS] WITH A SILVER COAL-PAN, AND EMPTY IT INTO ONE OF GOLD, BUT THIS DAY HE TOOK THEM OUT WITH A GOLDEN [COAL-PAN] IN WHICH HE WAS TO BRING THEM. IN [THE INNER SANCTUARY] ON OTHER DAYS<sup>12</sup> HE WOULD TAKE THEM UP WITH A COAL-PAN CONTAINING FOUR KABS, AND EMPTY IT INTO ONE CONTAINING THREE KABS,<sup>13</sup> THIS DAY HE TOOK THEM OUT WITH ONE CONTAINING THREE KABS, IN WHICH HE BRINGS OUGHT [THE CINDERS] IN, TOO. R. JOSE SAID: ON OTHER DAYS HE WOULD TAKE THEM OUT WITH ONE CONTAINING ONE SE'AH, AND EMPTY IT INTO ONE CONTAINING THREE KABS, THIS DAY HE TOOK THEM OUT WITH ONE CONTAINING THREE KABS, IN WHICH HE ALSO BRINGS IN [THE CINDERS]. ON OTHER DAYS THE PAN WAS HEAVY, TODAY IT WAS LIGHT.<sup>14</sup> ON OTHER DAYS ITS HANDLE WAS SHORT, TODAY IT WAS LONG.<sup>14</sup> ON OTHER DAYS IT WAS OF YELLOWISH GOLD, TODAY OF RED GOLD. THIS IS THE STATEMENT OF R. MENAHEM. ON OTHER DAYS HE WOULD OFFER HALF A MINA [OF INCENSE] IN THE MORNING AND HALF A MINA IN THE AFTERNOON, TODAY HE ADDS ALSO HIS TWO**

HANDS FULL.<sup>15</sup> EVERY DAY IT WAS FINE, BUT TODAY THE FINEST POSSIBLE.<sup>16</sup> ON OTHER DAYS THE PRIESTS WOULD GO UP ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE RAMP<sup>17</sup> AND COME DOWN ON THE WEST SIDE, TODAY THE HIGH PRIEST GOES<sup>18</sup> UP IN THE MIDDLE AND COMES DOWN IN THE MIDDLE. R. JUDAH SAYS: THE HIGH PRIEST ALWAYS GOES UP IN THE MIDDLE AND COMES DOWN IN THE MIDDLE. ON OTHER DAYS THE HIGH PRIEST SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET FROM THE LAVER, THIS DAY FROM A GOLDEN LADLE. R. JUDAH SAYS: THE HIGH PRIEST ALWAYS SANCTIFIES HIS HANDS AND FEET FROM A GOLDEN LADLE. ON OTHER DAYS THERE WERE FOUR WOOD-PILES THERE,<sup>19</sup> TODAY FIVE, THUS SAYS R. MEIR. R. JOSE SAYS: ON OTHER DAYS THREE, TODAY FOUR. R. JUDAH SAYS: ON OTHER DAYS TWO, TODAY THREE. GEMARA. But it is written: And there shall be no man in the tent of meeting?<sup>20</sup> R. Judah said: Read: Of the Hekal.<sup>21</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: ‘And there shall be no man in the tent of meeting’<sup>22</sup>

(1) Tosaf s.v. Velo expresses amazement at the fact that the questioner overlooks the Tosefta, in which R. Judah actually does dispute the anonymous Mishnah. It is to be found in Parah XII, 8, which, as Tosaf suggests, the questioner may not have known the Mishnah containing no such dispute of R. Judah's.

(2) Num. XIX, 19.

(3) The word ‘tahir’ (a clean person) is superfluous, since Scripture just speaks of him, hence it must mean one who is clean again, hence was unclean before. The inference for a tebul-yom (v. Glos.) thus appears justified.

(4) Hence it is impossible to explain them on one schema, because of the particular condition of this chapter, but for the tradition, the inferences would appear incompatible.

(5) V. Glos. s.v. (b).

(6) I.e., it is not fit for the Academy, we cannot accept your report.

(7) Lit., ‘the norm of justice’.

(8) The high priest is adjudged innocent, after having besought and obtained forgiveness for himself.

(9) V. Gemara, loc. cit.

(10) Through being kept there until the time of the smoking of the incense.

(11) Now he would take the incense with his hands and place it in the golden pan.

(12) Tamid V, 5.

(13) This list will prove’ helpful: 1 log=6 eggs; 1 kab =4 logs; 1 se'ah =6 kabs.

(14) The lighter pan and the longer handle were to assist the high priest in his heavy labour on the Day of Atonement.

(15) Both the daily incense on the golden altar in the inner Sanctuary. and the special incense for the day — the latter on a golden pan — were on the Day of Atonement, offered up by the high priest alone.

(16) I.e., ground very thin, thus of finest quality. Ex. XXX, 36.

(17) To the outer altar there were no steps, but the ramp, built ‘In the south of the altar, covering nine cubits of height. The priests went up to the right and down to the left.

(18) Var. lec., ‘Today they went up etc.’ V. Gemara.

(19) Explanation in the Gemara.

(20) Lev. XVI, 17. How then could the priest stir the blood on the fourth terrace in the Sanctuary?

(21) I.e., the fourth terrace leading from the Sanctuary to the Court. v. Mid. III, 6.

(22) Lev. XVI, 17.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 44a

— one could assume, not even in the Temple Court, therefore it says: ‘in the tent of meeting’. I know [this prohibition] only for the tent of meeting in the wilderness. Whence do we know thereof for Shiloh and the everlasting Sanctuary? To teach us that [Scripture] says in the holy place. I know [the prohibition] only during the time of [the smoking of] the incense, whence [do I know that it applies also] during the time of the sprinkling of the blood? To teach us that, Scripture says: until he come out and have made atonement for himself. — I know it only at the [time of] his entering.

Whence do I learn at his coming forth? To teach us that it says: until he come out. And he shall have made atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the assembly of the house of Israel, i.e., the atonement for himself precedes that for his household, and the atonement for his household precedes that for his brethren, the priests and the atonement for his brethren, the priests, precedes that for all the assembly of Israel.

The Master said: I know [of the prohibition] only for the time of [the smoking of] the incense. How is this implied? — Raba, and thus also R. Isaac b. Abdimi, and thus also R. Eleazar said: Scripture says: ‘And he shall have made atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the assembly of the house of Israel’. What atonement is there which obtains evenly for himself, his household, his brethren, the priests, and the whole assembly of the house of Israel? It is the smoking of the incense. But does the incense obtain atonement? — Indeed, for R. Hananiah cited:<sup>1</sup> We learn that the incense obtains atonement for what was said: And he put on the incense and made atonement for the people.<sup>2</sup> And the School of R. Ishmael taught: Why does incense obtain atonement for [the sin] of the evil tongue [evil speech]? Let that which is [performed] in secret<sup>3</sup> come and obtain atonement for what is committed in secret!

We have learnt elsewhere:<sup>4</sup> People must keep away from the place between Ulam<sup>5</sup> and altar at the time of the smoking of the incense. R. Eleazar said: This was taught only during the time of the smoking of the incense in the Sanctuary, but during the time the incense was smoked in the Holy of Holies, people had to keep away from the Hekal, but not from the place between the Ulam and the altar.

A. Adda b. Ahabah, or as some say, Kadi,<sup>6</sup> raised the following objection: R. Jose says: ‘Just as they keep away from the place between Ulam and altar during the [smoking of] the incense, so do they keep away at the time of the sprinkling of the blood of the anointed priest's bullock,<sup>7</sup> and of the bullock offered up because of an error of the congregation,<sup>8</sup> and of the he-goats [offered up] because of idolatry.<sup>9</sup> What gradation of sanctity is there, then, between the Hekal and the space between Ulam and altar? [None] except that from the Hekal men keep away both during the time of the smoking of the incense, and outside of the time of the smoking of the incense, but from the space between Ulam and altar people keep away only in the time of the incense. At any rate, at the time of the smoking of the incense, they do keep away.<sup>10</sup> Would you not say [it means] during the time of the smoking [of the incense] in the Holy of Holies?<sup>11</sup> — No, [the reference is to the time of smoking] in the Hekal.<sup>12</sup> If so, [how explain] ‘what then is the gradation between the two places’ etc.? Is the above the only difference in gradation?<sup>13</sup> Is there not also this difference: that from the Hekal they keep away during the time both of the smoking of the incense in the Hekal itself, and of the smoking of the incense in the Holy of Holies, whereas from the place between Ulam and altar they keep away only during the time of the smoking of the incense in the Hekal itself? — This [exactly] is what he teaches: ‘Except that from the Hekal men keep away, both during the time of the smoking of incense [in the Hekal] and outside of the time of the smoking of the incense [in the Hekal],<sup>14</sup> but from the place between Ulam and altar they keep away

---

(1) ‘Ar. 16a.

(2) Num. XVII, 12.

(3) In the Holy of Holies, hence — since none but the high priest could enter it — ‘in secret’.

(4) Kel. I, 9.

(5) The hall leading to the interior of the Temple.

(6) Either the name of an otherwise unknown Amora, or ‘As the case may be’; or an anonymous Amora; or ‘a fictitious one’, cf. B.M. 2a.

(7) V. Lev. IV, 3ff.

(8) Lev. IV, 13ff.

(9) Num. XV, 24; traditionally interpreted as the sin of idolatry.

(10) Even from the space between the [Ulam and the altar.

(11) Which refutes R. Eleazar.

(12) But at the time of the incense smoking in the Holy of Holies they separate only from the Hekal but not from the space between Ulam and the altar.

(13) Lit., 'and no more'.

(14) I.e., when incense is offered in the Holy of Holies.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 44b**

only in the time of the smoking of the incense [in the Hekal]. — But there is also this gradations that they keep away from the Hekal both during its own sanctification<sup>1</sup> and that of the Holy of Holies, whereas from the space between Ulam and altar they do not keep away except when the Hekal is being sanctified? — Raba said: The term 'keep away' includes it all in one.<sup>2</sup>

The Master said: So do they keep away at the time of the sprinkling of the blood of the anointed priest's bullock, and of the bullock offered up because of an error of the congregation, and of the he-goats offered up because of idolatry. Whence do we know that? — R. Pedath said: We infer that from the identity of the word 'atonement' [occurring also] with reference to the Day of Atonement.

R. Aha b. Ahabah said: Conclude from this that the gradations of sanctity<sup>3</sup> are Biblical, and thus they have learnt them by tradition, for if it should enter your mind that they are only Rabbinical enactment, then what [in law] is the difference in the space between Ulam and altar [from which they must keep away] for fear that they might enter by accident, they should [analogically] keep away from the whole Temple Court out of fear that they might accidentally enter? — The space between Ulam and altar, since it is not marked off in any fashion, is not recognizable sufficiently, whereas the Temple Court, since there is the outer altar to mark it off, is sufficiently recognizable.<sup>4</sup> Raba said: Conclude from this that the holiness of Ulam and Hekal is the same. For if it should enter your mind that they are of two different degrees of sanctity, then the sanctity of the Ulam itself is due only to rabbinic enactment; shall we then enact a preventive measure to prevent the violation of another preventive measure?<sup>5</sup> — No, the Ulam and the space between Ulam and altar are of one degree of sanctity, the Hekal and the Ulam, however, are of two degrees of sanctity.

ON OTHER DAYS HE WOULD TAKE THEM OUT WITH A SILVER COAL-PAN: What is the reason? The Torah has consideration for the money of Israel.<sup>6</sup>

TODAY HE TOOK THEM OUT WITH A GOLDEN PAN IN WHICH HE WAS TO BRING THEM IN: Why? [To prevent] weakness of the high priest.<sup>7</sup>

ON OTHER DAYS HE WOULD TAKE THEM UP WITH A COAL-PAN CONTAINING FOUR KABS: A Tanna taught:<sup>8</sup> One kab of the embers became scattered,<sup>9</sup> and he swept it into the channel.<sup>10</sup> One [Baraita] teaches one kab, and another two kabs? It is quite right according to the one which teaches 'one kab', for it is in accord with what the Rabbis said, but the one that taught 'two kabs' is in accord neither with the Rabbis nor with R. Jose?<sup>11</sup> — R. Hisda said: It is R. Ishmael, the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka, for it was taught: R. Ishmael, son of R. Johanan b. Beroka said: He brought [the cinders] in a pan containing two kabs. — R. Ashi said: You can also say that it is in accord with R. Jose and he said it thus: On other days he would take them up with a pan containing a se'ah of the wilderness,<sup>12</sup> and pour it into one containing three Jerusalem kabs.

ON OTHER DAYS THE PAN WAS HEAVY, TODAY IT WAS LIGHT: A Tanna taught: On other days it was of thick size, but this day it was thin.

ON OTHER DAYS ITS HANDLE WAS SHORT, TODAY LONG: Why that? So that the arm of

the high priest may support it. A Tanna taught: On other days it had no covering,<sup>13</sup> today it had one — this is the statement of the son of the Segan.<sup>14</sup>

**ON OTHER DAYS ITS GOLD WAS YELLOWISH:** R. Hisda said: There are seven kinds of gold:<sup>15</sup> gold; good gold; gold of Ophir;<sup>16</sup> fine<sup>17</sup> gold; spun<sup>18</sup> gold; locked<sup>19</sup> gold; Parwayim<sup>20</sup> gold. Gold and good gold, as it is written:<sup>21</sup> And the gold of that land is good. Ophir gold: [so called] because it derives from Ophir. Fine [mupaz] gold

---

(1) I.e., which would include also the sprinkling of blood.

(2) They both come under one head, independent of the particular rite which is the cause for the keeping away.

(3) Enumerated in Mishnah Kelim 1, 6 — 9.

(4) So as to prevent their entering by mistake, or accident.

(5) In Bez. 3a.

(6) Supra 39a.

(7) That is why he did not have to pour it into another pan. Having the whole heavy programme of the Day of Atonement on his shoulders, all legitimate relief is provided.

(8) V. Tamid 33a.

(9) When he emptied the coal-pan containing four kabs into one containing only three.

(10) V. Shek. IV, 2.

(11) According to whom three kabs would be scattered.

(12) Corresponding to six 'desert' or five Jerusalem kabs, the difference between the two being one sixth. The desert se'ah has five Jerusalem kabs and when the priest pours out three, two remain.

(13) A difficult word, obscure in etymology: variously translated as case, covering. v. Otzar ha-Geonim, ed. B.M. Lewin VI, 21: 'attachment', a contrivance to prevent the handle of the coal-pan from getting too hot. J.T. נִרְתִּיק, 'case', 'casket'.

(14) Perhaps the son of R. Hanina the Segan; perhaps also the last to hold this title, v. Bacher. Agada I, 55.

(15) Mentioned in the Bible.

(16) I Kings X, 11.

(17) Ibid. 18. Tosaf cites the J.T. explaining it to be gold without dross or alloy.

(18) Ibid. 16.

(19) Ibid. 21. The AJP Bible translates it 'pure' gold. 'Closed' to all dross, hence 'solid' would suit it as well.

(20) II Chron. III, 6, obviously the name of a place. The explanation here is homiletical.

(21) Gen. II, 12.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 45a**

, because it resembles [the shining jewel] paz. Spun gold, because it is spun like a thread. Locked [rare] gold, because when its sale is opened, all other shops are being locked up.<sup>1</sup> Gold of Parwayim, because it looked like the blood of a bullock [par]. R. Ashi said: There are but five [varieties], each having gold and good gold. Thus was it also taught:<sup>2</sup> 'On other days the gold was yellowish, this day it was red and that was the Parwayim gold, which looks like the blood of a bullock.'

**ON OTHER DAYS HE WOULD OFFER UP HALF [A MINA] ETC., ON OTHER DAYS IT WAS FINE, TODAY MOST FINE:** Our Rabbis taught: Why was it necessary to state 'beaten small'<sup>3</sup> since it is written already: And thou shalt beat some of it very small?<sup>4</sup> It is but to intimate that it must be most fine. **ON OTHER DAYS THE PRIESTS WOULD COME UP ON THE EASTERN SIDE OF THE RAMP:** Because a master said: Any turn you make shall be but to the right, i.e., toward the east.<sup>5</sup>

**BUT TODAY HE COMES UP IN THE MIDDLE, AND GOES DOWN IN THE MIDDLE:** Why? To honour the high priest.<sup>6</sup>

ON ALL DAYS THE HIGH PRIEST SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET FROM THE LAVER etc.: Why? To honour the high priest.

ON OTHER DAYS THERE WERE FOUR WOOD-PILES THERE: Our Rabbis taught:<sup>7</sup> On other days there were two wood-piles, today three; one for the big wood-pile; one for the second pile for the incense, and one which is added for this day;<sup>8</sup> this is the opinion of R. Judah. R. Jose said: On other days three, today four: one for the big wood-pile, one for the second pile of the incense, one to keep up the fire,<sup>9</sup> and one which was added for this day. R. Meir said: On all days four and today five; one for the big wood-pile, one for the second pile for the incense, one to keep up the fire, and one for [the burning of] limbs and fat-pieces which had not been consumed on the eve, and one which was added on this day. At any rate all are agreed about two, whence do they know it? — Scripture says: It is that which goeth up on its firewood upon the altar all night,<sup>10</sup> i.e., the big pile. And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereby,<sup>10</sup> i.e., the second pile for the incense. Whence does R. Jose infer the [pile for] keeping up the fire? He infers that from: And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereby.<sup>10</sup> And R. Judah? This [verse] refers to the kindling of the [splinters of] fig-wood,<sup>11</sup> for it was taught: R. Judah used to say: Whence do we know that the kindling of the fig-tree splinters must take place only on the top of the altar? To teach us that, it says: ‘And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereby’. R. Jose said: Whence do we know that a [special] pile is made up to keep the fire burning? To teach us that it says: ‘And the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereby.’ But whence does R. Jose infer that the fig-tree splinters must be kindled [on the top of the altar]? — He infers it from whence R. Simeon infers it. For it was taught:<sup>12</sup> And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire on the altar<sup>13</sup> — that teaches that the kindling of the fig-tree wood must be done by a priest and in a ministering vessel;<sup>14</sup> thus, R. Judah. R. Simeon said to him: How could it enter your mind that a lay Israelite could come up to the altar? Rather does [this passage] teach that the kindling of the fig-wood must take place on the top of the altar. And R. Judah? If we had to infer it from there, we might assume he may stay on the ground and kindle it with bellows, therefore he informs us [as above]. Whence does R. Meir know about limbs and fat-pieces unconsumed from the eve before [requiring a special pile]?<sup>15</sup> — He infers it from ‘And the fire’. And the Rabbis? — They do not interpret the ‘And’ [waw]. But, what, according to the Rabbis, does he do with the limbs and fat-pieces unconsumed from the eve before? — He returns them to the big pile, for it was taught: Whence do we know of limbs and fat-pieces unconsumed from the eve before

---

(1) For as long as such gold was obtainable in one shop, none would go to buy in any other.

(2) In support of the explanation of ‘Parwayim’.

(3) Lev. XVI, 12.

(4) Ex. XXX, 36, for all days of the year, therefore a minori for the Day of Atonement.

(5) [The ramp being on the southern side of the altar, by ascending on the eastern side of the ramp, the east of the altar, towards which he has turned is immediately on his right, thus obviating unnecessary movement in the Temple.]

(6) [As a mark of distinction he has the privilege of walking about freely in the Temple without restricting his movements to the minimum. Var. lec.: ‘They’ i.e., the high priest and those who accompany him as a mark of honour].

(7) V. Tosef. Yoma III.

(8) To take thence embers for the incense to be smoked in the Holy of Holies.

(9) In case the fire of the great pile did not keep up strong, one added fire from here.

(10) Lev. VI, 2.

(11) Whereby the big pile was lit,

(12) Supra 24b.

(13) Lev. I, 7.

(14) I.e., the priest must perform this in his priestly vestments.

(15) Since he uses the above passage for his own interpretation.

that he lays them in order on the altar, and if the latter cannot hold them, that he lays them on the ramp, or on the gallery,<sup>1</sup> until the great pile is made? To teach us that, Scripture says: Whereto the fire hath consumed the burnt-offering on the altar.<sup>2</sup> And R. Meir?<sup>3</sup> — [This is to teach] you may place back [there] unconsumed parts of the ‘burnt-offering’, but you may not place there unconsumed parts of the incense, for R. Hanania b. Minumai, of the school of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, said [with reference to]: ‘whereto the fire hath consumed the burnt-offering on the altar’ — you place back unconsumed parts of the burnt-offering, but you do not place back unconsumed parts of the incense. At any rate all agree that one adds [an additional pile] on that day; whence do they infer that? — They infer that from: ‘And the fire’, for even he who does not expound a ‘waw’, expounds ‘waw he’ [and the].<sup>4</sup> What does ‘Fire shall be kept burning upon the altar continually’<sup>5</sup> mean? — It is required as it was taught: ‘Fire shall be kept burning on the altar continually’; it shall not go out — that teaches concerning the second pile for the incense that it shall be laid in order only on the outer altar.<sup>6</sup> Whence do we know that about fire, for the coal-pan, [on the Day of Atonement] and for the candlestick?<sup>7</sup> That can be inferred as follows: The word esh [fire] is mentioned in connection with the incense,<sup>8</sup> and the same word is mentioned in connection with coal-pan and candlestick; hence just as the former comes upon the outer altar, so do the latter come upon the outer altar. Or turn this way<sup>9</sup> [perhaps]: the word esh [fire] is mentioned in connection with incense and is also mentioned in connection with coal-pan and candlestick; just as for the former it comes [for the altar] ‘near to it’,<sup>10</sup> so for the latter it comes [from the altar] near to it.<sup>11</sup> To teach us [the right law] Scripture says: ‘Fire shall be kept burning on the altar,’ it shall not go out i.e., the continual fire whereof I spoke<sup>12</sup> to you must be nowhere else but on the top of the outer altar. We thus learned it for the fire of the candlestick, whence do we know it for the fire of the coal-pan? This can be inferred: [The word] ‘esh’ [fire] is stated in connection with the coal-pan, and ‘esh’ is used in connection with the candlestick, hence just as the former comes from the outer altar, so does the latter come from the outer altar. But, perhaps turn this way: [the word] ‘esh’ is mentioned in reference to the incense, and ‘esh’ is used in connection with the coal-pan; hence just as the former comes from [the altar] near to it, so the latter too comes from [the altar] near to it. Therefore it says: And he shall take a censer full of coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord<sup>13</sup> Now which altar is [only] partly before the Lord, but not wholly before the Lord? You must say it is the outer altar.<sup>14</sup>

Now it was necessary [for Scripture] to mention both ‘from off the altar’ and from ‘before the Lord’. For if the Divine Law had written only ‘from off the altar’ I might have said: That ‘altar’ means the inner altar, hence the Divine Law said: ‘from before the Lord.’<sup>15</sup> And if the Divine Law had written: ‘From before the Lord’ [alone], I might have said it must be exactly before the Lord,<sup>16</sup>

---

(1) The sobeb v. Glos.

(2) Lev. VI, 3. This is superfluous in view of the preceding ‘it is that which goeth up on its firewood’, hence the derivation.

(3) How does he explain this verse.

(4) As in this case where it is written ‘and the fire’ a superfluous letter may have some intimation, two unnecessary ones must have it.

(5) Lev. VI, 6.

(6) ‘The altar’ in the cited verse referring to the outer altar.

(7) I.e., that they are to be fetched from the other altar.

(8) According to Rashi the word ‘esh’ is not really mentioned, but implied: he shall smoke it ‘and there can be no smoke without fire’; but Tosaf. cites Num. XVI, 18, where the word fire is actually explicit in connection with incense.

(9) I.e., argue thus; a suggestion opposed to the preceding one is occasionally introduced by this composite word.

(10) The inner altar is in the neighbourhood of the outer altar.

(11) I.e., the inner altar which is nearest to the candlestick and the Holy of Holies.

(12) I.e., the perpetual light of the candlestick, v. Ex. XXVII, 20.

(13) Lev. XVI, 12.

(14) Since the inner altar is entirely facing the inner Sanctuary.

(15) 'Mi-lifne' — 'from before' is taken to mean 'only part of the altar is before the Lord.'

(16) I.e., just opposite the entrance of the Sanctuary.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 46a

but not to one side or to the other,<sup>1</sup> therefore it was necessary [to have both phrases].

R. Eleazar said in the name of Bar Kappara: R. Meir used to say: For any of the limbs of the [daily] burnt-offering which remained over,<sup>2</sup> a special pile is to be arranged, even on the Sabbath. What is he teaching us? Have we not learnt: Every day there were four piles of wood there?<sup>3</sup> — R. Abin said: It was necessary [to state it] for those which became [somewhat] invalidated.<sup>4</sup> [This however] is only when the fire has already touched them, but not when the fire has not taken hold of them. Some there are who say: Whether they were valid or invalid<sup>4</sup> [the same rule applies]: If the fire had touched them, a special pile is needed but if not, not. [You say] 'Even on the Sabbath'. [Surely] we have learnt thus: AND TODAY FIVE [PILES OF WOOD]!<sup>5</sup> — R. Aha b. Jacob said: It was necessary [to mention that]. The thought might have arisen in you that this applied only when the Day of Atonement fell [immediately] after Sabbath, because the fat-pieces of the Sabbath may be offered up on the Day of Atonement, but not [if it fell] in the middle of the week, therefore he informs us [that it applies then too].

Raba said: Who is it that does not care what flour he grinds?<sup>6</sup> Have we not learnt: On all other days?<sup>7</sup> [These were four]-This is a real difficulty. Now he [Bar Kappara] disputes with R. Huna who holds: The continual offering suspends the Sabbath only at its beginning, but not at its end.<sup>8</sup>

[To turn to] the main text: The continual offering suspends the Sabbath only at its beginnings not at its end. What does it not suspend? — R. Hisda says: It suspends the Sabbath, but not the law of levitical impurity. Rabbah said: It suspends the law of levitical impurity,<sup>9</sup> but not the Sabbath. Said Abaye to Rabbah: There is a difficulty on your view as well as on the view of R. Hisda. According to you, there is a difficulty: Why does it suspend the law of levitical impurity? Because Scripture said: In its due season<sup>10</sup> i.e., even in levitical uncleanness, [it should suspend also] the Sabbath, [since] 'in its due season' [implies] even on the Sabbath? — And according to R. Hisda there is a difficulty. Wherefore the difference [in law in the case of] Sabbath touching which it is written: 'In its due season' [i.e.] even on the Sabbath; the same should apply to levitical impurity, since 'In its due season' [implies] even in levitical uncleanness.<sup>11</sup> He answered: There is no difficulty according to my view, nor is there any difficulty according to R. Hisda. There is no difficulty on my view; for the beginning is like the end

---

(1) Though it is on the western side of the altar.

(2) I.e., the limbs had been only partly consumed.

(3) One of which was meant for the limbs of the burnt-offering of the Temple, which remained over.

(4) I.e., Only in so far that they were not to be offered at the altar at the outset, though once they had been brought upon the altar they could be allowed to remain there to be consumed.

(5) And the same regulation governs both the Sabbath and the Day of Atonement, and it was taught that for the limbs of the continual dusk-offering a special pile was established on the Day of Atonement.

(6) I.e., does not care what argument he offers. Just as one who does not care what flour he grinds, will hurt his body through indigestible food, so will one who is not sensitive to careless thinking in his study, hurt his mind. V. Lewin, Otzar VI, 55, 170.-D.S. adduces a reading from the Aruk, 'he does not care what comes before him', i.e., he ignores texts in theorizing.

(7) Which includes the Sabbath.

(8) This offering is sacrificed on the Sabbath day, notwithstanding the fact that the labour involved many kinds of work expressly forbidden on that day. But only at the beginning. i.e., if the beginning of that sacrifice has to be made on the Sabbath. Of the Friday dusk-offering, however, the limbs must be smoked before the Sabbath. Since it belongs to Friday

it would be desecration to continue it on the Sabbath.

(9) Cf. supra 6b.

(10) Num. XXVIII, 2.

(11) For if no clean priest is present to sprinkle the blood, even one in the state of levitical uncleanness is permitted to do so.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 46b**

[consequently] in the case of the law of levitical impurity, since it is suspended at the beginning it is also suspended at the end, but with regard to the Sabbath, since it is not suspended at the beginning<sup>1</sup> it is also not suspended at the end. Nor is there any difficulty according to R. Hisda: He does not hold that the end is like the beginning: [consequently] with regard to the Sabbath, since it is inoperative when a community sacrifice is concerned, it is suspended also at the end of the sacrifice, whereas as regards the law of levitical uncleanness, since in the face of a community sacrifice it is only suspended,<sup>2</sup> it is suspended only at the beginning which is essential for [the obtainment of] atonement, but not at the end, which is not essential for atonement.

It was stated: If one puts out the fire of the coal-pan or of the candlestick, Abaye holds him guilty,<sup>3</sup> Raba holds him not guilty. If he put it out on the top of the altar, all agree that he is guilty, they dispute it only if he brought it down to the ground and put it out there. Abaye holds him guilty 'because it is fire of the altar'; whereas Raba holds him guilty, 'since he snatched it away, he has snatched it'.<sup>4</sup> According to whose opinion will be, then, what R. Nahman said in the name of Rabbah b. Abbuha: 'One who takes an ember down from the altar and puts it out is guilty' shall we say it will be in accord with Abaye?<sup>5</sup> — You may also say that it is in accord with Raba, for in the one case it was not snatched away' for its ordained use,<sup>6</sup> in the other case it was snatched away' from the altar for its ordained use.

Some there are who say: None disputes the case where he took it down to the floor and put it out there, [all agreeing] that he is not guilty, the dispute concerns but the case where he put it out on the top of the altar. Abaye holds he is guilty 'because it is the top of the altar', whereas Raba holds him guilty, 'since he snatched it away, he has snatched it'. According to whose opinion, then, will be the teaching of R. Nahman in the name of Rabbah b. Abbuha viz.: 'One who brings an ember down from the altar and puts it out is guilty', — will you not say it will be in accord with neither Abaye nor Raba? — [No], there it was not snatched away for its ordained use, here it was snatched away' for its ordained use. [

---

(1) The Friday dusk-offering must be offered before Sabbath since the blood of the offering would become useless, invalidated, if not sprinkled before sunset.

(2) Only 'with difficulty' but never imperative, every attempt must be made to prepare the sacrifice in levitical cleanness. V. Supra 7b.

(3) Of having transgressed the prohibition: 'It shall not go out' i.e., it must not be put out, Lev. VI, 6.

(4) And it has lost its sacred character, hence what he put out on the floor was no more a coal sanctified on the altar whence he does not become guilty of transgressing the prohibition.

(5) The adopted opinion in disputes between Abaye and Raba is in the overwhelming majority in accord with Raba, whence the question as to the meaning of his teaching an invalid opinion. V. B.M. 22b.

(6) To place it in the coal-pan.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 47a

### CHAPTER V

MISHNAH. THEY BROUGHT OUT TO HIM THE LADLE AND THE PAN. [FROM THE LATTER] HE TOOK HIS TWO HANDS FULL [OF INCENSE] AND PUT IT INTO THE LADLE, A TALL [HIGH PRIEST] ACCORDING TO HIS SIZE, A SHORT ONE ACCORDING TO HIS SIZE AND THUS WAS ITS MEASURE. HE TOOK THE PAN<sup>1</sup> IN HIS RIGHT [HAND] AND THE LADLE IN HIS LEFT [HAND].

GEMARA. THE PAN? But was it not taught:<sup>2</sup> He took the pan and went up to the top of the altar, took out the burning coals, and went down? — There the reference is to the pan of burning coals, here to the pan of the incense. For it was taught:<sup>3</sup> One brought out for him the empty ladle from the Cell of Vessels, and the heaped pan of incense from the Cell of the House of Abtinah.<sup>4</sup>

HE TOOK HIS TWO HANDS FULL AND PUT IT INTO THE LADLE, A TALL [HIGH PRIEST] ACCORDING TO HIS SIZE, A SHORT ONE ACCORDING TO HIS SIZE AND THUS WAS ITS MEASURE: For what purpose was the ladle on the Day of Atonement necessary? Surely the Divine Law said: [And he shall take] his hands full and bring it<sup>5</sup> — Because [otherwise] it is impossible.<sup>6</sup> For how shall he do it? Shall he bring in [the pan of burning coals] and then again bring in [the incense]?<sup>7</sup> The Divine Law refers to one 'bringing in', not to two 'bringings in'. — Shall he take the incense in his handfuls and place the pan<sup>8</sup> [of burning coals] on top of it, entering thus? Then when he comes [within the veil] how shall he act? Shall he take it between his teeth and set the pan [of burning coals] down? Now, if such procedure is unseemly in the presence of a mortal king, how much less seemly is it before the Supreme King of Kings, the Holy One, blessed be He? — Thus it is impossible and since it is impossible, we do it as we find it in connection with the [offerings of the] princes.<sup>9</sup>

He took the pan<sup>10</sup> in his right hand and the censer into his left hand.<sup>11</sup> 'The native below and the alien in the heavens above'? This one [the ladle] is small, the other [coal-pan] large,<sup>12</sup> and even where both are alike, as with R. Ishmael b. Kimhith, the one is hot and the other cold. It was reported about R. Ishmael b. Kimhith that he was able to take four kabs in his two handfuls, saying: All women are valiant but the valour of my mother exceeded them all.<sup>13</sup> Some interpret it<sup>14</sup> as referring to the crumb-dough,<sup>15</sup> in accord with Rabbah b. Jonathan who said in the name of R. Yehiel that crumb-dough is very helpful to a sick person. Others say it refers to the [healthy] semen [she received], in accordance with what R. Abbuha asked. For he raised a contradiction: It is written: For thou hast sifted<sup>16</sup> me with strength unto the battle<sup>17</sup> but it is also written, Who has girded me with valour [for the battle]<sup>18</sup> [to interpret the divergence thus]: David said before the Holy One, blessed be He: Lord of the Universe, Thou hast [first] 'carefully sifted' and then strengthened me. It was told of R. Ishmael b. Kimhith<sup>19</sup> that one day he talked in the street to an Arab, and spittle from his mouth flew on his garments,<sup>20</sup> whereupon his brother Jeshebab entered and ministered in his stead. Thus their mother saw<sup>21</sup> two high priests on one day. Furthermore, it is told of R. Ishmael b. Kimhith that he went out and talked with a certain lord<sup>22</sup> in the street, and spittle from his mouth squirted on his garments, whereupon Joseph his brother entered and ministered in his stead so that their mother saw two high priests<sup>21</sup> on one day. The Sages said unto her: What hast thou done to merit such [glory]? She said: Throughout the days of my life the beams of my house have not seen the plaits of my hair.<sup>23</sup> They said to her: There were many who did likewise and yet did not succeed.<sup>24</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: with his fists<sup>25</sup>, that means that he must not make a measure for his fistful.<sup>26</sup> The question was: How about making a measure for his handfuls? Is it only there<sup>25</sup> since it is written, 'With his fist',<sup>27</sup> whereas here<sup>28</sup> where it is not written 'With his handfuls' but 'his hand full of fine incense,' [it matters] not,<sup>29</sup> or does he derive [the meaning of] 'full' from [the word], full'

[occurring in connection with] his fist?<sup>30</sup> — Come and hear: AND THUS WAS ITS MEASURE'. Would you not say that it means: If he wishes to make a measure he may do so?<sup>31</sup> — No, this is what it means: In the same manner would he take the hands full within the Holy of Holies.<sup>32</sup> May not you then conclude from this that he takes the handfuls [outside] and repeats it inside again! — [No], perhaps it means that if he wants to have a measure made, he may do so;<sup>33</sup> or, that he must take neither less nor more.<sup>34</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: His fistfull.<sup>35</sup> One might have assumed that it may come forth on both sides, therefore Scripture says: 'With his fist'.<sup>36</sup> From 'With his fist' I might have inferred that he should just take some with his finger-tips hence Scripture says: His fistful', i.e., in the manner in which people take a fistful. How so? He bends three of his fingers<sup>37</sup> up to his wrist and takes a fistful.

- 
- (1) V. Gemara.
  - (2) Infra 48b.
  - (3) Ibid.
  - (4) V. supra.
  - (5) Lev. XVI, 12.
  - (6) To perform the rite without the ladle.
  - (7) In his handfuls.
  - (8) Shall he put the pan on the incense and enter.
  - (9) Num. VII, 14; One ladle . . . full of incense.
  - (10) This refers to the pan of burning coal.
  - (11) This is illogical for the ladle with the incense should be in his right hand and the less important pan in the left.
  - (12) Hence the heavier of the two, and therefore carried in the right hand.
  - (13) Lit., 'has ascended to the roof'. She has taken exceedingly good care of her children. The phrase is reminiscent of Prov. XXXI, 29. **הַרְגָּלָהּ** may be interpreted as valour (Jast.); as vine (Aruch) or bundles of green (R. Han.) i.e., children.
  - (14) The mother's valour or the children's power.
  - (15) Which she ate during her pregnancy or on which she fed her children.
  - (16) With reference to his inner constitution. E.V. 'girded me'.
  - (17) II Sam. XXII, 40.
  - (18) Ps. XVIII, 33. The texts of II Sam. XXII and Ps. XVIII are almost identical, hence changes or deviations must have a definite idea underlying each. 'Sifted' is an ad hoc interpretation. The words 'for the battle' are not found in Ps. XVIII, 33.
  - (19) Tosaf. Yoma III.
  - (20) It was on the day of Atonement, he was to minister as high priest and the spittle defiled and thus prevented him from officiating.
  - (21) Both her sons.
  - (22) In the Tosaf. the reading is 'a king' and the incident reported to have occurred on the eve of the Day of Atonement.
  - (23) Especially a married woman would always cover her hair, as a sign of modesty. [Buchler (JQR. 1926) p. 8 identifies this high priest with Simeon (Ishmael) the son of Kamithos who was appointed by Gratus in the year 17-18.] The sight of a married woman's hair is an impropriety. Git. 90a.
  - (24) In obtaining such distinction. Your suggestion is insufficient.
  - (25) Lev. VI, 8.
  - (26) I.e., he must not use a measure instead of his fist.
  - (27) I.e., with his fist only, not with a measure.
  - (28) Lev. XVI, 12.
  - (29) Does the prohibition of using a measure not apply here.
  - (30) V. Lev. II, 2; the word 'full' written thus implies prohibition of an artificial measure. By inference from the identity of phrase the same may be assumed to apply here.
  - (31) This may be explained to refer to the ladle, to mean that one could have a measure made in accord with the high priest's size of hand.
  - (32) The Mishnah here means: And this was the method of measurement within; i.e., the priest would empty incense

from the ladle into his hands and then put it over the burning coals in the pan.

(33) I.e., one cannot conclude from the Mishnah either way.

(34) Thus was the measure-two exact hands full-rigidly so.

(35) Lev. II, 2.

(36) Lev. VI, 8. No more, just as much as the closed fist will contain.

(37) Grasping with them.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 47b

In the case of the [meal-offering baked in a] griddle and the [meal-offering of the] stewing-pan<sup>1</sup> he makes it even with his thumb from above and with his small finger from below. And this was the most difficult service in the Sanctuary. [You say] 'this is'; and nothing else? Was there not the pinching of the bird's head<sup>2</sup> and was there not the taking of the fistfuls?<sup>3</sup> - But say, rather, this was one of the difficult priestly functions in the Sanctuary. — R. Johanan said: R. Joshua b. Uza'ah asked: How about that which is between [the fingers of the fist]?<sup>4</sup> -R. Papa answered: That which is inside needs no question for it surely belongs to the fistful. Concerning that which is on the outside, too, there is no doubt, it surely is considered a remainder.<sup>5</sup> The question attaches only to such portions as are in between [the fingers]. How about these? — Said R. Johanan: R. Joshua b. Uza'ah had subsequently solved [the question] viz., concerning [the portion] in between, uncertainty prevails.<sup>6</sup> How then shall he act?-R. Hanina said: He shall burn [as an offering] first the fistful and then the portions in between [the fingers]. For, if we were to burn up [the 'in between' portions] first, perhaps they are considered remainders, and it would thus be a case where the remainders became reduced between the taking of the fistful and the burning [of it on the altar], whereas the Master has said<sup>7</sup> that if remainders became reduced between the taking of the fistful and the burning thereof no more fistfuls may be burnt up on their account! If that be so, then even now apply thereto the rule:<sup>8</sup> Whatever had partly been used in fire offering must no more be burnt [as an offering]?<sup>9</sup> Said R. Judah, son of R. Simeon b. Pazzi: He burns them [the remainders] up as wood, in accord with R. Eliezer, for it was taught:<sup>10</sup> R. Eliezer said: For a sweet savour,<sup>11</sup> for this you must not bring them up but you may bring them up as fuel. This will be in accord with R. Eliezer, but what is there to be said in accord with the Sages?<sup>12</sup> R. Mari said: Fat priests<sup>13</sup> take the fistful. Now that you have come to this answer, according to R. Eliezer, too, [there is a procedure which may be adopted] at the outset,<sup>14</sup> viz., fat priests should take the fistful. R. Papa inquired: How about the middle [portions] 'in between' connection with the [two] hands full?<sup>15</sup> — What is he inquiring about? If he derives [the meaning of the word] 'full' from 'full' [occurring] there<sup>16</sup> it is the same [as the first question].<sup>17</sup> — This is what R. Papa asks: [Should we say that] we require that 'he shall bring it his hands full',<sup>18</sup> which is the case here, or is it required that he take...bring in, which is not the case here?<sup>19</sup> — The question remains unanswered.

R. Papa said: It is obvious to me that 'his fistful' means: In the manner in which people usually take a fistful, but R. Papa asked: If he had taken the 'fistful' with his finger-tips, what is the law then, or [if he took it] from below upward, or from the sides, what then? — The questions remain unanswered.

R. Papa said: It is obvious to me that the 'handfuls' are to be taken as men usually take them, but he asked: If he took the 'handfuls' with his finger-tips, what then? or from below upward, or from the side; or if he swept it with one hand and with the other and then brought the hands together? — The questions remain unanswered.

---

(1) V. Lev. II, 5 and 7.

(2) Zeb. 64b, based on Lev. V, 8.

(3) The priest's taking of the handfuls of incense, Lev. XVI, 12, v. infra 49b.

(4) Is it considered part of the fistful to be offered on the altar, or the remnant which went to the priests?

- (5) Belonging to the priests.
- (6) As to where they are to belong.
- (7) Men. 9a.
- (8) Men. 58a.
- (9) An interpretation of Lev. II, 12. And since he first burns up the fistful he should not be permitted to burn up after that the remainders as an offering.
- (10) Zeb. 77b.
- (11) Lev. II, 12, on which the rule cited last is based.
- (12) Who extend the prohibition even against burning them as fuel (v. Zeb. 77b). What is one therefore to do with the portions 'in between'.
- (13) Whose fingers are fat without any space between them for any quantity to get in.
- (14) The proposal to burn it as fuel is even according to R. Eliezer not one which is to be adopted at the outset, v. Zeb. ibid.
- (15) Sc. of incense offered on the Day of Atonement.
- (16) I.e., in connection with the fistful; just as with the fistful any heaping is not burnt up as offering, the same would apply to heapings of the two hands full. The analogy based on the use of the word 'full' in both Lev. II, 2, which refers to the first, as in ibid. XVI, 12, which deals with the two hands full.
- (17) Asked supra, whether a measure may be made for the hands full.
- (18) Lit., 'his hands full... and he shall bring' v. Lev. XVI, 12.
- (19) For he has not placed it between his fingers, it having entered there by itself, hence the required personal effort-and he shall take it-was absent.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 48a

R. Papa asked: If he stuck the fistful on to the side of the vessel, what then? Does the law require that it be put into the middle of the vessel, which is the case here, or must it be placed inside the vessel properly, and this was not done in our case? — The question remains unanswered.

Mar, the son of R. Ashi asked: If he overturned the vessel and placed the fistful on the bottom of the vessel, how then? Does the law require placing it in the vessel, which was done here, or is it to be placed properly, which has not been done? The question remains unanswered.

R. Papa asked: With regard to the 'handfuls' are they to be heaped or levelled?-R. Abba said to R. Ashi: Come and hear: The 'handfuls' whereof they spoke are to be neither levelled, nor heaped, but liberally measured. — We learned elsewhere:<sup>1</sup> If the blood was poured out on the pavement<sup>2</sup> and he gathered it up, it is invalidated. But if it was poured out of the vessel on the pavement and he gathered it up, it is usable. Whence do we know this?<sup>3</sup> — For the Rabbis taught: And [the anointed priest] shall take of the blood of the bullock,<sup>4</sup> i.e., from the blood of life<sup>5</sup> and not from the blood of the skin, nor from the last blood oozing out.<sup>6</sup> 'From the blood of the bullock' i.e., the blood from the bullock shall he receive [straight]. For if you were to interpret from the blood of the bullock' [as meaning] 'from the blood<sup>7</sup> i.e.' even if only part of the blood, has not Rab Judah said: He who receives the blood must receive the whole of the bullock's blood, as it is said: And all the remaining blood of the bullock shall he pour out at the base of the altar,<sup>8</sup> hence it is evident from here that from the blood of the bullock' must be interpreted as 'blood from the bullock [straight]';<sup>9</sup> he<sup>10</sup> holding the view: One may remove [a letter] and add [one] and thus interpret.<sup>11</sup>

R. Papa asked: If the incense was scattered from his handfuls, how then? Is his hand to be compared to the neck of the animal<sup>12</sup> so that the incense would be invalidated, or is it to be compared to a ministering vessel and thus is not invalidated? — The question remains unanswered.

R. Papa asked further: If, in taking the handfuls of the incense, he had an [unlawful] intention,<sup>13</sup> what then? Do we say that we infer [the meaning] of 'full' [by analogy of] 'full' occurring with the

meal-offering,<sup>14</sup> [viz.,] as in that case an [unlawful] intention effects an invalidation, so here too, an unlawful intention will effect an invalidation, or is it not so?-R. Shimi b. Ashi said to R. Papa: Come and hear: R. Akiba added [the cases of]<sup>15</sup> the fine flour, the incense, the balm, and the embers [of the sanctuary]. that if a tebul yom<sup>16</sup> had touched part of them, he invalidated all of them.<sup>17</sup> Now the assumption is that since a tebul yom invalidates them<sup>18</sup> so does their being kept overnight,<sup>19</sup> and since their being kept overnight invalidates them, so does unlawful intention.<sup>20</sup>

R. Papa asked:

- 
- (1) Zeb. 25a.
  - (2) Before having been received into a vessel, as prescribed.
  - (3) That it is necessary for the blood to flow from the neck of the animal straight into a vessel.
  - (4) Lev. IV, 5.
  - (5) The blood coming forth in a jet, with which life leaves the body of the animal.
  - (6) Of the vein which was cut.
  - (7) The Hebrew words are Mi-dam ha-par, 'From the blood of the bullock'. The 'mi' has partitive meaning-'from the blood', part of it, not all of it.
  - (8) Lev. IV, 7.
  - (9) Meaning not from the skin, the vein, but that which is the bullock's life, with the jetting away of which his life too is gone.
  - (10) The Tanna of the cited Baraitha.
  - (11) In order to remove a contradiction. This interpretation involves a change in the Hebrew text. Instead of **מִדָּם הַפָּר** the ad hoc reading is: **דָּם מֵהַפָּר** Involving a removal of one letter from the first word and its addition to the second word.
  - (12) When the blood flows from the neck of the animal to the pavement, instead of being received in a vessel, it is invalidated. Does the same law apply when the incense is scattered?
  - (13) An intention at the moment of slaying to eat of the flesh beyond the allotted time renders the animal in question 'a vile thing' (Zeb. 25a). If the priest has similar intention, i.e., to offer up the incense tomorrow instead of today, would the same consequence ensue for the incense?
  - (14) V. supra p. 223.
  - (15) V. Hag. 23b, Sonc. ed., for notes.
  - (16) One who has bathed in daytime but must await the sunset to be perfectly clean. V. Lev. XXII, 7.
  - (17) The vessel of ministry combining the various constituent parts of the flour etc., as one. V. Hag., Sonc. ed., 23b for notes.
  - (18) Through the union effected by the vessel of ministry.
  - (19) In virtue of the fact that they were contained in a vessel of ministry. V Me'il. 10a.
  - (20) I.e., since the incense by being placed in a vessel of ministry received a holy character in respect of contact with a tebul yom, and being kept overnight, it becomes invalidated through unlawful intention.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 48b

If he, in removing the coals [for the incense], had an unlawful intention — what then? Are preliminary<sup>1</sup> means of a religious act to be considered as the act itself or not? — The question remains unsolved.

The question was asked of R. Shesheth: If the blood was carried [to the altar] in the left hand, what is the law?<sup>2</sup> R. Shesheth answered: You have learnt it: He took the pan of burning coals in his right hand and the ladle in his left.<sup>3</sup> But he could have settled that point to them from what we have learnt:<sup>4</sup> [He carried] the right hind-leg in the left hand with the inside of the skin outward?<sup>5</sup> — If the argument were based on that I might have assumed this applies only to a carrying [of such things] which are not indispensable to atonement,<sup>5</sup> but in the case of a carrying [of things] which are indispensable to atonement,<sup>6</sup> [it would] not [apply], therefore he has to bring [the above reference].<sup>7</sup>

---

(1) So that his unlawful thought in connection with the preliminary act would have the same effect as such thought in connection with the religious act in itself and so the incense is rendered invalidated. Another interpretation would limit the effects of his unlawful intention to the preliminary act, here to the embers.

(2) All the other rites in connection with the blood sprinkling must be performed with the right. V. Zeb. 16b and 24a.

(3) Whence we may infer that even in this case he is within the law.

(4) Tam. IV, 3.

(5) I.e., the carrying of the limbs.

(6) E.g., the carrying of the blood to the place of sprinkling.

(7) Referring to the incense which is indispensable to atonement.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 49a

They raised the following objection:<sup>1</sup> A lay Israelite, an onen,<sup>2</sup> one inebriate or one with a blemish are invalidated for the receiving, the carrying, and the sprinkling of the blood, and so is one seated, and the left hand. This is a refutation. — But R. Shesheth himself has asked this question in refutation!<sup>3</sup> For R. Shesheth said to the Amora<sup>4</sup> of R. Hisda who asked of R. Hisda: May the blood be carried by a lay Israelite? He answered: It is proper and a scriptural verse supports me: And they killed the passover lamb, and the priests dashed<sup>5</sup> of their hand, and the Levites flayed them.<sup>6</sup> And R. Shesheth raised this question: A lay Israelite, a mourner, an inebriate, or one blemished are invalidated for the receiving, the carrying, or the sprinkling of the blood, and so is one seated and the left hand!<sup>7</sup> -After having heard it, he raised it in objection [against R. Hisda]. But R. Hisda had cited a scriptural passage [in support]? — They served only the purpose of a portico.<sup>8</sup>

R. Papa asked: If another<sup>9</sup> [priest] took his hands full and put it into his [the high priest's] hands — how then? Is what we require that it be 'his hands full' which we have here, or is it required that he both 'take [his hands full] and bring it in', which was not the case here? — The question remains unsolved. R. Joshua b. Levi asked: If he had taken his hands full and then died, what about someone else entering [within the Holy of Holies] with his [the first one's] handfuls? — Said R. Hanina: This is a question of the older generation!<sup>10</sup> Shall we say that R. Joshua b. Levi was older?<sup>11</sup> But R. Joshua b. Levi had said: R. Hanina permitted me to drink a cress-dish<sup>12</sup> on the Sabbath? [You say] to drink? That is self-evident, for we have learnt:<sup>13</sup> One may eat all kinds of food for a remedy, and one may drink every kind of drink as a medicine? — Rather to grind and to drink cress-dish on the Sabbath. What case do you mean? If it be a case of danger, surely it is allowed;<sup>14</sup> and if the case be without danger, it surely is forbidden?<sup>15</sup> -In truth the case referred to is one dangerous and this is how the question ran: Does it cure so that one may for this purpose desecrate the Sabbath, or does it not effect a cure so that one may not desecrate the Sabbath in connection with it? And why was it R. Hanina?<sup>16</sup> — Because he was familiar with medicine, for R. Hanina said:<sup>17</sup> Never did a man consult me concerning a wound inflicted by a white mule and recover. But we see that people recover? -Say: And it was cured.<sup>18</sup> -But we see them cured? -The reference here is to red mules, the end of whose feet is white. — At any rate we learn from here that R. Hanina was the older one?<sup>19</sup> -Rather, this is what he said: Our question is like one of the former generation.<sup>20</sup> But did R. Hanina express such a view?<sup>21</sup> Did not R. Hanina say: With a bullock,<sup>22</sup> i.e., but not with the blood of a bullock;<sup>23</sup> and, furthermore, was it not R. Hanina who said: If he took the hands full of the incense before the slaying of the of the bullock, he has done nothing?<sup>24</sup> — This is what he [R. Hanina] said: Since he<sup>25</sup> asks the question, the inference is justified that he holds 'With a bullock' includes also 'with the bullock's blood'; now, according to [this] his view, his question is like the question of an older generation. — What about that?<sup>26</sup> — R. Papa said: If [we say that] he takes the handful first and then must take it again,<sup>27</sup> then his fellow may enter with his hafinah,<sup>28</sup> because the hafinah is still the same; but if [we say] that he takes the handfuls once but does not take them again, then your question arises. Said R. Huna son of R. Joshua to R. Papa: On the contrary! If [we say that he] performs the hafinah twice, none else should enter with his hafinah, because it is impossible that the

second take not either a bit less [than the handfuls of the first]<sup>29</sup> or a bit more; but [if we say that] he performs only one hafinah, does your question arise. For the question had been raised: Must he perform the hafinah twice?- Come and hear: AND SUCH WAS ITS MEASURE. Now does not that mean that as the measure in the outside hafinah, so was it in the hafinah within the Holy of Holies? — No, perhaps the meaning here is that if he wanted to make a measure he could do so, or, that he must not take either more or less in the one case than in the other.<sup>30</sup> Come and hear:

---

(1) Zeb. 16a.

(2) V. Glos.

(3) Hence he obviously knew the Mishnah, how then could he have given the wrong answer!

(4) V. Glos. s.v. (b).

(5) II Chron. XXXV, 11.

(6) I.e., the blood which they received at the altar side from those who killed the passover, namely, lay Israelites who are fit for slaughtering sacrifices, v. Supra 43a.

(7) Which shows that R. Shesheth knew of the Mishnah disqualifying the carrying with the left hand, how then did he solve the question put to him contrariwise.

(8) The laymen served only the purpose of a portico, holding the bowls up to view, but not handing them to the altar.

(9) Lit., 'his fellow'.

(10) The fact that this question asked by a teacher of the older generation has been also put by myself is an implicit compliment to our learning; R. Joshua b. Levi being of the older generation.

(11) The older of the two scholars. Hence Hanina's remark about the 'older generation'.

(12) 'Drink' because usually mixed with wine or oil.

(13) Shab. 109b.

(14) And is not in need of any special argument for dispensation.

(15) And no effort to permit it would be legitimate.

(16) Of whom the question was asked.

(17) Hul. 7a.

(18) The first interpretation referred to the person injured by the mule,' the second to the wound.

(19) Since R. Joshua refers to Hanina as 'R. Hanina', one must assume that the former cannot have been older, for in that case he would have called him by his first name, Instead of saying 'R. Hanina etc.'

(20) He said to his pupils: This question of yours has been already asked by older scholars than you, viz., R. Joshua b. Levi, and it remained unsolved.

(21) Did he himself doubt as to whether the high priest may enter the Holy of Holies with the handfuls of incense that had been taken by someone else.

(22) Lev. XVI, 3.

(23) I.e., one priest must both slay the bullock and enter the Holy of Holies with its blood. This interpretation excludes the possibility of one's entering with the blood of a bullock slain by someone else.

(24) The ministration is invalid and must be repeated in proper form and order, infra 60b. As the taking of the hands full must not be performed before, but after the slaying of the bullock, the first high priest must have slain his bullock and the one who takes his place must slay another bullock, it is evident that he cannot use the handfuls taken by the first high priest, which took place before the slaying of the second bullock. Hence it seems impossible that R. Hanina could have asked the question attributed to him here.

(25) Since R. Joshua asked the question, he must hold that the second priest need not bring another bullock, for if that were his view, the taking of the handful of the incense before the slaying of the bullock would have been invalidated. Hence the apposite remark that others of an earlier generation who, in opposition to him hold that 'with a bullock' includes even 'with the blood of his bullock' have already asked the question.

(26) The original question: If a priest had taken the hands full of incense and thereupon had died, may another enter with his 'handfuls'?

(27) Within the Holy of Holies, v. infra and supra 47a.

(28) The handfuls taken by the high priest. V. Glos.

(29) As not all handfuls of people are of the same capacity.

(30) v. supra 47a and notes.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 49b

How does he do it?<sup>1</sup> He takes hold of the dish<sup>2</sup> with his finger-tips according to some with his teeth — and pulls it with his thumb until it reaches his elbows, then he turns it over in his hands and heaps up the incense in order that its smoke may come up slowly; some say he scatters it in order that its smoke may come up fast; and this is the most difficult ministration in the Sanctuary. This alone? None other? But is there not the pinching of the bird's head? And the taking of [an exact] fistful of the incense? — Rather [say] this is one of the more difficult ministrations in the Sanctuary.<sup>3</sup> [At any rate] infer from here that he had to perform the hafinah twice. — The inference is right.

The question was raised: If the priest slew [the animal] and died, may someone else enter with its blood? Do we say 'With a bullock' [includes] even 'with the blood of the bullock', or 'With a bullock' only but not with its blood?<sup>4</sup> — R. Hanina said: 'With a bullock', but not with its blood. R. Lakish said: 'With a bullock', and even with its blood. R. Ammi said: 'With a bullock', but not with the blood of the bullock. R. Isaac the Smith said: 'With a bullock' and even with its blood. R. Ammi raised the following objection: One<sup>5</sup> may be counted in<sup>6</sup> for the paschal lamb, or one may withdraw from being counted in it until it be slaughtered. Now, if that view were correct,<sup>7</sup> this should read: Until he sprinkles [the blood]. — There [is a special situation], because It is written: miheyoth misseh, i.e., as long as the lamb is alive.<sup>8</sup>

Mar Zutra raised the following objection: One must not redeem<sup>9</sup> with a calf or with a beast of chase, or with what had been slaughtered or with a cross-bred, or with a koy,<sup>10</sup> only with a lamb?<sup>11</sup> There is a different case, because [the meaning of] lamb [here] is inferred from 'lamb'<sup>12</sup> [mentioned in connection] with the paschal lamb. Then just as that must be male, without blemish, and one year old,<sup>13</sup> this too ought to be male, without blemish, and one year old? — [To prevent such interpretation], Scripture states: Thou shalt redeem . . . thou shalt redeem,<sup>14</sup> to include both. If [repetition of] 'Thou shalt redeem' means to include, then all ought to be included? — What value would the word 'lamb' have in that case!

---

(1) The second hafinah, in the Holy of Holies.

(2) I.e., the ladle when containing the handfuls.

(3) Supra 47b and notes.

(4) V. supra 49a and notes.

(5) Pes. 60b.

(6) V. Ex. Xli, 4.

(7) That the blood, in the service, takes the place of the bullock itself.

(8) E.V. And if (the household) be too little for a lamb', here the ad hoc interpretation is: as long as it is itself — read **מֵהַיּוֹת** i.e., as long as the animal is whole, before it is slaughtered, as long as it is alive.

(9) A firstling of an ass, Ex. XIII, 12, 13.

(10) A kind of bearded deer or antelope (Jastrow), which belongs either to the genus of cattle or of beast of chase.

(11) V. Bek. 12a. Since the emphasis is on 'lamb' (Ex. XIII, 13) and a slaughtered lamb is excluded, the inference appears justified, that a slaughtered lamb is no more considered to be a lamb. Hence a refutation of the view that blood can be considered as of equal ritual value with the animal itself.

(12) Ex. XII, 3ff

(13) Ibid. 5.

(14) Ibid. XIII, 13.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 50a

R. Isaac the Smith raised the following objection to R. Ammi's view: 'Even the whole bullock shall he carry forth'.<sup>1</sup> — [It means]: he shall take it out in its completeness.<sup>2</sup> And the bullock of the

sin-offering and the he-goat of the sin-offering?<sup>3</sup> — R. Papa answered: Nobody disputes with regard to skin, flesh, and excrement, the dispute applies only to the blood,<sup>4</sup> one holding blood to be designated ‘bullock’, the other holding that blood is not designated ‘bullock’. R. Ashi said: It seems reasonable to hold with the view that blood is designated ‘bullock’, for it is written: Herewith shall Aaron come into the holy place; with a young bullock.<sup>5</sup> Now does he bring it in with its horns? [Is it not] rather, with its blood, and yet it is called ‘bullock’. And the other?<sup>6</sup> [It means this:] ‘How<sup>7</sup> is Aaron legally permitted to enter the Sanctuary? With a young bullock for a sin-offering’. — But derive it<sup>8</sup> from the fact that it is a sin-offering whose owners have died and ‘a<sup>9</sup> sin-offering whose owners have died is left to die’?<sup>10</sup> -Said Rabin the son of R. Ada to Raba: Your own disciples said in the name of R. Amram: This<sup>11</sup> is a community sin-offering and the sin-offering of the community is not left. For we learned:<sup>12</sup> R. Meir said: ‘Are not the bullock of ‘the Day of Atonement and the pancakes of the high priest and the paschal lamb<sup>13</sup> each offerings of an individual and yet they suspend the law of Sabbath and the laws touching levitical impurity?’ Would you not infer therefrom that there must be a view according to which these are considered offerings of the congregation?<sup>14</sup> But according to your own arguments when it states:<sup>15</sup> R. Jacob said to him:<sup>16</sup> But are there not the bullock to be offered for an error of the congregation, and the he-goats to be offered up for idolatry and the festive offering,<sup>17</sup> all of which are community-offerings, and yet they suspend neither the laws of the Sabbath, nor those of levitical impurity? Would you infer from this that there must be a view that they are sacrifices of an individual?<sup>18</sup> Rather [what you must therefore say is] he answered the first Tanna whom he heard saying that a community-sacrifice suspends the laws both of the Sabbath and those touching levitical impurity, whilst the sacrifice of an individual suspends neither the laws of the Sabbath nor those affecting levitical uncleanness, whereupon R. Meir said: ‘Is [the law concerning] the offering of an individual a general rule, is there not the bullock of the Day of Atonement? Are there not the pancakes of the high priest and the paschal lamb, all of which are private offerings, and yet they suspend both the Sabbath and the impurity laws?’ And also R. Jacob said: ‘Is the law concerning the offering of the community a rule, are there not the bullock for an error of the community, and the he-goats for idolatry, and the festive offering, all of which are community-offerings yet suspend neither the laws of the Sabbath, nor those touching levitical impurity?’ Rather accept this principle: Whatsoever has a fixed time,<sup>19</sup> suspends both the laws of the Sabbath and those touching levitical impurity, even [though the sacrifice concerned be that] of an individual; and whatsoever has no definite time fixed suspends neither the Sabbath laws nor those affecting levitical uncleanness even if a community-offering [were involved].<sup>20</sup>

Abaye raised the following objection:<sup>21</sup> If the bullock and the he-goat of the Day of Atonement had been lost and other [animals] had been set aside in their stead,<sup>22</sup> then they must all be left to die; similarly, if the he-goats [offered in expiation] for idolatry had been lost and others had been set aside in their stead,<sup>22</sup> they must all be left to die; this is the view of R. Judah. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon hold: They should be left to go to pasture until they become unfit for sacrifice,<sup>23</sup> whereupon they should be sold and the money realized should go to the fund for [providing] freewill-offerings. because ‘a community-sacrifice is not left to die’.<sup>24</sup> Bullock here refers to the bullock offered up for an error of the community. — But the text reads ‘of the Day of Atonement’? — This refers to the he-goat. But it was stated: If the bullock of the Day of Atonement and the he-goat of the Day of Atonement had been lost and others were set aside in their stead,<sup>22</sup> they must all be left to die, this is the view of R. Judah. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon hold: They should be left to go to pasture until they become unfit for sacrifice, whereupon they should be sold and the money realized for them should go to the fund for providing freewill-offerings. because a community-offering is not left to die’? — Do not read:<sup>25</sup> ‘For a community-sacrifice is not left to die’, read rather, for ‘a sacrifice belonging to partners is not left to die’.<sup>26</sup> What is the practical difference?<sup>27</sup> — That the priests will not have to bring a sacrifice for an error in a legal decision.<sup>28</sup> — Come and hear: For R. Eleazar asked:

(1) Lev. IV, 12. The animal is slain already and yet Scripture calls it a ‘bullock’.

(2) I.e., all that is left of it the emphasis being on ‘the whole’.

- (3) Ibid. XVI, 27. This shows that the body of the bullock itself after it is slain is still designated 'bullock'.
- (4) Whether blood by itself is equivalent to the whole animal so that the terms may be used indiscriminately or not?
- (5) Lev. XVI, 3.
- (6) How will he explain this verse?
- (7) with such ministrations in view is Aaron permitted to enter the sanctuary, to perform all details in connection with the bullock.
- (8) That another priest may not enter with the blood of a bullock slain by the first priest who died.
- (9) Tem. 15a.
- (10) Hence no further ministration is possible with it.
- (11) Bullock of the Day of Atonement.
- (12) V. Tem. 14a (Mishnah); v. next note.
- (13) This is omitted in Mishnah Tem. hence var. lec. 'it has been taught' instead of 'we have learnt', v. note 2.
- (14) In accord with the view of the first Tanna, whom R. Meir opposes, that only community-offerings can suspend these laws.
- (15) Tosef. Tem. I.
- (16) To the same first Tanna whom R. Meir opposes.
- (17) Brought by the pilgrims to the Temple on the occasion of a festival (Ex. XXIII, 14).
- (18) The assumption being that only thus could they fail to suspend either of the laws.
- (19) The Pancakes of the high priest are to be offered at a definite time every day, whereas the festive offering may be brought for seven days following the festival, hence having no definite time.
- (20) Hence we have no proof that any Tanna is of the opinion that the bullock of the Day of Atonement is a community-sacrifice.
- (21) Infra 65a.
- (22) When they are found again, they are deprived of food until they die.
- (23) Because of a blemish or their repulsive appearance.
- (24) Hence we see that these Tannaim consider the bullock of the Day of Atonement a community-offering, in clear contradiction of the statement above.
- (25) In the cited Baraithas.
- (26) The bullock brought by the high priest on the Day of Atonement being considered a sacrifice belonging to partners because all the priests share in the atonement effected by it.
- (27) Since in either case the animal is not left to die, whether we call it a community sacrifice or one belonging to partners?
- (28) If the Beth din by error had wrongly advised the priests, such error would not be considered 'error of the community', as when a whole tribe by mistake transgresses the law, but would be considered a sacrifice of partners, which is not left to die. Herein lies the practical difference, hence the justification of the distinction.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 50b**

According to him who holds that the bullock of the Day of Atonement is a private sacrifice, is a substitute made for it valid<sup>1</sup> or not? Does not this imply that there is one who considers it a community-offering?<sup>2</sup> - No, the inference is that there is one who considered it an offering of partners.<sup>3</sup>

[To turn to] the main text: R. Eleazar asked: According to him who holds that the bullock of the Day of Atonement is an offering of an individual, is a substitute made for it valid or not?<sup>1</sup> What is his question? [Shall we say, as to] whether [the validity of a substitute] is dependent on him who consecrated it, or on him who attains atonement thereby?<sup>4</sup> Obviously [it may be objected] we make it dependent on him who obtains atonement thereby.<sup>4</sup> for R. Abbuha said in the name of R. Johanan: He who consecrates must add the fifth to and he who obtains atonement thereby can render valid a substitute,<sup>1</sup> and one who separates the priestly gift from his own produce for that of his neighbour has the benefit of the pleasure!<sup>5</sup> In truth it is obvious that the matter depends on him who obtains atonement, and this is what he asked: Have his fellow-priests a definite share in the atonement<sup>6</sup> or do

they receive their forgiveness merely by implication?<sup>7</sup> Come and hear: There are some aspects of the original sacrificial animal severer than those of a substitute animal, there are some aspects in which the substitute animal has more rigid rules than the original sacrificial animal. More severe are the regulations touching the original inasmuch as it applies both to an individual and to a community, suspends the Sabbath law, and the law concerning levitical impurity, and renders a substitute [valid,] all these things not applying to the substitute animal.<sup>8</sup> More severe are the regulations touching a substitute animal than those of the original sacrificial animal, inasmuch as a substitute is effected<sup>9</sup> even if it have a permanent blemish, and it cannot be made available [on redemption] for profane use, either to be shorn, or put to work,<sup>10</sup> all these things not applying to the original animal.<sup>11</sup> Now what kind of sacrifice is meant here? If we are to assume an individual's sacrifice [is meant]. how could it suspend the laws of either Sabbath or those touching levitical impurity; if, again, the reference be to a community sacrifice, how could it be replaced? Hence the reference here must be to the [high priest's] bullock, and [it is stated that] 'it suspends both Sabbath and impurity laws' because it has a definite time; and 'renders its substitute [valid]' — because It is the offering of an individual!<sup>12</sup> -Said R. Shesheth: No, the reference here is to the ram of Aaron.<sup>13</sup> Thus, indeed, does it also appear logical. For if we were to assume the reference is to the bullock, [the question would arise, Is it] that the substitute of the bullock does not suspend the Sabbath or the laws of impurity, but on a week-day it can be offered; surely is it not the substitute of a sin-offering,<sup>14</sup> and 'the substitute of a sin-offering is left to die'?-No! in truth, [the reference here is to] his bullock, and what does substitute mean here? [That which goes by] the name of substitute.<sup>15</sup> — But, if so, sacrifice here, too, should mean [that which goes by the name of] an original sacrifice?<sup>16</sup> — No, he does not deal with [whatever goes by the name of] an original sacrifice. Whence that?-Since it states: 'There are restrictions In the law regarding substitute animals, in that even a permanently blemished animal is affected, and it cannot be made available for profane use either to be shorn or put to work'. Now if the thought should arise in you that the word 'sacrifice' here meant [whatever goes by] the name of an original sacrificial animal, surely there is

---

(1) V. Lev. XXVII, 10.

(2) A substitute for a congregational sacrifice is not valid. V. Tem. 13a.

(3) A substitute for a sacrifice of partners is not valid, 13a.

(4) This is the problem: If it is determined by the one who consecrated then in his case the substitute would be valid, since it is the high priest, from whose possession it comes, who consecrated it. If, however, it depends on those who obtain forgiveness, then no such substitution would be possible. There are many. i.e., his fellow-priests, who obtain forgiveness with the bullock, and no substitute can be made in the case of a sacrifice of partners. (9) If someone consecrates an animal for his fellow, whose duty is thereby to be fulfilled, and it suffers a blemish and he wishes to redeem it, the one who consecrated it is considered its owner and must add a fifth to its value (v. Lev. XXVII, 19). whereas he who is to obtain atonement thereby, would not have to add the fifth, because Scripture insists (ibid.): And he that sanctified...will redeem it, then he shall add the fifth part of the valuation.

(5) He has the privilege of bestowing it upon whatever priest he chooses. This shows that there is no question that the validity of a substitute is determined by the one who consecrated the original sacrifice. What point then was there in R. Eleazar's question?

(6) Through the bullock of the high priest, i.e., are they to be considered partners in the sacrifice from the time of its dedication.

(7) Jast.: circuit, transference in direction. Rashi: floating, unsettled condition. Goldschmidt: from Syriac: the bearer (of atonement). i.e., the high priest.

(8) No substitute for a substitute is valid.

(9) The animal itself, even though it be blemished, partakes of sacrificial holiness, although unfit for the altar.

(10) I.e., even after redemption the substitute may neither be shorn nor put to work, though its flesh may be consumed as non-holy meat.

(11) If the original sacrificial animal had been blemished the owner who consecrated it could consecrate only its value, hence the animal on redemption was made available for profane use without any reservation.

(12) Which solves the question of R. Eleazar.

(13) I.e., the ram brought by the high priest for his own atonement on the Day of Atonement, v. Lev. XVI, 3.

(14) V. Lev. *ibid.*

(15) The teaching speaks here of a substitute in general, not of a substitute of any particular original sacrificial animal. The restriction concerning substitutes lies in the fact that no substitute ever suspends the law of the Sabbath, even though the substitute be offered up.

(16) Without referring to any original sacrifice in particular; why then refer the term either to his bullock or the ram of Aaron?

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 51a

the first-born and the tithe of cattle, the laws of which affect even a permanently blemished animal, and which are not available [on redemption] for profane use to be subjected to shearing or work. Hence [you must say] he does not deal with [whatever goes by] the name of an original sacrifice.<sup>1</sup> Why is it different with substitute animals? — The substitutes all have uniform rules, whereas the original sacrificial animal includes first-born and tithe for cattle. Now, as to R. Shesheth, why does he refer the teaching to the ram of Aaron, let him rather refer to the paschal lamb, which suspends the laws of the Sabbath and of levitical uncleanness and can have a substitute because it is an individual's sacrifice?—He holds that a paschal lamb is never offered for one individual.<sup>2</sup> Then let him put the case as dealing with the second paschal lamb? — Is that able to suspend the laws of levitical impurity?

Said R. Huna the son of R. Joshua to Raba: Why does the Tanna<sup>3</sup> designate the paschal lamb an individual's sacrifice and the festal offering a community sacrifice? Would you say because the latter is offered up by large crowds?<sup>4</sup> So is the paschal lamb offered up by large crowds. — There is the second paschal lamb, which is not offered up by large crowds. Said he to him: If so, it ought to suspend the laws of Sabbath and those of levitical impurity.<sup>5</sup> — He answered: Yes, he holds in accord with him who says that it suspends [them]. For it was taught: The second paschal lamb suspends the Sabbath, but not the laws of levitical impurity.<sup>6</sup> R. Judah says: It suspends also the laws of levitical impurity. What is the reason for the view of the first Tanna? He will tell you: 'You have postponed it<sup>7</sup> only because of levitical impurity, how then shall it suspend the laws of levitical impurity!' And R. Judah?—He will tell you: Scripture says: According to all the statute of the passover shall they keep it,<sup>8</sup> i.e., even in levitical impurity. The Torah gave him an opportunity to do it in levitical purity, but if he was not privileged to do so, let him do it even in impurity. [

---

(1) But with one particular type of original sacrifice.

(2) This is the view of R. Judah (Pes. 91a), there being always more than one to subscribe to the cost of the paschal lamb, which must be eaten up within its prescribed limited time, Ex. XII, 10.

(3) *Supra* 50a.

(4) I.e., on festivals when there are many pilgrims in the Temple.

(5) Since the reference is to the second paschal lamb. MS.M.: '(how state that) it suspends the law of Sabbath!'

(6) Pes. 95b.

(7) The offering of the paschal lamb, v. Num. IX, 11.

(8) *Ibid.* IX, 12.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 51b

But let him infer it<sup>1</sup> from the words of the Divine Law: 'which is of himself',<sup>2</sup> i.e., he shall bring it from what belongs to him, for it was taught 'which is of himself', that means he must bring it of his own possession, not from community funds. One might have assumed he must not bring it from community funds, because the congregation obtains no atonement therefrom, but he may bring it from the funds of his fellow-priests, because they do obtain atonement therefrom, therefore Scripture says: 'which is of himself'. One might have assumed he must [de jure] not bring it from funds beside

his own, but that if he [de facto] had done so, it would be valid, therefore Scripture says again: 'which is of himself', repeating the condition in order to render conformity with it indispensable.<sup>3</sup> — But according to your own view: If his fellow-priests have no part in it, how can they obtain atonement, [even by implication]?<sup>4</sup> Rather must you say it is different with regard to the private treasury of Aaron<sup>5</sup> for the Divine Law has declared it free to his fellow-priests, thus also with regard to the [question of a] substitute sacrifice [we say] the private treasury of Aaron is different since the Divine Law has made it free for his fellow-priests.

**MISHNAH. HE WENT THROUGH THE HEKAL<sup>6</sup> UNTIL HE CAME TO THE PLACE BETWEEN THE TWO CURTAINS WHICH SEPARATED THE HOLY FROM THE HOLY OF HOLIES AND BETWEEN WHICH THERE WAS [A SPACE OF] ONE CUBIT. R. JOSE SAID: THERE WAS BUT ONE CURTAIN, AS IT IS SAID: AND THE VEIL SHALL DIVIDE UNTO YOU BETWEEN THE HOLY PLACE AND THE MOST HOLY.<sup>7</sup> GEMARA. R. Jose gave a proper rejoinder to the Rabbis. What about the Rabbis? — They will tell you: Those things<sup>8</sup> applied at the Mishkan,<sup>9</sup> but in the Second Temple, because there was lacking the partition wall<sup>10</sup> which had been in the first Temple — and the Sages were doubtful as to whether its sacredness partook of the character of the Holy or the Holy of Holies, they made two curtains.<sup>11</sup>**

Our Rabbis taught: He was walking between altar and candlestick.<sup>12</sup> This is the view of R. Judah. R. Meir says: Between the table<sup>13</sup> and the altar. Some there are who say: Between the table and the wall.<sup>14</sup> Who are the 'some'? — R. Hisda said: It is R. Jose. who said: The entrance was to the north.<sup>15</sup> And R. Judah? — He will tell you that the entrance was to the south. According to whose view was that of R. Meir? If it agreed with R. Judah's, let him enter as R. Judah states,<sup>16</sup> if it agreed with R. Jose, let him enter as R. Jose states! In truth he agrees with R. Jose, but he will tell you the tables<sup>17</sup> were placed between north and south, hence they would interrupt his walk, preventing him from getting himself in.<sup>18</sup> Or, if you like you might say: In truth, the tables were placed from east to west, but it does not seem proper

---

(1) The answer to the question above of R. Eleazar concerning the relation of the fellow-priests to the high priest's Day of Atonement bullock.

(2) Lev. XVI, 6 with reference to his bullock.

(3) Lev. XVI, 11 surely indicates that they have no share in the bullock, but receive atonement only by implication through the high priest's atonement, although the bullock is his own private property.

(4) So Bah.

(5) I.e., in respect of the bullock of the Day of Atonement.

(6) V. Glos.

(7) Ex. XXVI, 33.

(8) The one curtain referred to in Exodus.

(9) The Sanctuary in the wilderness.

(10) I Kings VI, 16 refers to the two cedar-covered partitions, with a vacant space between them, which separated the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies, occupying the space of one cubit, but the text: And he built twenty cubits on the hinder part of the house with boards of cedar from the floor unto the joists, leaves it undecided from which of the two holy areas the space of one cubit was to be deducted.

(11) In the second Temple that partition was replaced by two curtains with a space between them.

(12) As he entered, he moved southward between the inner altar and candlestick, which was to the south, walking toward the curtain.

(13) The table was placed next to the northern wall, the candlestick next to the southern wall, the golden altar between them. According to R. Judah the high priest walked toward the Holy of Holies between altar and candlestick, that is on the southern side. According to R. Meir between table and altar, i.e., on the northern side.

(14) According to R. Jose between table and wall, on the northern side.

(15) R. Jose held that there was but one curtain, clasped on the north side, and since the entrance was on the north side, the high priest of necessity was walking along the northern wall.

(16) R. Judah also agreed that the immediate entrance into the Holy of Holies had to be on the northern side but he held that there were two curtains, with the outer one clasped to the southern side, through which he first entered, hence the high priest was walking along the southern wall till he reached the outer entrance, then walking along between the two curtains towards the north till he reached the second entrance leading immediately into the Holy of Holies.

(17) Solomon had made ten tables arranged in two rows of five tables, to the left and right of the table of shewbread. The Sages discuss if these tables were placed lengthwise from south to north or from east to west. R. Meir held the former view, so that all the tables were placed in the northern half of the Sanctuary (Ex. XXVI, 35): And thou shalt put the table on the north side. Now the breadth of the Sanctuary was twenty cubits, its northern half ten cubits; the length of a table two cubits, so that each row of five tables filled the northern half of the Temple hall, without any free space between tables and wall. If any space were left free, then the row of the tables would to that extent encroach upon the southern half. Thus the tables would block the high priest on his walk between the table and the wall.

(18) Between the table and the wall.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 52a

to go straight ahead [towards the seat of the Divine Presence].<sup>1</sup> And R. Jose? — Israel is so beloved that Scripture does not wish to burden their messenger.<sup>2</sup> As to R. Judah, let him enter between the candlestick and the wall! — His garments would become blackened.<sup>3</sup> R. Nathan said: Concerning the 'cubit of partition'. the Sages did not decide as to whether its sanctity was that of the Holy of Holies or of the Holy Place outside of it. To this Rabina demurred: What was their reason? Shall we say because it is written: And the house which King Solomon built for the Lord, the length thereof was three score cubits, and the breadth thereof twenty cubits, and the height thereof thirty cubits.<sup>4</sup> [Also] it is written: And the house, that is, the Temple before [the Sanctuary]. was forty cubits long<sup>5</sup> and it is further written: And before the Sanctuary which was twenty cubits in length, and twenty cubits in breadth, and twenty cubits in the height thereof<sup>6</sup> — so that we do not know whether the [space of] a cubit of the partition was to be deducted from the twenty or the forty, — perhaps it is to be deducted from neither the twenty nor the forty, the account referring only to the free spaces, not to the walls. As a proof [is the fact] that whenever the walls are mentioned, they are mentioned separately, for we have learnt: The Sanctuary was a hundred cubits square and a hundred cubits in height. The wall of the Ulam<sup>7</sup> was five [cubits thick] and the Ulam eleven. The wall of the Sanctuary six, and its interior forty cubits, the partition one cubit and the Holy of Holies twenty cubits, the wall of the Sanctuary six, the cell six and the wall of the cell five!<sup>8</sup> — Rather, the question is whether the sanctity of the partition is as that of the inner part [the Holy of Holies], or the outer part, and this is as R. Johanan reported: Joseph of Huzal asked: [It is written], And a debir<sup>9</sup> in the midst of the house from within he prepared to set there the ark of the covenant of the Lord.<sup>10</sup> The question was asked [in the Academy]: What does Scripture mean to say? [Does it mean] 'a debir in the midst of the house; from within he prepared to place the ark there'; or 'a debir in the midst of the house from within'?<sup>11</sup> — But could they have any doubt? Surely it was taught: Issi b. Judah said: There are five verses in the Torah [the grammatical construction of] which is undecided:

---

(1) on the assumption that they were placed between east and west, so that he could walk unhandicapped along the north wall towards the Holy of Holies, the suggestion is offered that it would not be in accord with the reverence due to that sacred place for the high priest to walk straight towards it, 'feasting his eyes all the time on that most awe-inspiring place, through the opening through which he was to enter, hence R. Meir's view.

(2) The high priest, as representative of Israel, is permitted to avoid the weary detour between table and altar and to proceed straight along the north wall towards the Holy of Holies.

(3) From the smoke (soot) of the candlestick on the wall.

(4) I Kings VI, 2.

(5) Ibid. 17.

(6) I Kings VI, 20.

(7) The hall leading into the interior of the Temple.

(8) V. Mid. IV. 6 and 7. Hence the question above is answered.

(9) E.V. 'Sanctuary:' here taken to denote the space between the partition dividing the Holy from the Holy of Holies.

(10) I Kings VI, 19.

(11) According to the first interpretation the cubit partition would be excluded then from the Holy of Holies. Does the 'from within' belong to the first part of the verse, referring to the debir or to the second interpretation and refer to the Holy of Holies?

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 52b

'lifted up',<sup>1</sup> 'like almond-blossoms';<sup>2</sup> 'tomorrow',<sup>3</sup> 'cursed'<sup>4</sup> and 'rise up'.<sup>5</sup> It was also taught:<sup>6</sup> Joseph of Huzal is the same as Joseph the Babylonian, and is identical<sup>7</sup> with Issi b. Judah, also with Issi b. Gur Aryeh,<sup>8</sup> also with Issi b. Gamliel, also with Issi b. Mahalalel. What was his real name? Issi b. Akiba!<sup>9</sup> — In the Torah there is no other,<sup>10</sup> but in the Prophets there is. But is there in the Torah no other; surely there is for R. Hisda asked:<sup>11</sup> [It is written], And he sent the young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt-offerings,<sup>12</sup> [does it mean] of lambs; and sacrificed peace-offerings unto the Lord [namely of oxen]; or [does the word] 'oxen' refer to all [sacrifices]?<sup>13</sup> — R. Hisda had indeed his doubts about it, but to Issi b. Judah it was obvious.

MISHNAH. THE OUTER CURTAIN WAS HELD BACK BY A CLASP ON THE SOUTH SIDE AND THE INNER CURTAIN ON THE NORTH SIDE. HE WALKED ALONG BETWEEN THEM UNTIL HE REACHED THE NORTH SIDE. WHEN HE REACHED THE NORTH SIDE HE TURNED ROUND TO THE SOUTH AND WENT ON ALONG THE CURTAIN, TO HIS LEFT, UNTIL HE REACHED THE ARK. WHEN HE REACHED THE ARK HE PUT THE PAN OF BURNING COALS BETWEEN THE TWO BARS.<sup>14</sup> HE HEAPED UP THE INCENSE UPON THE COALS AND THE WHOLE HOUSE BECAME FULL WITH SMOKE. HE CAME OUT BY THE WAY HE ENTERED<sup>15</sup> AND IN THE OUTER HOUSE<sup>16</sup> HE UTTERED A SHORT PRAYER. HE DID NOT MAKE THE PRAYER LONG SO AS NOT TO FRIGHTEN ISRAEL.

GEMARA. To what are we referring here? If it be the first Sanctuary, was there then a curtain?<sup>17</sup> Again, if it is to the second Sanctuary, was there then an Ark? Surely it has been taught: When the Ark was hidden, there was hidden with it the bottle containing the Manna,<sup>18</sup> and that containing the sprinkling water,<sup>19</sup> the staff of Aaron,<sup>20</sup> with its almonds and blossoms, and the chest which the Philistines had sent as a gift to the God of Israel, as it is said: And put the jewels of gold which you return to Him for a guilt-offering in a coffer by the side thereof and send it away that it may go.<sup>21</sup> Who hid it? — Josiah hid it. What was his reason for hiding it? — He saw the Scriptural passage: The Lord will bring thee and thy King whom thou shalt set over thee,<sup>22</sup> therefore he hid it, as it is said: And he said to the Levites, that taught all Israel, that were holy unto the Lord: Put the holy ark into the house which Solomon, the son of David, King of Israel did build. There shall no more be a burden upon your shoulders now. Serve now the Lord your God and His people Israel.<sup>23</sup> And R. Eleazar said: We derive by analogy<sup>24</sup> between the words 'there', 'generations' and 'to be kept' occurring in these passages!<sup>25</sup> In truth we refer to the second Sanctuary and what does 'He came to the Ark' mean? I.e., he came to the place of the Ark. But the text reads: HE PLACED THE PAN OF BURNING COALS BETWEEN THE TWO BARS?<sup>26</sup> — Read [it to mean]: 'as if it were between the two bars'.

HE HEAPED THE INCENSE UPON THE COALS. We learn here in accordance with the view that he heaped it [the incense]<sup>27</sup> up. One [Baraita] taught: He begins to heap it up on the inner side, which is to him the outer side,<sup>28</sup> whereas another taught: he begins to heap it up on the outer side which is to him the inner side. Abaye said: It is a matter of dispute among Tannaim. Further said Abaye: The view of him who holds he begins to heap it on the inner side, which is to him the outer side, seems logical, for we have learnt:<sup>29</sup> One teaches him: Be careful

---

(1) Gen. IV, 7: The meaning could be: If thou doest well (good!) — but thou must bear the sin, if thou doest not well; or

the usual interpretation: If thou doest well, there will be forgiving (or lifting up of face); and if thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door.

(2) Ex. XXV, 33: Three cups, made like almond-blossoms in one branch, a knop and a flower, or: Three cups, like almond-blossoms . . . a knop and a flower.

(3) Ex. XVII, 9: Go out and fight with Amalek tomorrow; I will stand on the top of the hill, etc.

(4) Gen. XLIX, 6, 7: And in their self-will they houghed oxen. Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce. Or: And in their self-will they houghed the cursed oxen. Their anger was fierce. (The cursed oxen would thus be an uncomplimentary reference to Shechem, a descendant of Canaan cursed in Gen. IX, 25).

(5) Deut. XXXI, 16: Behold thou art about to sleep with thy fathers; and (this people) will rise up. Or: Behold thou art about to sleep with thy fathers and (wilt in future) rise up. This people will go astray after the foreign gods. — Tosaf. s.v. endeavours to account for the curious order of the sentences quoted.

(6) Pes. 113b.

(7) Issi as an abbreviation of Joseph is perfectly possible. Tosaf.

(8) Judah is called Gur Aryeh (a lion's whelp) in the blessing of Jacob, hence the substitution here, v. Gen. XLIX, 9.

(9) V. Pes., Sonc. ed., p. 585. n. 6.

(10) Now Joseph of Huzal is here identified with Issi b. Judah and yet among the ambiguous passages here enumerated, the passage which aroused his question (I Kings VI, 20) is not mentioned!

(11) Hag. 6b.

(12) Ex. XXIV, 5.

(13) I.e., also to burnt-offerings, the meaning depending on the pause: If we pronounce 'oloth' (burnt-offerings) at the end of the middle pause, or read on without such pause in the middle.

(14) V. Ex. XXV, 13f.

(15) Just as, on entering, he turned southwards until he reached the Ark, thus as he left, he did not turn his face, but went backwards, with his face toward the Ark (Rashi).

(16) In the Sanctuary.

(17) V. supra 51b.

(18) Ex. XVI, 33.

(19) Num. XIX, 9.

(20) Num. XVII, 25.

(21) I Sam. VI, 8. Hence it is evident that it was placed together with the Ark and the fear was justified that together with the latter these things might be exiled and lost.

(22) Deut. XXVIII, 36.

(23) II Chron. XXXV, 3.

(24) That the other objects enumerated were hidden at the same time as the Ark.

(25) Ex. XXX, 6 and *ibid.* XVI, 33, the word 'there' occurs, justifying the inference that something must occur in both the Ark and the manna; in the passage referring to the latter, Ex. XVI, 33, as well as in the passage referring to the oil for anointing (*ibid.* XXX, 31) the priests the word 'generations' occurs, again indicating some justified inference of something in common; finally, in connection with the manna as well as in the passage about the staff of Aaron the word 'to be kept' occurs (Ex. XVI, 33 and Num. XVII, 25). From all these word analogies the inference is drawn that what manna, bottle, oil, staff of Aaron and Ark had in common is that having been placed in or near the Ark, they also were hidden together. Hence the reference in the Mishnah could not be to the second Sanctuary either.

(26) He placed it just where the two staves had been in the first Sanctuary.

(27) V. supra 49b.

(28) I.e., he commences to heap up the incense from the inside part of the coal-pan in relation to the Holy of Holies, working outwardly towards his arm. I.e., he commenced to heap up the incense on the outer side of the pan in relation to the Holy of Holies, working towards the inside, away from his arm, with the precaution suggested below.

(29) Tamid 33a.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 53a**

not to start in front of thee lest thou be burnt.<sup>1</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord:<sup>2</sup> i.e., he must not put it in order outside and thus bring it in. [This is] to remove the error from the minds of the Sadducees who said: He must prepare it without, and bring it in. What is their interpretation? — For I appear in the cloud upon the ark-cover<sup>3</sup> 'that teaches us that he prepares it outside and brings it in'. The Sages said to them: But it is said already 'And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord'.<sup>4</sup> If so for what purpose then is it stated 'For I appear in the cloud upon the ark-cover'? It comes to teach us that he puts into it a smoke-raiser.<sup>5</sup> — Whence do we know that he must put a smoke-raiser into it? — Because it is said: So that the cloud of the incense may cover the ark-cover.<sup>6</sup> But if he did not put a smoke-raiser into it, or that he omitted one of its spices he is liable to death. But [why not] infer this<sup>7</sup> from the fact that he effected an entrance for no purpose.<sup>8</sup> R. Shesheth said: We speak here of the case that he was in error about the entrance,<sup>9</sup> but deliberate in omitting the spice. R. Ashi said: You might even set the case when he was deliberate with regard to both but [here we deal with the case] where he brought in two incenses, one incomplete, the other defective, so that he is not guilty because of the purposeless entrance because he had offered up a perfect incense, but he is guilty in regard to the incense because he had offered up one defective incense.

The Master had said: 'Whence is it known that he must place a smoke-raiser into it? To teach us that, it is said: "So that [the cloud] may cover etc."<sup>10</sup> [What need of] one scriptural verse added to another?<sup>11</sup> — Said R. Joseph: This is what is meant: From here I know only about the leaf of the smoke-raiser, whence do I know about the root?<sup>12</sup> To teach us that Scripture said: 'So that it may cover [etc.]'<sup>13</sup> Said Abaye to him: But the opposite has been taught; for it was taught: If when he put in the root of the smoke-raiser, it would rise up straight like a stick until it reached the ceiling beams; as soon as it reached the beams of the ceiling it would come slowly down the walls until the house became full of smoke, as it is said: And the house was filled with smoke?<sup>14</sup> — Rather, said Abaye, this is what it means: Now I know only about the root of the smoke-raiser, whence do I know also about its leaf? To teach us that Scripture said: 'So that it may cover [etc.]'.

R. Shesheth said: I know only about the Tent of Meeting in the wilderness; whence do I know about Shiloh and the eternal Sanctuary? To teach us that Scripture said: 'So that it may cover [etc.]' But that we infer from, And so shall he do for the Tent of Meeting, that dwelleth with them?<sup>15</sup> — Rather is this meant: Now I know about the Day of Atonement,<sup>16</sup> whence do I know about the other days of the year? To teach us that, Scripture said: 'So that it may cover [etc.]'. R. Ashi said: One [passage] refers to the commandment, the other to its indispensableness.<sup>17</sup> Raba said: One refers to the penalty incurred, the other to the prohibition.<sup>18</sup> It was taught: R. Eliezer said: That he die not,<sup>19</sup> i.e., the penalty, For I appear in the cloud, i.e., the prohibition. I might have assumed that both were stated before the death of the sons of Aaron,<sup>20</sup> to teach us [the true fact] it is written: After the death of the two sons of Aaron.<sup>21</sup> One might assume that both were said after the death of the two sons of Aaron; to teach us [the true fact] it is written: 'For I will appear in the cloud upon the ark-cover.'<sup>22</sup> How is that [to be explained]? The prohibition [was stated] before the death, the penalty after the death. — How is this inference made? Raba said: 'For I will appear in the cloud' — but He had not appeared<sup>23</sup> yet. Then why were they punished? — As it was taught: R. Eliezer said: The sons of Aaron died only because they decided a question of law in the presence of Moses their Master. What was it they decided? — And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar<sup>24</sup> [means] although the fire was coming down from heaven<sup>25</sup> yet was it obligatory to bring private<sup>26</sup> fire.

HE CAME OUT BY THE WAY HE ENTERED: Whence is this known? — Said R. Samuel b. Nahmani in the name of R. Jonathan: Scripture said: So Solomon came to the high place that was at Gibeon, [unto] Jerusalem.<sup>27</sup> What has Gibeon to do with Jerusalem?<sup>28</sup> Rather, [Scripture] compares his departure from Gibeon towards Jerusalem with his entrance from Jerusalem into Gibeon, i.e., just as when he entered Gibeon from Jerusalem his face was directed towards the high place, in the same way as he had come in; in the same manner as he left Gibeon for Jerusalem his face was turned toward the high place even in the same way as when he had come in.<sup>29</sup> In similar manner the priests

as they ministered, the Levites on their service, the Israelites on their posts<sup>30</sup> — as they left they would not turn their face back, to go out, but would turn their face sideways to leave. Thus also a disciple taking leave of his master, must not turn his face back to go away, but must turn sideways to depart. As was the case with R. Eleazar, whenever he took leave of R. Johanan: if R. Johanan wanted to leave, R. Eleazar would stand on his place, the head bowed, until R. Johanan disappeared from his sight but when R. Eleazar wished to take leave he would walk backwards until he disappeared from the sight of R. Johanan. When Raba was about to take leave of R. Joseph he would go backwards, so that his feet were bruised and the threshold of the house of R. Joseph was stained with blood.

---

(1) The incense which he had heaped up towards his end and which burns continually may touch his arm and burn it whilst he is working it towards the other side.

(2) Lev. XVI, 13.

(3) The Sadduceans in literal translation have this interpretation: 'I, the Lord, am to be visited', i.e., seen, in the Holy of Holies, in the cloud of the smoke of incense, which must be a cloud, i.e., prepared outside, so that when, in the Holy of Holies I am seen, it is in the cloud of incense, all ready and rising up, as the high priest enters.

(4) Which clearly shows that the incense is put in the fire inside.

(5) The name of a plant used as an ingredient of the incense and whose effect lay in achieving a straight rising smoke.

(6) Lev. XVI, 13.

(7) That he is culpable if he omitted one of its ingredients.

(8) That is indicated already by the passage in Lev. XVI,2: That he come not at all times ... lest he die, which indicates that a fruitless entrance incurs such penalty, hence no additional source of that law is necessary.

(9) To which no penalty of death is attached.

(10) The incense without the smoke-raiser could not possibly effect such 'covering'.

(11) From the passage 'For in the cloud, etc.' we inferred the necessity of the smokeraiser, why then an additional verse?

(12) Whether the roots or the leaf achieved the straight smoke. R. Joseph holds that the leaves had such property, Abaye attributed that quality to the root.

(13) 'Cover' may refer to the capacity to just cover the ark-cover, but not to rise above it.

(14) Isa. VI, 4. This proves that the root is more effective for producing the straight smoke.

(15) Lev. XVI, 16, i.e., wherever he shall dwell with them, shall they do this.

(16) The portion of the Torah refers to the Day of Atonement.

(17) 'So that it may cover' is the command. He shall not come at all times ... for in a cloud shall I appear — and not otherwise is the prohibition that the incense is indispensable.

(18) Lit., 'warning'.

(19) Lev. XVI, 13.

(20) Who died in expiation of their sin; and thus assumed it was their neglect to put the smoke-raiser into the incense.

(21) Lev. XVI, 1.

(22) This is the literal rendering.

(23) I.e., when this scriptural verse was uttered the Lord had not appeared yet. But if the reference were to a time after the death of the two sons of Aaron, He would have appeared already, namely on exactly that day, as it is said: And the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people. (Lev. IX, 23).

(24) Lev. I, 7.

(25) V. supra 21b.

(26) Although their decision was correct, they incurred penalty for their presumptuousness in rendering a decision before their master, instead of requesting him to render it for them.

(27) II Chron. I, 13.

(28) The indeterminate 'Jerusalem' in the text is ambiguous and therefore invites ad hoc interpretation.

(29) So that the text means: In the same manner as Solomon journeyed to Gibeon, so did he proceed on his return journey from Gibeon to Jerusalem.

(30) V. Ta'an. 24a.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 53b**

The people told R. Joseph that Raba did that, whereupon he said to him: May it be the will [of God] that you raise your head above the whole city.<sup>1</sup> R. Alexandri said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi: One who prays [the 'Amidah]<sup>2</sup> should go three steps backwards, and then recite 'peace'.<sup>3</sup> R. Mordecai said to him: Having taken the three steps backwards, he ought to remain standing, as should a disciple who takes leave of his master; for if he returns at once, it is as with a dog who goes back to his vomit. It has also been taught thus: One who prays shall take three steps backwards and then pronounce 'peace'. And if he did not do so, it would have been better for him not to have prayed at all. In the name of R. Shemaya they said: He should pronounce 'peace' towards the right, then towards the left, as it is said: At His right hand was a fiery law unto them,<sup>4</sup> and it is also said: A thousand may fall at thy side and ten thousand at thy right hand.<sup>5</sup> For what reason 'and it is also said'? — You might have said it is the usual thing to take a thing with the right hand,<sup>6</sup> come therefore and hear: 'A thousand may fall at thy side and ten thousand at thy right hand'.<sup>7</sup>

Raba saw Abaye pronouncing 'peace' first towards the right and he said to him: Do you mean that your right hand is meant? It is your left hand, which is the right of the Holy One, blessed be He. R. Hiyya the son of R. Huna said: I saw Abaye and Raba who were taking all three steps with one genuflexion.

AND HE UTTERED A SHORT PRAYER IN THE OUTER HOUSE: What did he pray? Raba son of R. Adda and Rabin son of R. Adda both reported in the name of Rab: 'May it be Thy will, O Lord our God, that this year be full of heavy rains and hot'. But is a hot year an advantage? — Rather: If it be a hot one, let it be rich in rain. — R. Aha the son of Raba concluded the prayer in the name of R. Judah [thus]: May there not depart a ruler from the house of Judah, and may the house of Israel not require that they sustain one another, and permit not the prayers of travellers<sup>8</sup> to find entrance before you. R. Hanina b. Dosa was walking along a road when rain came down upon him. He said: 'Lord of the Universe! All the world is comfortable and Hanina is afflicted!' The rain stopped. As he came home, he said: 'Lord of the Universe! All the world is afflicted and Hanina is comfortable!'<sup>9</sup> The rain came again. R. Joseph said: Of what use is the prayer of the high priest against R. Hanina b. Dosa!

Our Rabbis taught:<sup>10</sup> It happened with one high priest that he prolonged his prayer. His fellow priests undertook to enter after him. As they began to enter he came forth. They said to him: Why did you prolong your prayer? — He said: Is it disagreeable to you that I prayed for you, for the Sanctuary, that it be not destroyed? — They said to him: Do not make a habit of doing so, for thus have we learnt: He would not pray long lest he terrify Israel.<sup>11</sup>

MISHNAH. AFTER THE ARK HAD BEEN TAKEN AWAY, THERE WAS A STONE FROM THE DAYS OF THE EARLIER PROPHETS,<sup>12</sup> CALLED THE SHETHIYAH,<sup>13</sup> THREE FINGERS ABOVE THE GROUND, ON WHICH HE WOULD PLACE [THE PAN OF BURNING COALS]. HE WOULD TAKE THE BLOOD FROM HIM WHO WAS STIRRING IT, AND ENTER [AGAIN] INTO THE PLACE WHERE HE HAD ENTERED,<sup>14</sup> AND STAND [AGAIN] ON THE PLACE ON WHICH HE HAD STOOD,<sup>15</sup> AND SPRINKLE THEREOF ONCE UPWARDS<sup>16</sup> AND SEVEN TIMES DOWNWARDS, AIMING TO SPRINKLE NEITHER UPWARDS NOR DOWNWARDS BUT KEMAZLIF [MAKING THE MOVEMENT OF SWINGING A WHIP]. AND THUS WOULD HE COUNT: ONE, ONE AND ONE, ONE AND TWO, ONE AND THREE, ONE AND FOUR, ONE AND FIVE, ONE AND SIX, ONE AND SEVEN. THEN HE WOULD GO OUT AND PUT IT ON THE GOLDEN STAND IN THE SANCTUARY. ONE WOULD BRING HIM THE HE-GOAT, HE WOULD SLAY IT, RECEIVE ITS BLOOD IN A BASIN, ENTER [AGAIN] THE PLACE HE HAD ENTERED BEFORE, STAND [AGAIN] ON THE PLACE HE HAD STOOD ON BEFORE AND WOULD SPRINKLE THEREFROM ONCE UPWARDS AND SEVEN TIMES DOWNWARDS. THUS WOULD HE COUNT; ONE, ONE AND TWO, ETC. THEN HE WOULD GO OUT AND PLACE IT ON THE SECOND GOLDEN STAND IN THE

SANCTUARY. R. JUDAH SAID: THERE WAS NO MORE THAN ONE GOLDEN STAND. HE WOULD<sup>17</sup> TAKE THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK AND PUT DOWN THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT, SPRINKLE THEREOF UPON THE CURTAINS FACING THE ARK OUTSIDE, ONCE UPWARDS, SEVEN TIMES DOWNWARD, AIMING TO SPRINKLE NEITHER UPWARDS NOR DOWNWARDS, BUT KE-MAZLIF [MAKING THE MOVEMENT OF SWINGING A WHIP]. THUS WOULD HE COUNT [AS ABOVE]. THEN HE WOULD TAKE THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT, DEPOSITING THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK, AND SPRINKLE THEREOF UPON THE CURTAIN FACING THE ARK OUTSIDE ONCE UPWARDS, SEVEN TIMES DOWNWARDS [AS ABOVE]. THEN HE WOULD POUR THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK INTO THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT EMPTYING THE FULL VESSEL INTO THE EMPTY ONE. GEMARA. [The Mishnah] does not teach ‘After the Ark has been hidden away’, but ‘After the Ark had been taken away’, this is in accord with him who holds that the Ark went into exile to Babylonia, for it was taught: R. Eliezer said: The Ark went into exile to Babylonia, as it was said: In the following year King Nebuchadnezzar sent and had him brought to Babel together with the precious vessels of the house of the Lord.<sup>18</sup> R. Simeon b. Yohai said: The Ark went into exile to Babylonia, as it was said: Nothing shall be left, saith the Lord,<sup>19</sup> i.e., the Ten Commandments contained therein R. Judah b. Ilai<sup>20</sup> said: The Ark was hidden [buried] in its own place, as it was said: And the staves were so long that the ends of the staves were seen from the holy place, even before the Sanctuary; but they could not be seen without; and there they are unto this day.<sup>21</sup> Now he<sup>22</sup> disputes ‘Ulla for ‘Ulla said: R. Matthiah b. Heresh asked R. Simeon b. Yohai in Rome.<sup>23</sup> Now since R. Eliezer had taught us on the first and second occasion that the Ark went into exile to Babylonia (the first was the one which we said just now: ‘And he had him brought to Babel together with the precious vessels of the house of the Lord’, but what is the second one? — Because it is written: And gone is from the daughter of Zion

---

(1) R. Joseph being blind would not have noticed this reverent conduct of his pupil. On learning it he pronounced a prayerful hope, which was fulfilled. For Raba did become head of the Academies of both Sura and Pumbeditha.

(2) Lit., ‘(prayer read) standing’. The prayer par excellence, v. P.B. p. 44ff.

(3) At the end of that prayer one says: May He who maketh peace in His high places, make peace for us and for all Israel. This is the pronouncement of ‘peace’.

(4) Deut. XXXIII, 2.

(5) Ps. XCI, 7.

(6) People would usually use their right hand, but there is no particular importance attached to it to bestow ceremonial preference upon it.

(7) Which suggests that the right hand is granted greater victory, hence is more significant than the left.

(8) Who would pray for dry weather, as better for their comfort on the road.

(9) As he had no fields and thus no need of rain.

(10) Tosef. Yoma II.

(11) By his delay, attributable either to his failure to obtain forgiveness or to personal mishap.

(12) According to Sot. 48b this term includes Samuel, David and Solomon.

(13) Root: shatha — to lay a foundation, thus foundation stone. From it, as the Gemara says, the world was founded or started.

(14) Into the Holy of Holies.

(15) Between the two staves.

(16) In the direction of the ‘ark-cover’.

(17) This continues R. Judah’s account. (5) V. Gemara. (6) Lev. XVI, 18: And he shall take the blood of the bullock and the blood of the goat and put it upon the horns of the altar round about. The inference is that since but one act of ‘putting’ is mentioned the two were mixed, by pouring the first into the second.

(18) II Chron. XXXVI, 10.

(19) Isa. XXXIX, 6, dabar, ‘thing’, here taken as ‘word’, i.e., the word(s) i.e., the ten commandments.

(20) Corrected according to Jer. Shek. VI; cur. edd. b. Lakish.

(21) I Kings VIII, 8.

(22) The one who reports in this Baraita the view of R. Simeon b. Yohai.

(23) Who had gone there to plead with the Emperor on behalf of the people of Israel afflicted by emergency decrees of the Governor, see Graetz II, 443 (Engl. ed.).

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 54a

all her splendour.<sup>1</sup> What does 'all her splendour' mean? All that is enclosed within her.<sup>2</sup> ) What do you say now? — He answered: I say that the Ark was hidden in its place, as it is said: 'And the staves were so long, etc.' Rabbah said to 'Ulla: How does it follow from this?<sup>3</sup> — Because it is written: 'Unto this day'. But does the term 'Unto this day' mean everywhere 'forever'? Is it not written: And they [the children of Benjamin] did not drive out the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem; but the Israelites dwelt with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem, unto this day.<sup>4</sup> Would you say here too that they did not go into exile? Surely it was taught:<sup>5</sup> R. Judah said: For fifty-two years no human being passed as it is said: For the mountains will I take up a weeping and wailing, and for the pastures of the wilderness a lamentation; because they are burned up, so that none passeth through, and they hear not the voice of the cattle; both the fowl of the heavens and the beast are fled and gone,<sup>6</sup> and the numerical<sup>7</sup> value of Behemah is fifty-two. Furthermore, R. Jose said: For seven years sulphur and salt prevailed in the land of Israel, and R. Johanan said: What is the basis of R. Jose's view? He infers it from the analogy of the words 'covenant', 'covenant'. Here Scripture reads: And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week;<sup>8</sup> and in another place it is written: Then men shall say: Because they forsook the covenant of the Lord, the God of their fathers.<sup>9</sup> — He answered: Here the word 'there' is used, there this expression<sup>10</sup> is not used. — Would you say that wherever the word 'there' is used, it implies 'forever', but the following objection can be raised: And some of them, even of the sons of Simeon, five hundred men, went to Mount Seir, having for their captains Pelatiah, and Neariah, and Rephaiah, and Uzziel, the sons of Ishi. And they smote the remnants of the Amalekites that escaped, and dwelt there unto this day.<sup>11</sup> But Sennacherib, King of Assyria, had come up already and confused all the lands as it is said: I have removed the bounds of the peoples, and have robbed their treasures?<sup>12</sup> This is a refutation.

R. Nahman said: It was taught that the Ark was hidden away in the Chamber of the wood-shed. R. Nahman b. Isaac said: Thus were we also taught.<sup>13</sup> It happened to a certain priest who was whiling away his time that he saw a block of pavement that was different from the others. He came and informed his fellow, but before he could complete his account, his soul departed. Thus they knew definitely that the Ark was hidden there. What had he been doing?<sup>14</sup> R. Helbo said: He was playing with his axe. The school of R. Ishmael taught: Two priests, afflicted with a blemish, were sorting the woods when the axe of one of them slipped from his hand and fell on that place, whereupon a flame burst forth and consumed him.<sup>15</sup>

R. Judah contrasted the following passages: And the ends of the staves were seen,<sup>16</sup> and it is written but they could not be seen without<sup>16</sup> — how is that possible? — They could be observed, but not actually seen. Thus was it also taught: 'And the ends of the staves were seen One might have assumed that they did not protrude from their place. To teach us [the fact] Scripture says: 'And the staves were so long'. One might assume that they tore the curtain and showed forth; to teach us [the fact] Scripture says: 'They could not be seen without'. How then? They pressed forth and protruded as the two breasts of a woman, as it is said: My beloved is unto me as a bag of myrrh, that lieth betwixt my breasts.<sup>17</sup>

R. Kattina said: Whenever Israel came up to the Festival, the curtain would be removed for them and the Cherubim were shown to them, whose bodies were intertwined with one another, and they would be thus addressed: Look! You are beloved before God as the love between man and woman.

R. Hisda raised the following objection: But they shall not go in to see the holy things as they are

being covered,<sup>18</sup> in connection with which Rab Judah in the name of Rab said: It means at the time when the vessels are being put into their cases?<sup>19</sup> — R. Nahman answered: That may be compared to a bride: As long as she is in her father's house, she is reserved in regard to her husband, but when she comes to her father-in-law's house, she is no more so reserved in regard to him.<sup>20</sup>

R. Hana son of R. Kattina raised the following objection: It happened with a priest who was whiling away his time<sup>21</sup> etc. — He was answered: You speak of a woman, who has been divorced. When she is divorced, she goes back to her earlier love.<sup>22</sup>

Of what circumstances are we treating here?<sup>23</sup> If we were to say the reference is to the first Sanctuary — but there was no curtain!<sup>24</sup> If, again, the reference be to the second Sanctuary, but there were no Cherubim? — In truth the reference is to the first Sanctuary and as to ‘curtain’ the reference here means the curtain at the entrances, for R. Zera said in the name of Rab: There were thirteen curtains in the Sanctuary, seven facing the seven gates, two [more], one of which was at the entrance to the Hekal,<sup>25</sup> the other at the entrance to the Ulam;<sup>26</sup> two to the debir; two, corresponding to them, in the loft.<sup>27</sup> R. Aha b. Jacob said: In truth the reference here is to the second Sanctuary, but it had painted Cherubim, as it is written: And he carved all the walls of the house round about with carved figures of Cherubim and palm-trees and open flowers, within and without,<sup>28</sup> and he overlaid them with gold fitted upon the graven work.<sup>29</sup> And it is written also: According to the space of each, with loyoth [wreaths round about].<sup>30</sup> What does ‘according to the space of each with loyoth’ mean? Rabbah son of R. Shilah said:

---

(1) Lam. I, 6.

(2) Hadarah (her inner chamber); i.e., all that is enclosed within Zion, in its Sanctuary, the Ark, etc.

(3) The inference that the Ark etc. was hidden in its place.

(4) Judg. I, 21.

(5) Shab. 145b.

(6) Jer. IX, 9.

(7) The numerical value serves only as ‘asmakta’ or intimation. Rashi goes through a closely reasoned argument to account for the fifty-two years.

(8) Dan. IX, 27.

(9) Deut. XXIX, 24; before that statement there is the reference to brimstone and salt: And that the whole land is brimstone and salt (v. 22). Thus the severe punishment for the forsaking of the covenant is that sulphur and salt cover the land. ‘One week’ in Dan. IX means a week of years.

(10) In the case of the Ark Scripture reads: ‘There unto this day’, implying for ever, whilst in the absence of ‘there’ in Judges I, 21, no such claim is made.

(11) I Chron. IV, 42-3.

(12) Isa. X, 13. The King of Babylon boasts of his achievements. Hence the sons of Simeon could not have dwelt there ‘forever.’

(13) Mish. Shek. VI, 2.

(14) To incur such punishment. The answer being that, unmindful of the reverence due to the Sanctuary, he had been playing around with his axe.

(15) or ‘it.’

(16) I Kings VIII, 8.

(17) Cant. I, 13.

(18) Num. IV, 20.

(19) This is said of the Levites in the wilderness, who, whilst carrying the vessels on their shoulders, were not permitted to look at them before they were covered. How much less would the Holy of Holies be profaned by being shown to the masses who had come to celebrate the Festival; the Cherubim being above the mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies.

(20) Before marriage there is reserve, which is given up in marriage, to be assumed again when divorce has taken place. Israel in the wilderness is comparable to the bride in her father's home; in the Temple to the bride in her husband's care.

(21) Which shews that the same reserve still obtains in the Temple.

- (22) I.e., to the reserve of original prenuptial state.  
 (23) Of what time speaks this account of the curtain being unrolled and the Cherubim shown to the pilgrims.  
 (24) I.e., between the Holy and the Holy of Holies, but a partition; v. supra 52b.  
 (25) V. Glos.  
 (26) I.e., in the cubit space of partition between the Holy and the Holy of Holies.  
 (27) Just above the entrance to the Holy of Holies.  
 (28) I Kings VI, 29.  
 (29) Ibid. 35.  
 (30) Ibid. VII, 36.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 54b

Even as a man embracing his companion.<sup>1</sup> Resh Lakish said: When the heathens entered the Temple and saw the Cherubim whose bodies were intertwined with one another, they carried them out and said: These Israelites, whose blessing is a blessing, and whose curse is a curse, occupy themselves with such things! And immediately they despised them, as it is said: All that honored her, despised her, because they have seen her nakedness.<sup>2</sup>

AND IT WAS CALLED SHETHIYAH: A Tanna taught: [It was so called] because from it the world was founded.<sup>3</sup> We were taught in accord with the view that the world was started [created] from Zion on. For it was taught: R. Eliezer says: The world was created from its centre, as it is said: When the dust runneth into a mass, and the clods keep fast together.<sup>4</sup> R. Joshua said: The world was created from its sides on, as it is said: For He saith to the snow: 'Fall thou on the earth'; likewise to the shower of rain, and to the showers of His mighty rain.<sup>5</sup> R. Isaac the Smith said: The Holy One, blessed be He, cast a stone into the ocean, from which the world then was founded as it is said: Whereupon were the foundations thereof fastened, or who laid the corner-stone thereof?<sup>6</sup> But the Sages said: The world was [started] created from Zion, as it is said: A Psalm of Asaph, God, God, the Lord [hath spoken],<sup>7</sup> whereupon it reads on: Out of Zion, the perfection of the world,<sup>8</sup> that means from Zion was the beauty of the world perfected.

It was taught: R. Eliezer the Great said: These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth, in the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven.<sup>9</sup> The generations [the creations] of heaven<sup>10</sup> were made from the heaven and the generations of the earth were made from the earth. But the Sages said: Both were created from Zion, as it is said: 'A Psalm of Asaph: God, God, the Lord, hath spoken, and called the earth from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof.' And Scripture further says: 'Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined forth', that means from it the beauty of the world was perfected.

HE TOOK THE BLOOD FROM HIM THAT WAS STIRRING IT: etc. What does 'KE-MAZLIF' mean? — R. Judah showed it to mean

- 
- (1) 'Loyoth' is connected with the root signifying 'attach', hence 'companions'.  
 (2) Lam. I, 8.  
 (3) Tosef. II. The suggestion is that Zion was created first, and around it other clods, rocks, formations, continents, were formed until the earth was completed.  
 (4) Job XXXVIII, 38.  
 (5) Ibid. XXXVII, 6. The picture here (Rashi) is that of a skeleton or frame, which filled in, gradually solidifying from all sides towards the centre, which is last in foundation. All Scriptural verses here are used as intimation not logically but illustratively. Here is an amazing anticipation of the modern theory that the world was founded by the solidification of vapours, the Talmudic account ascribing this gradual creation to the will of God.  
 (6) Job XXXVIII, 6.  
 (7) Ps. L, 1.

(8) Ibid. v. 2.

(9) Gen. 11, 4.

(10) All things of heaven, the stars, sun and moon.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 55a

‘as one swinging a whip’. — A Tanna taught: As he sprinkled, he did so not upon the ark-cover,<sup>1</sup> but against its thickness. And when he is to sprinkle upwards he first turns his hand down, and when he is to sprinkle downwards he first turns his hand up. — Whence do we infer this?<sup>2</sup> R. Aha b. Jacob said in the name of R. Zera: Scripture says: And sprinkle it upon the ark-cover and before the ark-cover.<sup>3</sup> Now with regard to the he-goat it need not be said [that he should sprinkle] downwards,<sup>4</sup> for that can be inferred from [the procedure with] the bullock where [the sprinkling] downwards<sup>5</sup> [is made], when then is it mentioned here too? To compare [the sprinkling] ‘upon’ [the ark-cover with the sprinkling] ‘before’ [it]: Just as [the sprinkling] ‘before’ does not mean ‘before’ actually,<sup>6</sup> so does sprinkling ‘upon’ [here] not mean really ‘upon’.<sup>7</sup> On the contrary! It was not necessary to state with regard to the bullock [that the sprinkling should be done] ‘upon’ [the ark-cover], for that could be inferred from the fact that the he-goat's blood was sprinkled upon [it], why then was it mentioned to compare the sprinkling ‘before’ [it], to the sprinkling ‘upon’ [it], viz. just as ‘upon’ means exactly, so shall ‘before’ here mean ‘upon exactly’?<sup>8</sup> How can you say this? Granted, if you say that the ‘downward’ sprinkling in the case of the he-goat is mentioned for the purpose of comparison,<sup>9</sup> then [sprinkling] ‘upward’ written in connection with the bullock is necessary in accord with the school of R. Eliezer b. Jacob; for the school of R. Eliezer b. Jacob taught: Upon the face of the ark-cover on the east,<sup>10</sup> this [special case] establishes a general rule viz., that wherever Scripture says ‘before’ [‘face’] it means ‘on the east’; but if you say that the ‘upwards’ in connection with the bullock is mentioned for the purpose of comparison, then for what purpose is the ‘downward’ in connection with the he-goat mentioned?

Our Rabbis taught: ‘And he shall sprinkle it upon the ark-cover and before the ark-cover’. From this we know how often the he-goat's blood is to be sprinkled upwards, viz., once; I do not know, though, how often ‘downwards’, so that I infer that thus: The word ‘blood’ is used in connection with the downward [sprinkling] of the bullock's blood, and the same word ‘blood’ is used about the downward [sprinkling] of the goat's blood: hence just as ‘downwards’ with the bullock means seven times, so does ‘downwards’ with the goat mean ‘seven times’. Or argue it this way: The word ‘blood’ is used in connection with the ‘upward’ [sprinkling] of the goat's blood, and the word ‘blood’ is used in connection with the downward [sprinkling] of the he-goat's blood; hence just as ‘upwards’ with the he-goat means once, thus also shall ‘downwards’ with the he-goat mean ‘once’? Let us see what comparison is legitimate: One may infer ‘downwards’ from ‘downwards’; but one may not infer ‘downwards’ from ‘upwards’. On the contrary: It is legitimate to infer [one aspect of] one matter from [another aspect of] the same matter, but one may not infer one matter from an extraneous one!<sup>11</sup> To teach [the true facts] Scripture says: And [he shall] do with its blood<sup>12</sup> as he did with the blood of the bullock.<sup>13</sup> Now it was not necessary<sup>14</sup> to say ‘as he did’, why then was it said? To show that all the ‘doings’ of them should be alike; as there were seven sprinklings downward with the bullock, so shall there be seven sprinklings downward with the goat. We learn thus how many [sprinklings] downwards there are to be both with bullock and he-goat. But I do not know how many [sprinklings] upwards are to be made with the bullock's blood. And so I infer: The word ‘blood’ is used for the upward [sprinkling] in the case of the he-goat, and the word ‘blood’ is used for the upward [sprinkling] in the case of the bullock. Hence, [the inference that] just as the upward sprinkling in the case of the he-goat has to be made once,<sup>15</sup> so shall the upward [sprinkling] in the case of the bullock be made once. Or argue it this way: The word ‘blood’ is used for the downward [sprinkling] in the case of the bullock, and the word ‘blood’ is used in the case of the upward [sprinkling] of the bullock: hence just as seven downward sprinklings have to be made with the bullock's blood, so must seven upward sprinklings be made with the bullock's blood! Let us see

what comparison is legitimate: One may fitly infer [something about] upward [sprinklings] from [other] upward [sprinklings], but one may not infer [something about] upward [sprinklings] from downward [sprinklings]. On the contrary: It is legitimate to infer one [aspect of one] matter from [another aspect of the same] matter, but one may not fitly infer one matter from an extraneous one.<sup>16</sup> Scripture therefore teaches: ‘And he shall do with his blood as he did with the blood of the bullock’! It was not necessary to say ‘with his blood’, why then was it said? To intimate that all the ‘doings’ of them should be alike: just as seven sprinklings downward were made in the case of the bullock, so shall seven sprinklings downward be made in the case of the goat; and just as only one upward sprinkling was made with the he-goat, so only one sprinkling upward had to be made in the case of the bullock.

ONE, ONE AND ONE, ONE AND TWO: Our Rabbis taught: [He counted] One, one and one, one and two, one and three, one and four, one and five, one and six, one and seven<sup>17</sup> — this is the view of R. Meir. R. Judah says: One, one and one, two and one, three and one, four and one, five and one, six and one, seven and one. Yet they are not conflicting,<sup>18</sup> each counting as is customary in his place. At any rate, both agree that the first sprinklings must be counted with each of the following. What is the reason thereof? — R. Eleazar said: In order that he make no mistake in the count.<sup>19</sup> — R. Johanan said: Scripture said: ‘And before the ark-cover shall he sprinkle’. Now it was not necessary to say ‘shall he sprinkle’. [For what teaching purpose] why then was it said, ‘He shall sprinkle’? — To indicate that the first sprinkling shall be counted with each subsequent one. — What is the [practical] difference between the two? — In case he had not counted, but also had made no mistake.<sup>20</sup> HE WENT OUT AND PLACED IT ON THE GOLDEN STAND IN THE SANCTUARY: We have learned there:<sup>21</sup> There were no money chests<sup>22</sup> [provided] for obligatory bird-offerings, to prevent confusion. What does ‘to prevent confusion’ mean? — R. Joseph said: To prevent confusion between freewill and obligatory offerings.<sup>23</sup> — Abaye said to him: Let him make two and inscribe on them: This is a freewill-offering, the other obligatory. — R. Judah

---

(1) I.e., not on the top surface thereof.

(2) That the two upward sprinklings are not made actually upon the ark-cover.

(3) Lev. XVI, 15, with reference to the he-goat.

(4) I.e., ‘before the ark-cover’.

(5) V. infra.

(6) The blood in the downward sprinkling fell on the ground not on the ark-cover. V. Rashi. Cur. edd.: ‘does not mean upon’.

(7) Not only not exactly upwards, but really downwards.

(8) So that in his downward sprinkling the blood is to touch the thickness of the ark-cover, whilst in his upward sprinkling it should touch its upper surface.

(9) As is stated at first.

(10) So lit., Lev. XVI, 14.

(11) I.e., the he-goat from the bullock.

(12) Sc. of the he-goat.

(13) Lev. XVI, 15.

(14) Since the sprinkling ‘upon’ or ‘before’ has been expressly mentioned in connection with the he-goat. Any apparently superfluous word or words were chosen for intimation or indication.

(15) As the Scriptural text indicates.

(16) The assumption that different parts of the same procedure are governed by similar rules seems more justified than that similar aspects of altogether different matters have such regulations.

(17) Tosef. II.

(18) In the place of R. Meir the tens were counted first, the singles following, whilst the opposite way of counting prevailed in the city of R. Judah.

(19) And include the one sprinkled upward among the seven which he has to sprinkle downwards (Bertinoro).

(20) If counting is obligatory, he had failed to do it properly. If the only purpose is the prevention of error and he has

managed to avoid it, then de facto all is right.

(21) J. Shek. VI, 6.

(22) These were special money chests into which persons who had a freewill-offering of a bird to offer would put in money in payment of the offerings which the priests would make on their behalf. No such chests were however available for obligatory offerings of a bird.

(23) There were different regulations governing the ritual of the freewill and obligatory offerings respectively, for of the obligatory birds one was offered up as a burnt-offering, the other as a sin-offering, whereas all freewill-offerings were burnt-offerings, these differences implying distinctions in the ritual. Now if one of the money chests were confused with another, so that the priest would offer a freewill-offering from the money meant for obligatory offerings and vice versa, the offering would be rendered invalid.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 55b

does not consider such inscriptions [of any value]. For we have learnt: R. JUDAH SAID: THERE WAS NO MORE THAN ONE STAND. Now why not two? Evidently because they might be mixed up! But then let him provide two and write upon them: This is for the bullock and this for the he-goat? Hence you must<sup>1</sup> assume that R. Judah does not consider such inscriptions [of any value]. An objection was raised in the Academy: There were thirteen money chests in the Temple, on which were inscribed: 'new shekels', 'old shekels', 'bird-offerings', 'young birds for the whole offering', 'wood', 'frankincense', 'gold for the mercy-seat', and on six of them: 'freewill-offerings'. 'New shekels': [i.e.] those shekels due each year; 'old shekels': [i.e.] one who had not paid his shekel last year must pay it the next year. 'Bird-offerings', these are turtle-doves. 'Young birds for the whole offerings', these are young pigeons; and both of these are for whole offerings. This is the view of R. Judah.<sup>2</sup> — When R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he said: In the West<sup>3</sup> they said: It is a preventive measure against the case of a sin-offering whose owner has died.<sup>4</sup> But do we indeed take that into consideration? Have we not learnt: If someone sends his sin-offering from a far-away province,<sup>5</sup> it is offered up in the assumption that he is alive?<sup>6</sup> — Rather [the preventive measure is] against the case of a sin-offering whose owner has assuredly died.<sup>7</sup> But in that case let us separate four zuz<sup>8</sup> and cast them into the sea,<sup>9</sup> so that the rest will be available for use! R. Judah rejects the principle of Bererah.<sup>10</sup> Whence do we know this? Would you say from what we have learnt:<sup>11</sup> If a man buys wine from the Cutheans<sup>12</sup> on the eve of Sabbath, as it is getting dark,<sup>13</sup> he may say: Let the two logs<sup>14</sup> which I am about to set apart<sup>15</sup> be heave-offering

---

(1) Because the priest might overlook them.

(2) Shek VI, 6; for notes v. Sonc. ed. a.l. Hence R. Judah apparently did consider inscriptions of value.

(3) Palestine.

(4) A sin-offering, the owner of which died, must not be sacrificed but must be left to die, v. supra 50a. Now if the owner died, then the money for the value of the sin-offering which he may have put in one of the chests must be thrown into the sea. That money, being unusable and confused with other monies in the chest, would render them all useless. This is the confusion referred to above, hence the non-provision of money chests for obligatory offerings of a bird.

(5) Lit., 'province of the sea'.

(6) V. Git. 28a.

(7) It is known that he died after having deposited his money in the chest for the bird-offerings before having offered it up.

(8) The usual price of one dove.

(9) And thus free the rest of the monies for their designated purposes, on the assumption that these four zuz represented the money for the sin-offering of a bird and was that deposited by the deceased.

(10) Lit., 'choosing', 'choice', then subsequent selection, retrospective designation, i.e. , the legal effect resulting from an actual selection or disposal of things previously undefined as to their purpose (Jast.).

(11) Demai VI, 4.

(12) Before the prohibition against their wines had been decreed. As the Cutheans (Samaritans) were suspected of neglecting the laws of terumah and tithe the buyer must himself set these aside before he can be permitted to drink any of

the wine.

(13) If the purchase took place on the Sabbath eve immediately before dusk (when there is no time to remove these priestly and levitical dues from the wine) and he requires the wine for the Sabbath. It is prohibited to separate priestly or levitical dues on the Sabbath, v. Bez. 36b.

(14) A log (v. Glos.) is c. 549 cubic centimetres.

(15) For the hundred logs contained in the cask he bought.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 56a

ten<sup>1</sup> tithe-offering, and nine second tithe, and after he sets aside the redemption<sup>2</sup> money for the second tithe he may drink it at once. These are the words of R. Meir.

---

(1) 'Logs which I am about to set aside'.

(2) Lit., 'to profane'. 'to desecrate'; to cause the loss of priestly status or of sacred use, to make available for private use. With money (cf. Deut. XIV, 25) that he has at home or anywhere else.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 56b

R. Judah, R. Jose and R. Simeon prohibit it. Hence we see that he rejects the principle of Bererah! — How does that follow? Perhaps the matter is different there, as the motive is taught there: They said to R. Meir: Don't you admit that if the bottle burst he would be found retrospectively to have drunk untithed wine? He said to them: If it bursts.<sup>1</sup> — Rather is it to be derived from what Ayo taught: for he taught: R. Judah said: No man may stipulate two possibilities at the same time. But if the Sage comes from the east, his 'Erub<sup>2</sup> applies eastwards alone; if he comes from the west, his 'Erub applies westwards alone, but never in both directions. And we asked concerning it: What is the difference touching both directions that it cannot apply, it is only because the principle of Bererah is rejected,<sup>3</sup> the same ought to apply even [where the condition was 'if the Sage comes] from the east or west'? Thereupon R. Johanan said: In this case the Sage has arrived already.<sup>4</sup> But now that we maintain that R. Judah rejects the principle of Bererah whilst upholding the value of inscriptions [notices],<sup>5</sup> also for the Day of Atonement let there be prepared two stands with such inscriptions! Because the high priest is fatigued, he would not pay attention to them. For should you not agree to this consideration, he could really do without any such inscriptions, for one [contains] more [blood], and the other less.<sup>6</sup> And if you were to say, he does not receive the whole of it,<sup>7</sup> but R. Judah said: He who slays the animal, must receive the whole blood, as it is said: The whole blood of the bullock he shall pour upon the base of the altar.<sup>8</sup> And if you were to say some thereof might be spilled; — still, one [blood] is lighter [in colour], the other darker. Hence you must needs explain that the high priest, because of his fatigue, could not pay sufficient attention [to the difference in the blood]; thus is it here: because of his fatigue the high priest could not pay sufficient attention [to the inscriptions].

Once a man went down [to the praying desk] in the presence of Raba<sup>9</sup> and read: Then he came forth, and placed it upon the second stand in the Temple. He took the blood of the bullock and deposited the blood of the he-goat. He said to him: In one point in accord with the Sages,<sup>10</sup> in another with R. Judah?<sup>11</sup> Rather say: He deposited the blood of the he-goat and took the blood of the bullock.

AND HE SPRINKLED THEREOF UPON THE CURTAIN OUTSIDE OPPOSITE THE ARK: Our Rabbis taught: And so shall he do for the tent of meeting.<sup>12</sup> What does that come to teach? That as he sprinkles in the Holy of Holies, thus must he sprinkle in the Hekal, i.e., just as in the Holy of Holies he sprinkles once upward and seven times downward, from the blood of the bullock, thus shall he sprinkle in the Hekal. That dwelleth with them in the midst of their uncleanness<sup>13</sup> i.e., even when they are unclean, the Divine Presence is among them.

A certain Sadducee<sup>14</sup> said to R. Hanina:

- (1) This is a contingency that need not be reckoned with, since a guard may be appointed to watch out for such theoretical situations.
- (2) The word 'erub' means interweaving, mixture, confusion, conjunction. It signifies also a symbolical act, by which the legal fiction of community or continuity is established. With reference to the Sabbath limits: a person deposits, before the Sabbath (or the Holy Day), certain eatables to remain in their place over the next day, by which act he transfers his abode to that place and his movements on the Sabbath are measured from it as the centre. On the Sabbath in the area around a town or place the limits are two thousand cubits in every direction. The case here discussed is that of one who expects a scholar outside his city and is desirous of meeting him. He deposits the 'erub for this purpose. V. 'Er., Sonc. ed., pp. 252f. notes.
- (3) It being held that the choice the man made between the two Sages on the following day may not have been his choice at twilight on the previous day when the validity of the 'erub must take effect.
- (4) Sc. at twilight of the Sabbath eve he was already within the permitted Sabbath limit of that man's town though the latter was unaware of the fact. As the validity of the 'erub was made dependent on an event that, though unknown to the speaker, had actually taken place before twilight of the Sabbath eve there can be no question as to the 'erub's effectiveness. It is not the speaker's subsequent knowledge of the fact that renders the 'erub valid retrospectively, but the presence of the Sage at the crucial moment. The question of bererah, therefore, does not at all arise.
- (5) As so proved from Shek. VI, 5.
- (6) One contains the blood of the bullock which is of a larger quantity than that of the he-goat.
- (7) Sc. the blood of the bullock.
- (8) Lev. IV, 7.
- (9) He acted as deputy of the congregation (public reader) and read the order of the service of the Day of Atonement.
- (10) The reference to the second stand.
- (11) Stating that he took first the blood of the bullock and then deposited the blood of the he-goat.
- (12) Lev. XVI, 16.
- (13) Ibid.
- (14) A censorial corruption of Min (v. Glos.). A Sadducean would not have spoken of Israel as 'you'.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 57a

Now you are surely unclean, for it is written: Her filthiness was in her skirts.<sup>1</sup> -He answered: Come and see what is written concerning them: 'That dwelleth with them in the midst of their uncleanness', i.e., even at the time when they are unclean, the Divine Presence is among them. — But may something inferred by analogy be used as basis of another by analogy?<sup>2</sup> — The inference here came from the subject itself for which inference was made, together with another, thus cannot be considered inference by analogy.<sup>3</sup> This will be well in accord with the view that such inference is not inference by analogy, but what can be said according to the view that even that is inference by analogy? — Only the localities are inferred here from one another.<sup>4</sup> Or, if you like, say: He infers the outside [sprinklings] from the inside ones simultaneously.<sup>5</sup> It was taught: When he sprinkled, he did not sprinkle directly upon the curtain, but towards it. R. Eliezer b. Jose said: I saw it<sup>6</sup> in Rome and there were upon it many drops of blood both of the bullock and the he-goat of the Day of Atonement. — Perhaps these stains were those from the [blood of] the bullock [offered up] for an error of the community,<sup>7</sup> or of the goats [offered in expiation] for idolatry? — He saw that they were in their regular order.<sup>8</sup> It has also been taught<sup>9</sup> in connection with the bullock offered up for an error of the community: When he sprinkled the drops were not to reach the curtain, but if they did, they just did.<sup>10</sup> And R. Eleazar b. Jose said: I saw it in Rome and there were upon it many drops of blood from the bullock offered up for an error of the congregation and from the he-goats offered up for idolatry. But perhaps they came from the bullock and he-goat of the Day of Atonement? — He saw that they were not in their regular order.

If the blood [of the one] was mixed up with the blood [of the other],<sup>11</sup> — Raba holds, he sprinkles

once upwards and seven times downwards, and it serves for both. When this was reported before R. Jeremiah, he said: Those foolish Babylonians, because they live in a dark country, they utter dark teachings.<sup>12</sup> Surely he would be giving the upward sprinkling [of the blood] of the he-goat before the downward sprinkling [of the blood] of the bullock, whereas the Torah said: And when he hath made an end of atoning for the holy place,<sup>13</sup> [implying] he must complete [the sprinkling of] the blood of the bullock, then complete [the sprinkling of] the blood of the he-goat. Rather, said R. Jeremiah: He sprinkles once upward and seven times downward in the name of the bullock, and then he sprinkles once upward and seven times downward in the name of the he-goat.

If the blood of one was mixed up with the blood of the other in the midst<sup>14</sup> of the last sprinklings, then R. Papa wanted to say before Raba, he makes seven downward sprinklings in the name of the bullock and he-goat, then makes one upward in the name of the he-goat. Said Raba to him: Now they had just called us foolish, now they might call us the most foolish of the foolish for we teach them but they learn not. Surely now he would be making the downward sprinkling [of the blood] of the he-goat before the upward sprinkling [of the blood] of the he-goat, whereas the Torah said: Sprinkle first upward, then downward.

---

(1) Lam. I, 9.

(2) Above (55a) we inferred the number of upward and downward sprinklings with the blood of the bullock and the he-goat respectively. Here again an attempt is made to infer through analogy the number of upward and downward sprinklings in the Sanctuary from the sprinklings in the Holy of Holies. The rule is that in the laws appertaining to sacrifices something obtained by analogy may not become the basis or source of new inference by analogy; such inference is legitimate only when based upon the Biblical text itself.

(3) In the primary analogy the main law prescribing upward and downward sprinklings is definitely taught in the Biblical text, both in the case of the bullock and the he-goat, it is only their number that is inferred from one another. In such a case the primary analogy may be made the basis for a further analogy. It is only when the very law itself is mentioned in one case only and then inferred through analogy for the other that no further inference by analogy may be made. If e.g., no reference had been made in the Biblical text to any upward or downward sprinkling, such regulation being based on inference from one to the other, it would then be wrong to endeavour to derive another law by analogy from the first law inferred by analogy.

(4) I.e., whereas in the first analogy the inference was made from one animal for the other, the second is concerned in the localities — i.e., the Holy of Holies and the Temple, extending the sprinkling regulations from the former to the latter.

(5) The second inference is not made via the animals but directly from the sprinklings within the Holy of Holies to those outside, in the Temple Proper.

(6) V. Me'il. 17b: R. Eliezer was in Rome and had occasion to see the holy vessels in the royal treasury, among them the curtain of the Holy of Holies.

(7) Lev. IV, 13 and Num. XV, 24.

(8) One on top of the other, as the result of the motion of the priest, in the manner of one swinging a whip.

(9) V. D.S. Cur. edd. 'We also learnt'.

(10) De facto it did not matter: even if the drops reached the curtain there was no cancellation of the service.

(11) The blood of the bullock with the blood of the he-goat.

(12) V. Pes., Sonc. ed., 60b.

(13) Lev. XVI, 20.

(14) I.e., after he had made the upward sprinkling with the blood of the bullock.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 57b**

Rather, said Raba, he makes seven downward sprinklings in the name of the bullock, then makes one upward and seven downward sprinklings in the name of the he-goat.

If the cups [of blood] have become confused,<sup>1</sup> then he sprinkles, and sprinkles again, and sprinkles once more, three times.<sup>2</sup> If part<sup>3</sup> of the blood became mixed up and part not, then obviously when he

makes the sprinklings he makes them from that part which is definitely known [to be unmixed]; but as for the other,<sup>4</sup> is it to be considered a remainder and must thus be poured out at the base<sup>5</sup> of the altar, or is it to be considered 'rejected' [from sacred use] and must be poured into the canal?<sup>6</sup> — R. Papa said: Even according to the view that one cup renders the other a remainder,<sup>7</sup> that applies only where he could make the sprinklings if he wanted to do so but in this case,<sup>8</sup> even if he so desired, he would be unable to make the sprinkling. R. Huna the son of R. Joshua said to R. Papa: On the contrary! Even according to the view that one cup renders the other 'rejected', that applies only if he rejected it with his hands [deliberately], but where he had not rejected it with his hands it would not apply? For it has been taught: Above it is said: And the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out,<sup>9</sup> and below: And all the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out.<sup>10</sup> Whence do we know that, in the case of a sin-offering, if he had received the blood in four cups and sprinkled from each one cup thereof<sup>11</sup> one sprinkling, all the remaining blood must be poured out at the base? To teach us that Scripture said: 'And all the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out'. One might have assumed that even if he made the four sprinklings from one of the [cups], to teach us correctly, Scripture said: 'And the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out' i.e., only this is to be poured out at the base but they [the rest] are to be poured into the canal. R. Eliezer son of R. Simeon said: Whence do we know that if he received the blood of a sin-offering in four cups and made the four sprinklings from one of them, that they must all be poured out at the base? To teach us that Scripture said: 'And all the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out'.<sup>12</sup> But according to R. Eliezer son of R. Simeon is it not written: 'And the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out'? — R. Ashi said: This is meant to exclude the [blood that] remains in the neck of the animal.

**HE Poured the blood of the bullock into the blood of the he-goat:** We were taught in accordance with the view that one mixed [the blood] to sprinkle upon the horns [of the inner altar], for it has been said: R. Josaia and R. Jonathan [were disputing], one said: One mixed [the bloods], the other one did not do so. It may be ascertained that it is R. Josaia who held that one mixed [the bloods]; for he said: Although Scripture does not state: 'together',<sup>13</sup> is it not written: it is as if 'together' were written. You might also say that it is R. Jonathan, but here it is different, because Scripture states 'once'.<sup>14</sup> It has been taught contrary to this, our reply: 'And he shall take of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the goat'<sup>15</sup> i.e., that they are to be mixed. This is the view of R. Josaia.

---

(1) The priest not knowing which of the cups contained the blood of the bullock and which the blood of the he-goat.

(2) In each case he makes one sprinkling upward and seven downward from one cup then again from the second cup, finally again from the first cup, so that in any case the blood of the bullock would have been sprinkled before that of the he-goat. For, if the first cup was actually that containing the bullock's blood, and the second that containing the he-goat's blood, he has fulfilled his duty properly, with the first and second series of sprinklings. If, however, the first cup happened to be that of the he-goat, then such sprinkling was of no avail, and the second cup being that containing the bullock's blood and the third again the one containing the he-goat's blood, are in order and the service is performed in accord with the regulations which postulate that the sprinklings made with the bullock's blood came first.

(3) As e.g., when the blood contained in two cups was poured into a third, so that each of the two cups contained a quantity of blood.

(4) The mixed blood in the third cup.

(5) V. Zeb. 47a: the remaining blood was poured over the western base of the outer altar.

(6) I.e., since the sprinklings did not come from it, shall the blood be relegated, together with all waste of the Temple Court, through the canal, to the brook of Kidron.

(7) Whenever the priest has received the blood in two cups but has sprinkled from one only, the blood in the other cup is poured out over the base of the altar.

(8) Where part of the blood of the two cups was poured into a third.

(9) Lev. IV, 25.

(10) Ibid. v, 34.

(11) The blood of the sin-offering was sprinkled upon the four corners of the altar.

(12) Thus we see that the first Tanna treats the blood in the cup or cups from which no sprinkling has been made as rejected, to be poured out in the canal, whereas R. Eliezer b. R. Simeon treats it as the remainder, to be poured out over the base.

(13) In Sanh. 66a these two Sages debate the question as to whether literal direction is necessary to indicate that a prohibition does not refer to two persons together where the contrary might be assumed, R. Judah holding that such direction is necessary while R. Jonathan holds it is not. Thus, on the view of R. Josaia, even though no definite instruction is to be found in the text, the inference that the blood of the bullock and he-goat be sprinkled together, appears legitimate according to the analogous consistence of the view.

(14) Ex. XXX, 10. And Aaron shall make atonement upon the horns of it once (a year). The word is here interpreted to mean that one sprinkling is to be made of the blood of both animals.

(15) Lev. XVI, 18.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 58a

R. Jonathan said: [He sprinkled] separately from the one and from the other. Said R. Josaia to him: But was it not said already: 'Once'? To this R. Jonathan replied: But was it not said already: 'From the blood of the bullock and the blood of the he-goat'? Why then was the word 'once' stated? To tell you, [sprinkle] once, but not twice from the blood of the bullock; once and not twice from the blood of the he-goat. Another [Baraitha] taught: 'And he shall take from the blood of the bullock and from the blood of the he-goat' i.e., that the two shall be mixed together. You say that they shall be mixed together! but perhaps he should sprinkle separately from the one and from the other? To teach us the right thing, Scripture says: 'once' and the anonymous [Baraitha] is in agreement with the view of R. Joshua.

HE Poured THE [CONTENTS OF] THE FULL VESSEL INTO THE EMPTY ONE: Rami b. Hama asked of R. Hisda: If he placed one bowl into another and this received the blood, what then? Is homogeneous matter considered an interposition or not?<sup>1</sup> He answered: You have learnt that already: HE Poured [THE CONTENTS OF] THE FULL VESSEL INTO THE EMPTY ONE. Does this mean that he placed the full bowl into the empty one?<sup>2</sup> — No, it means that he poured the full vessel into the empty one.<sup>3</sup> But the first part states already: HE Poured THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK INTO THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT? — [It is repeated] in order [to make sure] that he will mix it very well indeed.

Come and hear: If he stood upon any vessel, or upon his fellow's foot, it is invalid!<sup>4</sup> — It is different with his neighbour's foot, because he [his fellow] does not abandon it.<sup>5</sup> Some there are who say: This is how he asked of him: Is such the manner of ministration or not? Come and hear: For the school of R. Ishmael taught:[And they shall take] all the vessels of ministry, wherewith they minister in the sanctuary,<sup>6</sup> i.e., two<sup>7</sup> vessels, but one ministry [service].

Rami b. Hama asked of R. Hisda: If he deposited bast in the bowl and he received the blood therewith, what then? Is heterogeneous matter considered an interposition<sup>8</sup> or not? Is it not considered an interposition, since it penetrates [the blood], or is there no difference? — He replied to him: We have learnt that: He empties out the water until the sponge is reached.<sup>9</sup> — It is different with water because it is very weak. Some there are who say: This is how he answered him: In the case of the blood<sup>10</sup> it is permitted, but in the case of the fistful it is invalid.<sup>11</sup>

---

(1) The priest is to receive the blood. If one bowl is considered an interposition, then the priest, whose hand does not hold the bowl containing the blood, is not really receiving the blood, the ministration then should be cancelled as invalid. (This discussion refers, as Rashi explains, not just to the Day of Atonement, but to the service on any day of the year). The two bowls are homogeneous and if they be considered as interposition, then the above question follows. With regard to heterogeneous matter, there is no doubt; it surely is considered an interposition, v. Tosaf. s.v. ג'י.

(2) That would indicate that homogeneous matter is not considered an interposition and would thus settle the above

question in the affirmative.

(3) So that the situation is entirely different and no inference as to the interposition of homogeneous matter is possible.

(4) If the priest, in receiving the blood, stood upon a vessel, then that vessel was interposing between the floor of the Sanctuary and the priest, therefore invalidating the service. (Zeb. 24a). Similarly, if he stood upon his fellow's foot. The foot, however, is homogeneous and the fact that the service is cancelled, would seem to indicate that homogeneous matter is considered an interposition, so that the question above would appear to be answered.

(5) Homogeneous matter is not considered an interposition, but a human foot is an undeniable entity.

(6) Num. IV, 12.

(7) I.e., vessels in the plural means at least two (although the plural is indefinite as to the maximum, there is the undeniable minimum of two); whereas the word ministry refers to one ministration only.

(8) The bast is heterogeneous to the bowl, hence should be considered an interposition. But since the blood penetrates the bast and reaches the bowl, does it cancel the interposing bast, so that, as it were, the priest had received the blood in the bowl proper, as viewed retroactively, or not?

(9) Parah VI, 3: If someone was mixing the ashes (of the red heifer) in the water of a trough of stone, and there was a sponge in the trough then the water in the sponge is invalid, as a sponge is not a vessel. What should he do? The water in the trough should be poured out until the sponge is reached and the water is valid. Hence we see that a sponge is not considered interposing so as to invalidate the whole water, and similarly here, the bast should not be considered as interposing between the bowl and the blood.

(10) Because it is thin.

(11) For the fistful of the flour-offering was required to be received in the vessel after having first been taken, analogous to the receiving of the blood, hence any interposing object would render the ministration invalid.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 58b**

MISHNAH. AND HE SHALL GO OUT UNTO THE ALTAR THAT IS BEFORE THE LORD,<sup>1</sup> — THAT IS THE GOLDEN ALTAR.<sup>2</sup> THEN HE BEGINS TO SPRINKLE<sup>3</sup> DOWNWARD.<sup>4</sup> WHENCE DOES HE COMMENCE? FROM THE NORTH-EAST HORN [OF THE ALTAR], THEN THE NORTH-WEST, THEN THE SOUTH-WEST, THEN THE SOUTH-EAST. WHERE HE COMMENCES [SPRINKLING] ON THE OUTER ALTAR,<sup>5</sup> THERE HE COMPLETES [SPRINKLING] ON THE INNER ALTAR. R. ELIEZER SAID: HE REMAINED IN HIS PLACE AND SPRINKLED. AND HE WOULD SPRINKLE EVERY HORN FROM BELOW UPWARDS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE HORN AT WHICH HE WAS STANDING, WHICH HE WOULD SPRINKLE FROM ABOVE DOWNWARDS. THEN HE SPRINKLED THE TOP<sup>6</sup> OF THE ALTAR SEVEN TIMES AND Poured OUT THE REMAINDER OF THE BLOOD AT THE WESTERN BASE OF THE OUTER ALTAR. AND [THE REMAINDER OF THE BLOOD SPRINKLED] ON THE OUTER ALTAR HE Poured OUT AT THE SOUTHERN BASE. BOTH MINGLED IN THE CANAL<sup>7</sup> AND FLOWED INTO THE BROOK KIDRON AND THEY WERE SOLD TO GARDENERS AS MANURE AND BY USING THEM ONE TRANSGRESSES THE LAW OF TRESPASS.<sup>8</sup> GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: 'And he shall go out unto the altar', what does that mean to teach? R. Nehemiah said: Since we find that, in connection with the bullock offered up for [the transgression in error of] 'any of the commandments',<sup>9</sup> the priest stands outside the altar and sprinkles towards the curtain,<sup>10</sup> one might have assumed that here the same would take place, therefore Scripture said: 'And he shall go out unto the altar', hence he must have been found before on the inner side of the altar.<sup>11</sup> — Another [Baraitha] taught: 'Before the Lord'. What does that mean to teach? R. Nehemiah said: Since we find with the bullock and he-goat of the Day of Atonement that the priest stands on the inner side of the altar and sprinkles upon the curtain, as he sprinkles one might have assumed here the same would be the case, therefore Scripture has come to teach us: The altar of sweet incense before the Lord, which is in the tent of meeting,<sup>12</sup> that implies: the altar before the Lord, but not the priest before the Lord. How that? He stands outside the altar and sprinkles.

HE BEGAN TO SPRINKLE DOWNWARD: Our Rabbis taught: He began to sprinkle downward.

Whence did he commence? From the south-eastern horn, [proceeding to] the south-western, north-western and north-eastern horns respectively. This is the view of R. Akiba, — R. Jose the Galilean says: [He started from] the north-eastern, [proceeding to] the north-western, southwestern and south-eastern horns respectively.<sup>13</sup> At the place where, according to R. Jose the Galilean, he commenced, there according to R. Akiba, he stopped. At the place where R. Akiba would have him start, there R. Jose the Galilean would have him stop. All agree at any rate that he does not start at the point he first comes to.<sup>14</sup> What is the reason? Said Samuel: Scripture said: And he shall go out unto the altar, i.e., only after he has gone over the whole altar. But according to R. Akiba he ought to go around it to the right.<sup>15</sup> Shall we say [then] that they are disputing a teaching of Rami b. Ezekiel? For Rami b. Ezekiel said: Concerning the sea<sup>16</sup> which Solomon made, [Scripture states]: It stood upon twelve oxen, three looking toward the north, and three looking toward the west, and three looking toward the south, and three looking toward the east; and the sea was set upon them, and all their hinder parts were inward.<sup>17</sup> Hence you are taught that all the turns you make [in the Temple] must be to the right, i.e., eastward;<sup>18</sup> one Master [R. Jose the Galilean] agreeing with Rami b. Ezekiel, the other Master [R. Akiba] disagreeing? — No, all agree with the view of Rami b. Ezekiel and the matter of dispute here is, rather, this: One Master holds that [the regulations] within<sup>19</sup> are inferred from [those] without,<sup>20</sup> the other Master holding we do not infer [the regulations] ‘within’ from [those] ‘without’. But according to R. Akiba, granted that he does not infer ‘within’ from ‘without’, let him be permitted to do it one way if he so chooses, or the other way if he so chooses?<sup>21</sup> — R. Akiba will tell you: As far as de jure regulation is concerned he ought to start at the horn to which he had come first, for Resh Lakish has said: One must not forego the occasion for performing a religious act;<sup>22</sup> and the reason why he does not do so is because Scripture said: ‘And he shall go out unto the altar,’ i.e., until he has gone outside the whole altar. Therefore as soon as he has sprinkled the blood on this horn, he returns to the horn with which he should have started from the beginning.<sup>23</sup>

---

(1) Lev. XVI, 18.

(2) Ex. XXX, I.

(3) Lit., ‘to cleanse from sin’.

(4) Lit., ‘he goes down’ i.e., he applies the blood to the horn of the altar beginning at the top and leading his finger downward.

(5) Zeb. 53a.

(6) This word is variously interpreted in the Gemara. It may mean ‘back’, i.e., top; it has been claimed as ‘the pure, real surface’ (of gold) i.e., free from coals or ashes; as the centre of the altar front.

(7) V. Shek. IV, 2.

(8) Lev. V, 15.

(9) Lev. IV, 1ff.

(10) V. infra.

(11) The text should have read: ‘He shall make atonement on the altar that is before the Lord’. ‘And he shall go out unto the altar’ has no special significance. But since we find that on the occasion of other sacrifices he was standing outside, the words ‘and he shall go out’ here indicate that in this case he was on the inner side.

(12) Lev. IV, 7. The words ‘before the Lord’ are in themselves superfluous — for obviously the altar was ‘before the Lord’ — but are to indicate that only the altar was ‘before the Lord’ but not the priest. The latter stood outside and did not interpose between the altar and the curtain either when he sprinkled the blood on the corners or against the curtains.

(13) The dispute hinges on the question as to whether there were one or two curtains before the Holy of Holies. R. Akiba holds there were two, the outer one clasped on the south side. As the priest came from the Holy of Holies from the south in order to proceed with the sprinkling against the curtain, the first horn of the altar he meets is the south-western, however, he did not sprinkle, because of the interpretation of ‘And he shall go out unto the altar’ (v. infra) so that he begins the sprinkling on the south-eastern side and then turning to the left continues with the outer corners. R. Jose the Galilean holds, in accord with R. Jose, that there was but one curtain, clasped on the north side, so that as the priest came forth from the north he reached first the north-western horn of the altar, where, however, he did not sprinkle but at the north-eastern horn, and then turning to the right he returned to the north-western horn to continue his sprinkling.

- (14) Coming from the west, he first reaches one of the western horns of the altar (v. previous note), yet does not commence with it.
- (15) V. p. 273, n. 5.
- (16) The water reservoir in the Temple of Solomon.
- (17) I Kings VII, 25.
- (18) This is derived from the order in which the sides are enumerated; the phrase 'eastward' does not apply here but is taken from the passage where this principle is originally quoted in connection with the ramp. v. supra 45a and Zeb. 62b.
- (19) The inner altar.
- (20) The Sea of Solomon.
- (21) Either to the right or to the left.
- (22) V. supra 33a.
- (23) V. p. 273. n. 5.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 59a

Or if you like, say: If we hold that the sprinkling [on the inner altar] was done in walking around,<sup>1</sup> there would be general agreement that we infer 'within' from 'without', but the dispute here rests on this: one Master holds the sprinkling was done by circular movements of the hand, the other Master holding the sprinkling was done in walking around. Or if you like, say: All agree that the sprinkling [on the inner altar] was done by circular movements of the hand, the point of dispute here is: one Master holds, we may infer [the regulations touching] the hand from [those governing] the foot, the other Master holding that we do not infer the 'hand' from the 'foot'. But does R. Jose the Galilean hold that the sprinkling was done by circular movement of the hand? Surely, since the second part reads: R. Eliezer said: HE REMAINED IN HIS PLACE AND SPRINKLED,<sup>2</sup> it follows that the first Tanna did not hold so?<sup>3</sup> Hence it is obvious, as we have answered before: One Master holds the sprinkling was done by circular movement of the hand, whereas the other Master holds it was done by walking around. And if you like to say: The dispute lies therein: that one Master holds that the [phrase] 'round about' [mentioned in connection] with the inner altar signifies the same as 'round about' [mentioned in connection] with the outer altar,<sup>4</sup> whereas the other Master holds that the whole of the inner altar occupied as much space as one horn of the outer altar.<sup>5</sup>

It was taught: R. Ishmael said: Two high priests had survived the First Sanctuary. One said: I had done the sprinkling [in the inner altar] by circular movement of my hand; the other said: I had done the sprinkling by walking around the altar. The first advanced a reason for his procedure, so did the second. The first said: The 'round about' of the inner altar had to be as the round about' of the outer altar; the other stating: The whole of the inner altar occupied as much space as one horn of the outer altar.

R. ELIEZER SAID: HE REMAINED IN HIS PLACE AND SPRINKLED. With whom does our Mishnah agree? — With R. Judah. For it was taught: R. Meir said, R. Eliezer said: He remained in his place and sprinkled. And all the sprinklings he made from above downward with the exception of the one athwart, which he made from below upward. R. Judah said, R. Eliezer said: He remained in his place and sprinkled. All the sprinklings he made from below upward with the exception of this one right before him which he made from above downward, to prevent his garments from becoming sullied.<sup>6</sup>

THEN HE SPRINKLED THE TOP [TIHARO] OF THE ALTAR: What does 'TIHARO' mean? — Rabbah son of R. Shila said: The centre of the altar-front, as people say: 'The moon-light [tiharo] shines,' meaning thereby the middle of the day. An objection was raised: As he sprinkles, he sprinkles neither upon the ashes, nor upon the embers, but he removes the coal to both sides and sprinkles?<sup>7</sup> — Rather, said Rabbah son of R. Shila: [It means] the cleared surface<sup>8</sup> of the altar, as it is written: And the like of the very heaven for [tohar] clearness.<sup>9</sup>

It was taught: Hanania said: He would sprinkle<sup>10</sup> standing on the north side.<sup>11</sup> — R. Jose said: He would sprinkle standing on the south side.<sup>11</sup> Wherein are they disputing? — One [Hanania] holds the entrance was through the curtain on the south, whereas the other [R. Jose] holds it was on the north side.<sup>12</sup> At any rate all agree that on the place where he completed the sprinkling on the horns there he would sprinkle on the top thereof. What is the reason? — Scripture says: And he shall cleanse it...and hallow it,<sup>13</sup> i.e., where he hallows it,<sup>14</sup> there shall he cleanse it [we-tiharo].<sup>15</sup>

**AND THE REMAINDER OF THE BLOOD HE SPRINKLED UPON THE WESTERN BASE OF THE OUTER ALTAR:** For Scripture said: And all the remaining blood of the bullock shall he pour out [etc.],<sup>16</sup> and as he comes forth [from the Sanctuary] he meets this [side of the altar base] first.

**AND THAT OF THE OUTER ALTAR HE Poured ON THE SOUTHERN BASE:** Our Rabbis taught: ‘The base of the altar’<sup>17</sup> i.e., the southern base. You say it is the southern base. But perhaps it is not so, but rather the western base? I will tell you: Let his coming down from the ramp be inferred from his going out of the Sanctuary: Just as when he goes out of the Sanctuary [he pours out the remainder of the blood] at [the point] nearest to him, and which is it? — the western base, so when he comes down from the ramp [he pours out the remainder of the blood] at the point nearest to him, and which is it? — the southern base.

It was taught: R. Ishmael said: Both times [blood was poured out] at the western base. — R. Simeon b. Yohai: No, [it was] at the southern base. — It is quite right, according to R. Ishmael: He holds that one may infer that concerning which no details are given from that which is thus described,<sup>18</sup> but what is the reason of R. Simeon b. Yohai? — R. Ashi said: He holds the entrance [to the Sanctuary] was at the south.<sup>19</sup> The teaching of the school of R. Ishmael was taught in the school of R. Simeon b. Yohai:<sup>20</sup> In both cases it was the southern base. As a mnemotechnic sign remember: The men won over the man.<sup>21</sup>

**BOTH MINGLED IN THE CANAL AND FLOWED etc.:** Our Rabbis taught: One transgresses the law of trespass with [sacrificial] blood. These are the words of R. Meir. R. Simeon and the Sages hold: One does not commit such trespass.

---

(1) As was the case with the sprinkling on the outer altar.

(2) So that the sprinkling was done by the circular movement of his hand.

(3) The first Tanna (anonymous) of our Mishnah is R. Jose the Galilean, in accordance with his view in the Baraita cited. Now since R. Eliezer, in disputing, states that the sprinkling was made by circular movements of the hand, it is obvious that R. Jose did not think so. Hence the statement ‘All agree that the sprinkling was done by circular movement of the hand’ is wrong.

(4) V. Lev. XVI, 18. And...he shall put it upon the horns of the altar round about. In the case of the outer altar, the sprinkling was done by walking around, the analogy would render the same procedure proper with the inner altar.

(5) One cubit square.

(6) The purpose of this procedure was practical, beyond any ritualistic significance: he sprinkled upon the horn before him from above downward, lest some blood drip into his sleeve.

(7) The first interpretation of the word ‘tiharo’ would identify it with the middle of the side of the altar. But the passage just adduced indicates it must be the top. Cf. supra, p. 69, n. 2.

(8) Lit., ‘exposed (part)’.

(9) Ex. XXIV, 10.

(10) The seven sprinklings on the top of the altar, as explained supra.

(11) I.e., on the side where he completed the round of sprinkling on the altar.

(12) V. supra p. 274, n. 1, 5.

(13) Lev. XVI, 19.

(14) On the horns, i.e., on the horn where he completes the hallowing.

(15) By means of the seven sprinklings.

(16) Lev. IV, 7.

(17) Lev. IV, 30 with reference to an individual sin-offering.

(18) With regard to blood-offerings which are sprinkled on the inner altar there is the Biblical statement: Upon the base of the altar . . . which is at the entrance to the tent of meeting (Lev. IV, 7 and 18), this being the western base; there being no such statement concerning those offerings of which the blood is on the outer altar, the inference is legitimate.

(19) [The whole of the outer altar being on the northern half of the court so that when the priest came out of the Sanctuary the first base he met was the southern, v. supra 16b.]

(20) [I.e., R. Ishmael had retracted his view so that the disciples of R. Simeon b. Yohai could report the teaching in the name of R. Ishmael (Rashi).]

(21) 'The men drew nigh', i.e., won over the man, viz., the disciples of R. Simeon prevailed upon R. Ishmael to agree with them.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 59b

Now the dispute touches only the question as to whether [there is a trespass] Rabbinically;<sup>1</sup> according to Biblical law, however, there is no trespass.<sup>2</sup> When [do we know] these things? — 'Ulla said: Scripture said: 'To you'<sup>3</sup> i.e., it belongs to you. The school of R. Simeon taught: To make atonement<sup>4</sup> i.e., I have given it for atonement, but not for [the law of] trespass [to apply]. R. Johanan said: Scripture said: 'It' i.e., [implying that] it is before atonement: just as after atonement one cannot be guilty of trespass concerning it,<sup>5</sup> thus can one before atonement not be guilty of trespass concerning it. But perhaps say: It is after the atonement as before the atonement: just as before the atonement one may become guilty of trespass concerning it, so also after atonement may one become guilty of trespass concerning it? — There is nothing concerning which one can become guilty of trespass, once the atonement touching it has been fulfilled.<sup>6</sup> But there is the removal of the ashes [from the altar]?<sup>7</sup>

---

(1) Making the offender liable to pay the capital value of the blood.

(2) And the offender is exempt from the extra payment of the fifth, v. Lev. V, 16.

(3) Lev. XVII, 11 . I have given it (the blood) to you.

(4) Ibid. 'To make atonement', implies but for no other ritual purpose, such as the application of the law of trespass.

(5) Once atonement has been effected with any sacrifice the law of trespass does not apply to it, v. infra.

(6) Once it has served its purpose it is no longer considered the property of the Sanctuary for laws of trespass to apply to it.

(7) V. Lev. VI, 3. The Biblical regulation And he shall put them (the ashes) beside the altar, (ibid.), indicates that they must be hid away, are not available for private use, and are hence still the property of the Sanctuary, to which the laws of trespass apply though the commandment concerning it has already been fulfilled.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 60a

— That is because referring to the removal of the ashes and the priestly garments<sup>1</sup> there are two verses [written] for the same purpose<sup>2</sup> and wherever two verses have the same purpose no deduction can be made from them [for other precepts].<sup>3</sup> That will be right according to the Rabbis who hold: 'And he shall put them there'<sup>4</sup> signifies that they must be hidden away but what can be said according to R. Dosa who holds that the garments of the [high] priest may be used for a common priest? — That is because concerning the removal of the ashes and the heifer<sup>5</sup> whose neck is to be broken are two verses written for the same purpose, and wherever two verses are written for the same purpose no deduction can be made from them. That will be right according to the view that holds from two identical Scriptural statements no deduction can be made; but what can be said in accordance with the view that such deduction is permissible? — There are two limiting qualifications: And he shall put them<sup>6</sup> and the one whose neck was broken.<sup>7</sup> For what purpose are

three Scriptural verses necessary in connection with the blood?<sup>8</sup> — One is to exclude [blood] from [the rule touching] left-overs,<sup>9</sup> one to exclude it from the rule touching trespass,<sup>10</sup> and one to exclude it from the rule touching ritual uncleanness.<sup>11</sup> But no verse is necessary to exclude it from the rule touching piggul<sup>12</sup> for we have learnt: Whatever has that which renders [the offering] permissible, whether for human beings<sup>13</sup> or for service on the altar<sup>14</sup> can make one liable on its account for piggul. And blood itself is a thing which renders the offering permissible.<sup>15</sup>

**MISHNAH. CONCERNING EVERY MINISTRATION OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT MENTIONED<sup>16</sup> IN THE PRESCRIBED ORDER IF ONE SERVICE WAS DONE OUT OF ORDER BEFORE ANOTHER ONE, IT IS AS IF IT HAD NOT BEEN DONE AT ALL. IF HE SPRINKLED THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT BEFORE THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK, HE MUST START OVER AGAIN, SPRINKLING THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT AFTER THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK. IF BEFORE HE HAD FINISHED THE SPRINKLINGS WITHIN [THE HOLY OF HOLIES] THE BLOOD WAS Poured AWAY, HE MUST BRING OTHER BLOOD, STARTING OVER AGAIN AND SPRINKLING AGAIN WITHIN [THE HOLY OF HOLIES]. LIKEWISE, IN MATTERS OF THE SANCTUARY AND THE GOLDEN ALTAR, SINCE THEY ARE EACH A SEPARATE ACT OF ATONEMENT.<sup>17</sup> R. ELEAZAR AND R. SIMEON SAY: WHEREVER HE STOPPED, THERE HE MUST BEGIN AGAIN.<sup>18</sup>**

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis taught: Concerning every ministration of the Day of Atonement mentioned in the prescribed order, if one service was done [out of order] before another one, it is as if one had not done it at all. R. Judah said: When does this apply? Only with regard to service performed in white garments, within [the Holy of Holies], but any service performed in white garments without, if in connection with them he performed one out of order before the other one, then what he has done is done [valid]. R. Nehemiah said: These things apply only to service performed in white garments, whether performed within [the Holy of Holies] or without, but in case of services performed in golden garments outside, what has been done, is done. Said R. Johanan: And both expounded it on the basis of one Scriptural passage: And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you . . . once in the year.<sup>19</sup>

---

(1) I.e., the garments with which the high priest performed the service of the Day of Atonement, v. Lev. XVI, 23.

(2) Lit., 'that come as one', i.e., in both there is a special verse stating that the same law applies.

(3) In both cases the Biblical law stipulates that they must not be used; Lev. XVI, 23 and VI, 3 (v.infra). The Torah should have stated the law in one case, for the other to be inferred in the usual manner. The identical statement in both cases — thus ruling out the usual analogy — indicates that both deal with unusual cases, from which no deduction would be legitimate.

(4) Lev. XVI, 23.

(5) Deut. XXI, 1f. 'There' (in the valley) indicates that it shall be buried there.

(6) Lev. VI, 3.

(7) Deut. XXI, 6. The definite article (ha-'arufah) is interpreted as implying limitation. The limitation excludes other things from the operation of this law.

(8) On 59b three Amoraim had inferred that the law of trespass does not apply to blood from three special, otherwise superfluous phrases. The Gemara now suggests that since three such special phrases appear, with but one of them necessary according to each Amora, they must each serve a limiting purpose.

(9) Portions of sacrifices left over beyond the legal time must be burnt. But blood of such left-overs is not included in the principle of left-overs, and, therefore, if one ate such blood, the penalty incurred derives only from the fact that he ate blood, not any additional penalty because he has eaten of left-overs.

(10) The law of trespass does not apply to blood.

(11) If someone ate of holy sacrifices in a state of levitical impurity, the penalty, if unwittingly, is a sin-offering, as it is for eating blood. The law does not apply to the blood of sacrifices, which if eaten in a state of levitical impurity involves only one sin-offering, viz., for eating blood.

(12) Piggul i.e., vile (ness) is the term used for a sacrifice that is rejected because of an improper intention in the mind of

the officiating priest at the time of the sacrificing. Such improper intention includes his intention to dispose of the same beyond its legal space or time. (Lev. VII, 18 and *ibid.* XIX, 7.)

(13) The priests or owners by whom portions of the offering are consumed.

(14) On which the prescribed sacrificial portions are burnt.

(15) Zeb. 43a. The sprinkling of the blood makes parts of sacrifices permissible to the owner or priests; just as it makes certain portions of the animal fit to be offered up on the altar.

(16) In our Mishnah.

(17) Therefore every act of atonement completed, even if out of order is valid, without any repetition necessary.

(18) Even if the individual act of atonement has not been completed. These Rabbis hold that one may continue, or start again, even in the midst of a service, even though this service had been started out of order.

(19) Lev. XVI, 34.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 60b

R. Judah holds: [This means] the place on which once a year atonement is obtained: whereas R. Nehemiah holds that it refers to the objects through which once a year atonement is obtained.<sup>1</sup> But according to R. Judah, is then 'place' written here?<sup>2</sup> — Rather is this the reason for R. Judah's view: It is written 'This', and it is written 'Once', one excludes [services performed in] white garments, the other [those performed in] golden garments.<sup>3</sup> And R. Nehemiah?<sup>4</sup> — One excludes the golden garments, the other the remaining blood,<sup>5</sup> which [if done out of order] do not impair [the service]. And R. Judah? — If [an act performed in white garments out of order] impairs the service,<sup>6</sup> it impairs it here too, and if it does not impair [the service] it does not impair it here either;<sup>7</sup> as it was taught:<sup>8</sup> And when he hath made an end of atoning for the holy place,<sup>9</sup> i.e., if he has obtained atonement he has completed it, if not, not. This is the opinion of R. Akiba. R. Judah said to him: Why should we not interpret thus: If he has completed it, he has obtained atonement, if not, not, to say, that if one of the sprinklings is missing, he has done nothing? And we inquired: What is the difference between them and R. Johanan and R. Joshua b. Levi, each gave an answer: One said: They differ only as to the interpretation of the text, while the other said: The remaining blood<sup>10</sup> is what they differ in. But did R. Johanan hold thus?<sup>11</sup> Surely R. Johanan said: R. Nehemiah taught in accordance with the view that the remaining blood [offered not as prescribed] impairs [the service].<sup>12</sup> This is a refutation.

R. Hanina said: If he took the handfuls of the incense before the slaying of the bullock, he has done nothing. According to whom is this? [Presumably] not according to the view of R. Judah. Surely he said that the word 'statute' was written only in connection with ministrations performed in white garments within [the Holy of Holies]! — [No], you may say that it is even in agreement with R. Judah's view, inasmuch as what is necessary for a service performed within is considered as a service within.

We learned: IF BEFORE HE HAD FINISHED THE SPRINKLINGS WITHIN [THE HOLY OF HOLIES] THE BLOOD WAS Poured AWAY, HE MUST BRING OTHER BLOOD, STARTING OVER AGAIN AND SPRINKLING WITHIN AGAIN. Now, if this view were right [it] should read: 'He should start again with the taking of the handfuls'?'<sup>13</sup> —

---

(1) The word 'statute' denotes that the order for this day is statutory, hence any disregard would render a service out of order invalid. R. Judah holds that this 'statute'- limitation has reference to the place whence once a year atonement is obtained, i.e., the Holy of Holies, whereas R. Nehemiah assumes it refers to the objects, by means of which, or in which, once a year atonement is obtained, i.e., both place and garments. Hence according to R. Judah the order is indispensable within the Holy of Holies, but not in the rest of the Sanctuary in which atonement is obtained frequently, and not but once in the course of the year. According to R. Nehemiah both place and garments, in which atonement must be obtained, have indispensable order of regulations.

(2) That the term 'statute' should refer to it?

(3) 'This' and 'Once' being limitations.

(4) How does he explain these two limitations?

(5) Even if the pouring out had been delayed beyond the order, services performed meantime remain valid. The fact that this is done in white garments has no effect on the enforcement of the order in which it is to be done.

(6) I.e., those parts of the service that were to follow it, but which were performed before it.

(7) And there is no reason to exclude the remainder of the blood.

(8) [That according to R. Judah the omission of the rite in connection with the remainder of the blood impairs the service, and consequently the term 'statute' should apply to it equally with the other acts performed in white garments.]

(9) Lev. XVI, 20.

(10) R. Akiba holds: the omission of the rite connected with it does not impair the atonement, as the main sprinklings had been made and the atonement is complete, even if the remaining blood has not been poured away; whereas R. Judah holds: If all is completed, then he has obtained atonement, if not (and failure to pour away the remaining blood would be included in this indispensable programme) not.

(11) That according to R. Nehemiah the remaining blood presents no handicap. Since above R. Johanan said that both used one Scriptural passage as their text and R. Nehemiah was consequently held to infer that the disposal of the remaining blood according to order was not indispensable.

(12) V. Zeb. 11a.

(13) Since R. Hanina holds that taking the handfuls of the incense before the slaughtering of the bullock is invalid, he would have to take afresh a new handful before slaughtering the second bullock.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 61a**

He does not treat of the incense.<sup>1</sup>

'Ulla said: If he slew the he-goat before sprinkling the blood of the bullock, he has done nothing. We learned: IF HE SPRINKLED THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT BEFORE THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK, HE MUST START OVER AGAIN, SPRINKLING THE BLOOD OF THE HE-GOAT AFTER THE BLOOD OF THE BULLOCK. Now, if this view were right, [it] should read: 'He shall start over again' and slaughter?<sup>2</sup> — 'Ulla explained this to refer to the sprinklings in the Sanctuary;<sup>3</sup> and thus also R. Afes explained it to refer to the sprinklings in the Sanctuary. LIKEWISE IN MATTERS OF THE SANCTUARY AND THE GOLDEN ALTAR: Our Rabbis taught: And he shall make atonement for the most holy place,<sup>4</sup> i.e., the Holy of Holies [for] The tent of meeting, i.e., the Sanctuary;<sup>5</sup> [for] the altar<sup>6</sup> in the literal sense. 'He shall make atonement' — this [refers to] the courts; 'the priests' in the literal sense; 'the people', i.e., Israel; 'He shall make atonement', this refers to the Levites. Then they are all declared alike in respect of one atonement, for all other sins they<sup>7</sup> obtain atonement through the he-goat-that-is-to-be-sent-away,<sup>8</sup> this is the view of R. Judah. R. Simeon said: Just as the blood of the he-goat [the rites of which are] performed within obtains atonement for Israel in all matters of impurity touching the Sanctuary and its holy things,<sup>9</sup> thus also does the blood of the bullock obtain atonement for the priests in all matters of impurity touching the Sanctuary and its holy things; and just as the confession over the he-goat-to-be-sent-away obtains atonement for Israel with regard to all other transgressions, so does the confession over the bullock obtain atonement for the priest for all other transgressions.<sup>10</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: 'And when he hath made an end of atoning for the holy place', this refers to the Holy of Holies; 'The tent of meeting', i.e., the Sanctuary; the altar, in its literal sense — this teaches that for all of these special [independent] atonements must be obtained. Hence they said: If he sprinkled some of the sprinklings made within, and the blood was poured away, he shall bring other blood and start again from the beginning with the sprinklings within. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say: He shall start but from the place where he stopped. If he has completed the sprinkling due within and the blood was poured away, then he shall bring other blood and he shall start from the beginning with the sprinklings in the Sanctuary. If he had sprinkled some of the sprinklings due in the Sanctuary and the blood was poured away, he shall bring other blood and start again from the

beginning with the sprinklings due in the Sanctuary. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say: He need start but from the place where he had stopped. If he had completed the sprinklings due in the Sanctuary and the blood was poured away, he shall bring other blood and start again from the beginning with the sprinkling due on the altar. If he had made some of the sprinklings due on the altar and the blood was poured away, he shall bring other blood and he shall start again from the beginning with the sprinklings due on the altar. R. Eliezer and R. Simeon said: He shall not start except from the place where he had stopped. If he had completed the sprinklings due on the altar and the blood was poured all agree that this is no handicap. Said R. Johanan: Both<sup>11</sup> infer it from one scriptural passage: With the blood of the sin-offering of atonement . . . once a year.<sup>12</sup> R. Meir holds: I have spoken to thee of one sin-offering [whereby to obtain one atonement], not of two sin-offerings; R. Eleazar and R. Simeon holding, I have spoken of one sprinkling, not of two sprinklings.<sup>13</sup>

It was taught: Rabbi said: R. Jacob taught me a difference with regard to the logs.<sup>14</sup> But is there no [dispute]? Surely it has been taught: If he made some of the sprinklings within [the Sanctuary],<sup>15</sup> and the blood was poured away, he must bring another log [of oil] and start again from the beginning with the sprinklings due within. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon hold: He starts again from the place he had stopped at. If he had completed the sprinklings due within [the Sanctuary] and the log was spilt, he shall bring another log and start again from the beginning with the application on the thumbs<sup>16</sup> and toes.<sup>16</sup> If he had made some of the applications on the thumbs and toes and the log was spilt, he shall bring another log and start over again from the beginning with the applications on the thumbs and toes. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon hold: He shall start where he had stopped before. If he had completed the applications due on the thumbs and toes and the log was spilt, then all agree that the applications on the head are not a handicap.<sup>17</sup> Say rather: R. Jacob taught me also [the difference of opinion] concerning the log.<sup>18</sup>

The Master had said: The applications on the head are no handicap. Why that? Shall I say because Scripture says: And what remaineth over of the oil,<sup>19</sup> but then [when it says]: But that which is left of the meal-offering etc.,<sup>20</sup> would you say that there, too, it constitutes no handicap?<sup>21</sup> — It is different there because it is written: ‘And the rest’<sup>22</sup> and what remaineth over etc’<sup>23</sup>

---

(1) He would certainly have to take anew the handfuls.

(2) [It is assumed that the reference is to the sprinklings within the Holy of Holies, with the result that the he-goat was slaughtered before the sprinkling of the blood of the bullock.]

(3) But the slaying of the he-goat took place in its proper place, after the blood of the bullock had been sprinkled within.

(4) Lev. XVI, 33.

(5) These sprinklings atone for any impurity that occurred in the Holy of Holies or the Sanctuary, if any person should have entered there unwittingly in a state of impurity. V. Shebu. 7b.

(6) If any impurity occurred to any person at the altar, he staying there for a period co-extensive with the time of one prostration.

(7) Priest, Levites and Israelites.

(8) Besides those of impurity. In the case of other transgressions the he-goat-to-be-sent-away obtains forgiveness for both priests and commoners. But for the sin implied in any impurity in the Temple, it is the bullock which obtains forgiveness for the priests, and the he-goat which brings it to Israel.

(9) Without confession. As there was no confession with that he-goat.

(10) V. Sheb. 13b.

(11) The anonymous authority who is R. Meir on the one hand, and R. Eleazar and R. Simeon on the other.

(12) Ex. XXX, 10.

(13) The word **חטאת** rendered ‘sin-offering’ means also ‘purge from sin’, hence sprinkle.

(14) With regard to the log of oil used for the purification of the leper (v. Lev. XIV, 21) R. Jacob had taught that unlike the sprinklings of the Day of Atonement, there was no dispute concerning the question here where one must start again after a service had been performed out of order.

(15) This refers to the purification rite of a leper, v. Lev. XIV, 16.

(16) Lev. XIV, verse 17.

(17) Hence the dispute between the Rabbis did affect the log of oil as well.

(18) The report had been originally misread. As R. Hananel suggests, it read: 'R. Jacob had not made any difference with regard to the log'. In its original interpretation it implied: There was no difference of opinion among the Rabbis touching the log. But, since that report was now refuted, the meaning must have been: R. Jacob taught me that there was no difference between the log and the other case; in both the Rabbis are of divergent opinion.

(19) Lev. XIV, 29 which indicates that the oil used for the head is but a remainder and not an essential part of the rite.

(20) Ibid. II, 10.

(21) In reality it does, v. Men. 9a.

(22) Ibid. XIV, 17 with reference to the oil applied to the thumbs and toes.

(23) The oil applied on the thumbs and toes is thus designated 'remainder' and that applied on the head 'remainder of remainder' and therefore constitutes no handicap.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 61b

R. Johanan said: If the guilt-offering of a leper had been slaughtered not for its own purpose,<sup>1</sup> — therein we find a dispute between [on the one hand] R. Meir, and R. Eleazar and R. Simeon [on the other]. R. Meir, who said he must bring another one and start all over from the beginning, would here consistently hold that he must bring another [animal as] guilt-offering and slay it, whereas R. Eleazar and R. Simeon, who say: He shall start at the place he had left off before, would hold that here there is no redress.<sup>2</sup>

R. Hisda demurred to them: Surely it is written: 'It<sup>3</sup> — This is a refutation. It was taught in accord with R. Johanan: If the guilt-offering of a leper had been slaughtered not for its own purpose, or if one had not sprinkled of its blood upon the thumbs and toes, it is considered a burnt-offering in regard to the altar and requires the [prescribed]<sup>4</sup> libations and he requires another guilt-offering to render him right again.<sup>5</sup> — And R. Hisda? — He will answer you: What means, he requires? — He requires, but he has no remedy [to get it]. But would a Tanna teach: 'He requires' when he has no remedy [of getting it]? Indeed, as it was also taught: [Concerning] a baldheaded nazirite Beth Shammai taught he requires to pass through a razor [over his head],<sup>6</sup> whereas Beth Hillel said: He need not pass through a razor [over his head]. And R. Abina said: When Beth Shammai say: It is necessary, [they mean] he requires to [do so] but he has no remedy.<sup>7</sup> He thus contradicts R. Pedath, for R. Pedath said: Beth Shammai and R. Eleazar say one and the same thing. 'Beth Shammai', as we have stated above, and 'R. Eleazar' as we have learnt.<sup>8</sup> If he<sup>9</sup> have no thumb or toe, he<sup>9</sup> can never obtain purity. R. Eleazar said: One should place it on the place due, and thereby the duty is done. R. Simeon said: If he placed it on [the thumb and toe of] the right, he has done his duty.

Our Rabbis taught: And the priest shall take [receive] of the blood of the guilt-offering<sup>10</sup> — one might have assumed that is to be done with a vessel, therefore the text reads: 'And he shall put it' i.e., just as the 'putting' must be done by the priest himself, so must the 'taking' be by the priest himself. One might have assumed the same applied to the blood which is to be used for [sprinkling upon] the altar, therefore the text reads: For as the sin-offering . . . so is the guilt-offering.<sup>11</sup> Just as a vessel is necessary [for receiving the blood of a] sin-offering,<sup>12</sup> so is a vessel necessary [for the blood of] the guilt-offering. You thus find yourself stating that in the case of the guilt-offering of the leper two priests receive the blood thereof, one in his hand,<sup>13</sup> the other in a vessel.<sup>14</sup> The first who receives it in the vessel proceeds to the altar, whereas the other who receives it in his hand goes to the leper.

We have learnt there: All of them<sup>15</sup> render the garments levitically impure and are to be burnt in the place where the ashes are deposited. This is the opinion of R. Eleazar and R. Simeon. The Sages say: They do not render the garments ritually unclean and they are not to be burnt in the place where the ashes are deposited, except the last one because with that he completed the atonement. — Raba

asked the following question of R. Nahman: How many he-goats is he to send away?<sup>16</sup> — He answered: Should he perhaps send his flock away?<sup>17</sup> — He said to him:

---

(1) [I.e., he offered it in the name of some other sacrifice. In such a case the sacrifice is valid but is not accounted to the owner in fulfillment of his duty and the owner must consequently bring anew the offering which was due from him.]

(2) [R. Meir, who holds that part of a service that has not been completed is of no account, would similarly regard this incomplete guilt-offering as not offered and would require another guilt-offering; whereas R. Eleazar and R. Simeon, who do not disregard that part of the service which had been performed, would hold that he cannot bring a new guilt-offering as Scripture explicitly states 'One lamb for a guilt offering' (Lev. XIV, 12) and not two.]

(3) Lev. XIV, 12: 'And offer it as a guilt-offering', i.e., only the one which has been waved together with the oil. This unequivocal statement of the Torah R. Meir too must accept, hence the interpretation just offered is to be rejected.

(4) V. Num. XV, 1ff.

(5) I.e., the leper becomes pure, normal again, so that he may eat holy things (sacrificial meat). This shews that there is a view that he can bring a new guilt-offering, which supports R. Johanan.

(6) Num. VI, 5: All the days of his vow of the Naziriteship there shall no razor come upon his head, until the days be fulfilled, i.e., but when the days are fulfilled he shall have his hair cut.

(7) This bald-pate cannot do so. Yet it is stated 'he requires'.

(8) Naz. 46b.

(9) The leper.

(10) Lev. XIV, 14.

(11) Ibid. XIV, 13.

(12) V. Zeb. 97b.

(13) For sprinkling on the leper himself.

(14) For the sprinkling on the altar.

(15) All the bullocks and he-goats mentioned in our Mishnah, in connection with blood poured away before the completion of the individual atonement or the whole service in question, and for which substitutes are obligatory, must be burnt outside the three camps (that of the priests, the Levites, and of Israel) and they render the garments of those occupied with burning impure. Lev. XVI, 27-28.

(16) [Where, for instance, the blood of the he-goat was poured away after the sprinklings in the Holy of Holies in which case he has to bring anew two goats and cast lots afresh.]

(17) Obviously only one he-goat-to-be-sent-away is dealt with in Lev. XVI.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 62a

Does he not burn<sup>1</sup> his flock? — How compare these two? With regard to this, it is written 'it',<sup>2</sup> touching the other it is not written 'it'.

It was stated: R. Papi said in the name of Raba: He sends away the first. — R. Shimi said in the name of Raba: He sends away the last. It is quite right according to R. Shimi in the name of Raba, who said he sends the last away: that is because with him he completes the atonement, but what is the view of R. Papi in the name of Raba? — He holds with R. Jose who says: The commandment is properly fulfilled with the first one. Which view of R. Jose is referred to here? Shall I say it is R. Jose's view in the case of the baskets — for we learned: There were three baskets, each of three se'ahs, in which they took up terumah out of the [shekel] chamber<sup>3</sup> and on them were inscribed [the letters] Alef, Beth, Gimel. And it was taught: R. Jose said: Why were Alef, Beth, Gimel inscribed upon them? So that one may know which of them was taken up first [out of the shekel chamber], so as to use it first, for the commandment properly applies to the first! But perhaps it is because at the time when the first is to be used, the others are not ready for use?<sup>4</sup> Rather [do we refer to the view of] R. Jose touching the paschal sacrifice, for it has been taught:<sup>5</sup> If one set aside his passover sacrifice and it was lost [went astray] and he set aside another one in his place and then the first was found again, so that both are before him, then he may offer up whichever he wants. This is the view of the Sages. R. Jose says: The commandment attaches properly to the first, but if the second be better than [the first] then he may offer it.

## CHAPTER VI

MISHNAH. THE TWO HE-GOATS OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT ARE REQUIRED TO BE ALIKE IN APPEARANCE, IN SIZE, IN VALUE, TO HAVE BEEN BOUGHT AT THE SAME TIME. BUT EVEN IF THEY ARE NOT ALIKE THEY ARE VALID. IF ONE WAS BOUGHT ONE DAY AND THE OTHER THE FOLLOWING DAY, THEY ARE VALID. IF ONE OF THEM DIED BEFORE THE LOT WAS CAST ANOTHER ONE IS BOUGHT FOR THE SECOND ONE. BUT [IF IT DIED] AFTER THE LOT WAS CAST ANOTHER PAIR MUST BE BOUGHT AND THE LOTS CAST FOR THEM OVER AGAIN. AND IF THE ONE THAT WAS CAST FOR THE LORD DIED, HE [THE HIGH PRIEST] SHOULD SAY: LET THIS ON WHICH THE LOT FOR THE LORD HAS FALLEN STAND IN ITS STEAD. AND IF THE ONE THAT WAS CAST FOR AZAZEL DIED HE SHOULD SAY: 'LET THIS ON WHICH THE LOT FOR AZAZEL HAS FALLEN STAND IN ITS STEAD. THE OTHER ONE IS LEFT TO PASTURE UNTIL IT BECOMES BLEMISHED WHEN IT IS TO BE SOLD AND ITS VALUE GOES TO THE TEMPLE FUND. FOR THE SIN-OFFERING OF THE CONGREGATION MUST NOT BE LEFT TO DIE.<sup>6</sup> R. JUDAH SAYS: IT IS LEFT TO DIE. FURTHERMORE SAID R. JUDAH: IF THE BLOOD WAS Poured AWAY, THE GOAT-TO-BE-SENT-AWAY WAS LEFT TO DIE. IF THE GOAT-TO-BE-SENT-AWAY DIED THE BLOOD IS Poured AWAY.

## GEMARA.

---

(1) And yet it states that 'all of them are burnt on the place where the ashes are deposited'.

(2) Lev. XVI, 10, with reference to the he-goat-to-be-sent-away. 'It' implies only 'one'.

(3) Into which the shekels were thrown in the month of Adar, with which the priests filled the three baskets for the communal offerings. V. Shek. III, 2.

(4) When one basketful is taken up first one would obviously use that first, but the goat of the first pair could not be sent away before all the sprinklings of blood had been made, when the second is as fitting to be sent away as the first.

(5) Infra 64a.

(6) V. Tem. IV, 3.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 62b

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 62b

Our Rabbis taught: And he shall take. . . two he-goats,<sup>1</sup> now the minimum of he-goats is two; why then is 'two' mentioned? To indicate that the two be alike. Whence do we know that even if the two are not alike they are valid? Therefore the text reads: 'He-goat', 'he-goat',<sup>2</sup> which is inclusive [widens the scope]. Now the reason, then, is only that the Divine Law expressly includes it, but had the Divine Law not done so, one would have assumed that they are invalid. Whence do we derive this indispensability? — You might have thought that we say: 'Two' is written three times.<sup>3</sup> But now that the Divine Law has twice written 'he-goat' what is the purpose of 'two' written three times? — One applies to appearance, the other to size, the third to value. It has been similarly taught in connection with the lambs of the leper: And he shall take two lambs.<sup>4</sup> Now the minimum of lambs is two, then why does the text say: 'Two'? To indicate that the two be alike. Whence do we know that even if the two be not alike, they are valid? Therefore the text reads: 'Lamb', 'lamb',<sup>5</sup> which is inclusive [widens the scope]. Now the reason is only that the Divine Law expressly includes it, but had the Divine Law not done so, one would have assumed that they are invalid, whence do we assume this indispensability? — You might have thought we say: It is written: [This] shall be [the law].<sup>6</sup> But now that the Divine Law has said: 'Lamb', 'lamb', what purpose serves 'shall be'? — That refers to the rest of the status of the leper.<sup>7</sup>

It was similarly taught in connection with the [birds of] the leper: Birds;<sup>8</sup> now the minimum of birds is two. Why then is 'two' mentioned? To indicate that the two be alike. Whence do we know that even if they be not alike, they are valid? Therefore the text reads: 'Birds', 'birds',<sup>9</sup> which is inclusive. Now the reason then is that the Divine Law expressly includes it, but had the Divine Law not included it, one would have assumed that they are invalid. Whence do we derive this indispensability? — You might have thought that we say that it is written 'shall be'. But now that the Divine Law through 'birds', ['birds'] includes it, what purpose serves 'shall be'? — Because of the rest of the status of the leper.

If so, in the case of the daily burnt-offerings let us make a similar deduction: 'Lambs', 'lambs',<sup>10</sup> since the minimum of lambs is two, why does the text read: 'Two'? To indicate that they shall be alike. And whence do we know that even if they are not alike they are valid? Therefore the text reads: 'Lamb', 'lamb',<sup>11</sup> which is inclusive.<sup>12</sup> But as far as proper performance of the precept is concerned is it indeed required<sup>13</sup> [that the lambs shall be alike]? — Here we need it for what has been taught: Two for the day<sup>10</sup> i.e., against the day.<sup>14</sup> You say: Against the day, but perhaps it really means, the daily duty? When it says: The one lamb shalt thou offer in the morning, and the other lamb shalt thou offer at even,<sup>11</sup> behold the daily duty is already stated, hence how do I apply the words: 'Two for the day'? I.e., against the day. How is that? The continual morning offering was being slain on the north-western corner, on the second ring,<sup>15</sup> whereas that of the even was slain on the north-eastern corner on the second ring.<sup>15</sup> But the additional sacrifices of the Sabbath certainly must be alike.<sup>16</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: If he [the high priest] slew two he-goats of the Day of Atonement outside [the Temple court] before the lots were cast, then he is guilty in respect of both; if, however, after the lot was cast, then he is guilty<sup>17</sup> in respect of the one cast 'for the Lord', but free in respect of the one cast 'for Azazel'.<sup>18</sup> If before he has cast the lots, he is guilty in respect of both of them. But what [sacrifice] are they fit for?<sup>19</sup> — Said R. Hisda: Since [each] is fit to be offered up as the he-goat [the rites of which are] performed without.<sup>20</sup> But why is it impossible to offer it up as the he-goat [of which rites are] performed within [the Holy of Holies]? presumably because it still lacks the casting of the lot? But then it ought to be unfit to be used as the he-goat [of which rites are performed] without, for the reason that it still lacks the other ministrations of the Day?<sup>21</sup> — R. Hisda holds: One may not call the absence of any functions due on the same day a lack of time.<sup>22</sup>

Said Rabina: Now that R. Hisda said that the absence of the casting of the lot has the same significance as the absence of a [direct] action,<sup>23</sup> then in view of what Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel: 'Peace-offerings which have been slain before the doors of the Temple have been opened are invalid, as it is said: And he shall slay it at the gate of the tent of meeting,<sup>24</sup> i.e., at the time when it is open, but not when it is closed';

- 
- (1) Lev. XVI, 5.
  - (2) Ibid. 9, 10.
  - (3) Lev. XVI, 5, 7, 8 and thus indicates indispensability.
  - (4) Ibid. XIV, 10.
  - (5) Ibid. 12, 13.
  - (6) Ibid. 2. 'Shall be' implies precise instructions from which there may be no deviation.
  - (7) I.e., to the other regulations relating to the purification of the leper.
  - (8) Lev. XIV, 4.
  - (9) Ibid. 5, 6.
  - (10) Num, XXVIII, 3.
  - (11) Ibid. 4.
  - (12) It is inclusive, i.e., as long as it is a lamb, even if not exactly like the other, it is included in the terms of the commandment.
  - (13) This, however, is nowhere stated.
  - (14) I.e., the morning sacrifice is to be offered up against (opposite) the sun-rise, viz., on the western side of the altar, and the evening sacrifice on the opposite, namely, the eastern side (R. Han.).
  - (15) To the north of the altar were rings, twenty four, six rows of four each, at which they slaughtered the animal offerings. (V. Mid. III, 5.). On these rings the animals were securely tied before slaying. When the morning sacrifice was slain on the western side the light of the sun poured freely in, just as in the eve, when the sacrifice was slain on the eastern side, the rays of the sinking sun were unimpeded. Always in the direction opposite to the light of the day. Tosaf. suggests that the second ring rather than the first was used to prevent the animal from polluting the altar with excrements.
  - (16) [Since in connection with this only 'two lambs' is stated (V. Num. XXVIII, 9) but not the inclusive 'one lamb'. V, Rashi and R. Han.]
  - (17) On the score of Lev. XVI, 3ff:
  - (18) The he-goat destined for Azazel would in any case be killed outside the Sanctuary hence nothing illegitimate took place, no change of place.
  - (19) That he should be liable for slaughtering them outside the Temple court.
  - (20) I.e., in the Sanctuary proper, without the Holy of Holies. The additional sacrifice for the Day of Atonement, a he-goat, is offered up, its blood sprinkled without (Num. XXIX, 11).
  - (21) i.e., the sprinkling of the blood of the bullock and he-goat and the taking and offering of the handfuls of incense, all of which must take place before the additional sacrifice is offered up.
  - (22) The absence of the ministrations of the day mentioned in n. 3 does not affect the validity of the he-goat offered as an additional offering, as these do not constitute a defect in the he-goat itself, but are absent because the time for them had not yet arrived. Whatsoever is bound to come within the day, may not be considered wanting on that day. [This distinguishes it from the casting of lots, the absence of which constitutes a lack in the very he-goat which consequently renders it unfit for use within].
  - (23) In the offering itself, rendering it unfit for Temple use.
  - (24) Lev. III, 2.

### **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 63a**

if someone had slain them outside before the doors of the Temple had been open, he would be free, because the lack of opening is like the lack of a [direct] action.<sup>1</sup> But does R. Hisda adopt the principle of 'since'?<sup>2</sup> Surely R. Hisda said: If someone had slaughtered the Passover sacrifice outside on any of the other<sup>3</sup> days of the year, then, if he did it in its own name, he is free, but if he did it not

in its own name, he is culpable.<sup>4</sup> The reason [that he is culpable] lies in his having slaughtered it not in its own name. But if he had slaughtered it without any indication it is [as if — slaughtered] in its name, and he would be free? Why that? Let us say: Since it would be fit for a sacrifice not in its own name, within the Temple<sup>5</sup> [he should be liable]? Now, how compare? There a removal is necessary,<sup>6</sup> whereas this needs no such removal. Rabbah b. Shimi taught these [two statements of R. Hisda] as [emanating] from Rabbah. He then raises a difficulty from [the one view of] Rabbah against [the other given by] Rabbah; but answers [the difficulty] as we have answered. When R. Dimi [came from Palestine] he said in the name of R. Jeremiah, who said it in the name of R. Johanan: If one slaughtered a Paschal sacrifice outside on any of the other days of the year, whether in its name or not in its name, he is exempt. Said R. Dimi: I have reported this statement in the presence of R. Jeremiah [and queried]: It is all correct [in the case where it was slaughtered] in its name, since it is not fit [for the Temple], but [where it was] not in its name [why should it be exempt]? Surely it would be fit as a sacrifice not in its own name within the Temple? And he said this [in reply]: The removal [of the name of a sacrifice] outside [the Temple] is not deemed [an effective] removal.<sup>7</sup> — When Rabin came [from Palestine], [he said that] R. Jeremiah said in the name of R. Johanan: If one had slain a Passover sacrifice outside on any of the other days of the year, whether in its own name or not in its own name, he is culpable. Even ‘in its own name’? But have we not learnt: A sacrifice whose time has not yet come [may be such] either because of itself or because of its owner. Which is a sacrifice whose time has not yet come because of its owner? If the owner, either man or woman, was afflicted with gonorrhoea, or was a woman after child-birth or a leper and had offered up their sin-offering or their guilt-offering outside [before the appointed time], they are free.<sup>8</sup> But if they offered up their whole-offerings or their peace-offerings outside, they are culpable.<sup>9</sup> And R. Hilkiyah b. Tobi said: They did not teach thus only if they were offered up in their own name, but if they were not offered up in their own name, they were not culpable.<sup>10</sup> Now at any rate, then, when offered up in their own name, the owners are culpable. But why that? Let us say, Since they are fit to be offered up in their own name within [they should be culpable]?- How compare? There a removal is necessary, but here Passover sacrifice during the rest of the days of the year is a peace-offering.<sup>11</sup>

R. Ashi taught:<sup>12</sup> the owner is culpable, as we had stated above. R. Jeremiah of Difti taught he is not culpable, because he is of the opinion that the Passover sacrifice during the rest of the days of the year requires a removal,<sup>13</sup> and the removal outside [the Temple] is not [effective]. Therein he disputes with R. Hilkiyah b. Tobi.<sup>14</sup>

The Master said: ‘When the lot has been cast, he is culpable in respect of the one [he-goat] cast ‘for the Lord’, and free with respect to the one cast ‘for Azazel’. Our Rabbis taught: What man soever there be of the house of Israel that killeth an ox or lamb, or goat, in the camp, or that killeth it without the camp, and hath not brought it unto the entrance of the tent of meeting to present it as an offering unto the Lord.<sup>15</sup>

(1) So that the offerings were not fit for Temple use, and thus involve no guilt when offered outside.

(2) הוֹאִיל either derived from יֵעָל — ע and ס interchange frequently — thus: it helps — and followed by — ‘because’ since; or הֵאָּן + אִילוֹן ‘look now, if’, i.e., once this is so, that also may be granted; or from the Biblical הֵאָּן ‘accepted, agreed that this is so, that also ought to be accepted’, implying that because something is permitted in one case, the permission should be extended to all analogous cases.

(3) Besides the eve of Passover, the fourteenth of Nisan, which is the proper date for this sacrifice.

(4) Because in this case it is a peace-offering, which should have been slain within the Temple.

(5) It could be used within as a peace-offering.

(6) [It could not be used within as a peace-offering unless it had been expressly removed at the time of slaughtering from its original purpose as Passover sacrifice, and consequently as long as no such removal had been made it cannot be said to be fit for use within the Temple.] The he-goat offered within as well as the one without are sin-offerings in either situation.

(7) [Although a paschal lamb on any other days in the year can be removed from its original purpose and offered as a

peace-offering, such a removal is effective only when it is offered within the Temple, but where it is offered outside, the paschal lamb retains its original name and purpose and consequently involves no guilt for having been slaughtered outside.]

(8) V. Lev. XV, 14, 29; XII, 6, XIV, 10.

(9) In the case of sin-offerings or guilt-offerings, which were offered up outside before they were due, no culpability is involved, because they are not acceptable within before their time has come, neither as obligatory nor as freewill-offerings. But burnt-offerings or/and peace-offerings, which are accepted even when not obligatory, are fit to be offered up within even before the appointed time, hence they involve culpability when offered up without. V. Zeb. 112b.

(10) This exemption applies only when the guilt-offering was offered up in its own name outside, in which case being before its appointed time it would be unfit for the Temple. But if it was offered up for another purpose than that originally designated, e.g., for a burnt — or peace-offering, where it would be acceptable within at any time, there is culpability when offered up without.

(11) Without the need of an express removal from its original purpose.

(12) With reference to the statement reported by Rabin.

(13) Before it can be offered as a peace-offering.

(14) Who holds that a removal outside the Temple is an effective removal.

(15) Lev. XVII, 3, 4.

### **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 63b**

From [the word] ‘offering’ I might have assumed that even offerings for the temple repair [are included], which are also called ‘offerings’, in accord with the Scriptural words: And we have brought the Lord's offering,<sup>1</sup> therefore the text reads: ‘And hath not brought it unto the entrance of the tent of meeting’, i.e., whatsoever is fit to be brought to the tent of meeting, if offered up outside, involves culpability; but whatsoever is fit to be brought to the entrance of the tent of meeting, if offered up outside, does not involve culpability. Thus I would exclude only those which are not fit to be offered up at the entrance of the tent of meeting, but I would not exclude [the cow for the sin-offering<sup>2</sup> and] the he-goat-to-be-sent-away, which are fit to be brought to the entrance of the tent of meeting, therefore the text reads: ‘Unto the Lord’ i.e., only those assigned to the Lord, to the exclusion of such as are not assigned to the Lord.

But do the words ‘Unto the Lord’ imply exclusion,? I shall raise a contradiction: It may be accepted for an offering made by fire unto the Lord,<sup>3</sup> i.e., the fire-offerings.<sup>4</sup> Whence do we know that one may not dedicate it before its time has come?<sup>5</sup> Therefore the text reads: ‘As an offering’. ‘Unto the Lord’, includes the he-goat-to-be-sent-away!<sup>6</sup> Said Raba: There [the meaning is determined] by the context, and here too [its meaning is determined] by the context: There ‘Unto the entrance implies inclusion, therefore ‘Unto the Lord’ implies exclusion; here ‘An offering made by fire’ implies exclusion, hence ‘Unto the Lord’ has inclusive<sup>7</sup> meaning. Now the only reason then is that the Divine Law included it, but if it had not done so I would have assumed that the he-goat-to-be-sent-away could be dedicated before its time.<sup>8</sup> But<sup>9</sup> the lot does not determine except such [an animal] as is fit ‘for the Lord’?<sup>10</sup> — Said R. Joseph: This is in accord with Hanan the Egyptian, for it was taught:<sup>11</sup> Hanan the Egyptian says: Even if the blood is in the cup, may he bring its mate and pair them.<sup>12</sup> But admitted that Hanan does not accept the opinion concerning ‘rejection’<sup>13</sup> you surely did not hear that Hanan does not accept the opinion as to the necessity of casting the lots? Perhaps he [the high priest] would have to bring [two] and cast lots [afresh]?<sup>14</sup> — Rather, said R. Joseph, this [Baraitha]<sup>15</sup> is in accord with R. Simeon, for it was taught: If one of them died, he brings another one without casting lots, this is the view of R. Simeon! Rabina said: The reference [in the Baraitha] is to a case in which one of them became blemished and was redeemed with another one.<sup>16</sup> But whence will you say that a blemish renders it [the scapegoat] invalid? As it was taught: Nor make an offering by fire of them,<sup>17</sup> this refers to the pieces of fat. From here I could infer only as to all the pieces. Whence do we know that it applies also to parts thereof? Therefore the text reads: ‘Of them’. ‘The altar’<sup>17</sup> i.e., the sprinkling of the blood. Unto the Lord,<sup>17</sup> that includes the

he-goat-to-be-sent-away.

Now it was necessary [for the Scripture] to write [disqualifying a scapegoat], the blemished animal and one whose time has not yet come. For if the Divine Law had written only about the animal whose time has not yet come, I would have assumed there [it is disqualified] applies because its time has not yet come, but in the case of one blemished whose time had come, I might have assumed that [the disqualification does] not [apply]. And if the Divine Law had written about the blemished animal alone, I might have assumed the reason [for its being disqualified] there lies in repulsiveness, but with the animal whose time has not yet come, and where there is no repulsive feature, one might have assumed [the law] does [not] apply, hence it was necessary [to write about both].

---

(1) Num. XXXI, 50.

(2) The red heifer. Tosaf. supports Rashi's elimination of this reference to the red heifer, because the latter was not brought to the entrance of the tent of meeting, hence is logically excluded from the present discussion.

(3) Lev. XXII, 27.

(4) Only from the eighth day are they acceptable as offerings.

(5) I.e., that an offering cannot be dedicated before the eighth day.

(6) This shows that 'Unto the Lord' implies inclusion.

(7) The he-goat-to-be-sent-away is not 'for the Lord', but fit to be brought unto the entrance of the tent of meeting. So 'Unto the Lord' excludes whatsoever is not assigned for the Lord. In the other passage 'An offering made by fire' excludes, of course, the goat, which is to be hurled from the precipice, whereas 'Unto the Lord' is complimentarily inclusive, hence the goat must not be offered up before it is eight days.

(8) I.e., before it is eight days old.

(9) V. Tem.6b.

(10) And that implies a minimum age, hence invalidation before its time.

(11) Zeb. 34b.

(12) Even if the blood of the he-goat to be sprinkled up within is in the cup, when the he goat-to-be-sent-away dies, no new casting of the lots is necessary according to Hanan, but, as is assumed at present, one may simply bring another he-goat from outside and pair it and appoint it for Azazel even without lots. Thus we see that Hanan does not hold the principle that the lot does not determine etc.; and consequently the he-goat-to-be-sent-away need not necessarily have reached its proper time hence a scriptural verse is necessary to teach that it must do so.

(13) He does not accept the view of R. Judah in our Mishnah that the scapegoat is to be rejected as unfit on account of the mishap to the other.

(14) Leaving the one, upon whom the lot 'for the Lord' now falls, to pasture until it acquires a blemish, whilst obtaining atonement through the blood of the first. At any rate, however, casting the lots is necessary, hence one whose time had not yet come would be invalidated, because the lot determines only what is 'fit for the Lord', i.e. whose time has come.

(15) Which requires a special text to teach that the he-goat-to-be-sent-away must be of minimum age.

(16) Where the he-goat-to-be-sent-away suddenly became blemished, its successor obtained by means of redemption needs no lot to determine its purpose, and, since no list was required, there is no implied obligation as to proper minimum age.

(17) With reference to blemished animals. Lev. XXII, 22.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 64a**

Raba said: [It<sup>1</sup> was necessary] for the case that he<sup>2</sup> had a sick person in the house, for whom he killed the mother-animal on the Day of Atonement.<sup>3</sup> But is it forbidden in such a case?<sup>4</sup> Does not the Divine Law say: Ye shall not kill it<sup>5</sup> and this is not killing?<sup>6</sup> — In the West [Palestine] they said: Hurling it down from the [mountain] peak, that is its killing.

IF THAT 'FOR THE LORD' DIED, etc.: Rab said: The second of the first pair is to be offered up, the second of the second pair should be left to pasture.<sup>7</sup> - R. Johanan said: The second of the first

pair should be left to pasture, the second pair should be offered up. In what principle do they differ? — Rab holds: Living animals<sup>8</sup> are not rejected [forever], whereas R. Johanan holds: Living animals are rejected [forever]. What is the reason for Rab's view? He infers it from those whose time has not yet come: An animal whose time has not yet come, although it is as yet unfit, when it later becomes fit again, will be quite in order. Thus also here. How can this be compared? There<sup>9</sup> it was never fit at all. Here it was once fit and then rejected? — Rather is this the reason of Rab's view: He infers it from an animal afflicted with a passing blemish: An animal afflicted with a passing blemish surely although now unfit, yet when it is fit again, is quite in order. Thus also here. But whence do we know if touching the former? Because it is written: Because their corruption is in them, there is a blemish in them<sup>10</sup> i.e., only as long as a blemish is in them are they not acceptable, but when their blemish passes they are acceptable. And R. Johanan? — The Divine Law stated 'in them'<sup>10</sup> i.e., only these are acceptable after the blemish has passed, but all other animals rejected [through temporary unfitness] once they have been rejected, stay rejected. And Rab? — The words 'in them' signify that only as long as they are in their natural form are they not acceptable, but as soon as they are mixed up with others, they are acceptable; as we have learnt,<sup>11</sup> if the members of unblemished [whole-offerings] were mixed up with the members of blemished [animals], R. Eliezer says: If the head of one of them had been offered,<sup>12</sup> the heads of all may be offered; if the legs of one of them had been offered, the legs of all may be offered. The Sages, however, say: Even if all the members with exception of one have been offered, this one must go forth to the place of burning. And the other one [R. Johanan]? He infers that from [the fact that instead of] 'bam' [is written] 'bahem'.<sup>13</sup> — And the other one [Rab]? — He does not expound from 'bahem' instead of 'bam'. But according to Rab, granted that animals cannot be rejected for ever, if he wishes let him offer this, and if he wishes let him offer the other?<sup>14</sup> — Raba said: Rab holds to the view of R. Jose, who said: The command attaches properly to the first. — Which [view of] R. Jose are you referring to? Shall I say, You say [the view of] R. Jose concerning the baskets, for we have been taught:<sup>15</sup> There were three baskets each of three se'ahs,<sup>16</sup> in which they took up terumah out of the shekel-chamber, and on each of them was inscribed: Alef, Beth, Gimel. And we have been taught: R. Jose said: Why is Alef, Beth, Gimel inscribed upon them? So that one may know out of which of them the terumah was taken up [out of the shekel-chamber] first, to use it first, for the command properly applies to the first! — But perhaps it is different there because at the time when the first is to be used, the others are not ready for use yet?<sup>17</sup> - Rather is it R. Jose['s view] concerning the Passover sacrifice, for it was taught: If someone has separated his Passover sacrifice and it is lost, and he thereupon puts aside another one in its place, and afterwards the first one is found again, so that both are standing [ready to be used], then he can offer up whichever he prefers; this is the view of the Sages. R. Jose holds the commandment attaches properly to the first,<sup>18</sup>

---

(1) The verse disqualifying a scapegoat that has not reached its proper time.

(2) Who was the purveyor to the community of these animals.

(3) In case of a dangerously ill person the slaying of an animal for food or remedial purpose is permitted. Raba suggests the case that the purveyor of the he-goat had, on the Day of Atonement, slain its mother for the patient. But in view of the prohibition (Lev. XXII, 28:) Whether it be cow or ewe, ye shall not kill it and its young both in one day, the he-goat would thus become an animal that was wanting in time all the Day of Atonement, after the lot had been cast.

(4) To use the young as scapegoat.

(5) Lev. XXII, 28.

(6) The prohibition is now interpreted to refer to the technical ritual slaying, whereas the scapegoat is being hurled down the precipice.

(7) Until it acquires a blemish.

(8) If they are temporarily invalidated, they can still be used by means of the substitution of another animal as pair.

(9) Because it was wanting in time and thus was never rejected.

(10) Lev. XXII, 25.

(11) Zeb. 77b.

(12) Before the confusion of the other members with the members of the whole-offerings had been noticed.

(13) From the fact that the Divine Law used the longer word 'bahem' instead of the shorter 'bam', which has the identical meaning, this inference is attempted. The rival view ignores this variation as not intended for additional inferences.

(14) Whereas the law here is stated to require only the first.

(15) V. supra 59b and notes.

(16) I.e., 144 eggs.

(17) But here although the lots had been cast, the goat could not be slain until after the blood of the bullock had been sprinkled. In the interim the he-goat with it had died, two others were brought in, and when the time for slaying the goat had come, the latter was already in readiness.

(18) For notes v. supra 59b.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 64b**

but if the second one be very much better, he shall offer it up.

Raba said: Our Mishnah points to be in accord with Rab, whereas the Baraitha is in accord with R. Johanan. Our Mishnah is in accord with Rab for it reads: IF THE ONE THAT WAS CAST FOR THE LORD DIED, HE [THE HIGH PRIEST] SHOULD SAY: LET THIS ON WHICH THE LOT FOR THE LORD HAS FALLEN STAND IN ITS STEAD' [implying] that the other remains as it is.<sup>1</sup> The Baraitha is in accord with R. Johanan, for it reads: As to the second.<sup>2</sup> I do not know whether [it means] the second of the first pair, or the second of the second pair. But from the words 'shall be set alive'<sup>3</sup> [I infer: only this one] but not one whose pair has died.<sup>4</sup> How does that follow? — 'It shall now be set alive', [and] not the one that has been set [alive] before [but whose pair has died].

We learned: FURTHERMORE DOES R. JUDAH SAY: IF THE BLOOD WAS Poured AWAY, THE SCAPEGOAT IS LEFT TO DIE; IF THE SCAPEGOAT DIED, THE BLOOD IS Poured AWAY. Now that is quite right according to R. Johanan, who holds living animals are rejected [permanently], — therefore the scapegoat is left to die. But according to Rab, who holds that living animals are not rejected [permanently], why should the scapegoat be left to die? — Rab will answer you: What I say, I say in accordance with the view, not of R. Judah, but of the Sages.<sup>5</sup> It is quite right according to Rab: Therein lies the difference between the Sages and R. Judah; but according to R. Johanan, wherein lies the difference?<sup>6</sup> — Raba said: That is what we have said [above]: The Mishnah points to be in accord with Rab.

We learned: FOR A COMMUNITY SIN-OFFERING IS NOT LEFT TO DIE. This [implies] that one of an individual, in such a case, would be left to die. Now that will be right according to R. Johanan,<sup>7</sup> following R. Abba in the name of Rab, for R. Abba said In the name of Rab:

---

(1) In the state of holiness, without being rejected.

(2) The second mentioned in the Mishnah, that it is left to pasture.

(3) Lev. XVI, 10. One that 'shall be set alive', not one which had been set alive again, a second time.

(4) Hence the second in the Mishnah must refer to the second of the first pair.

(5) [Who, as is to be inferred from the words of R. Judah, held that the second in the first pair is to be offered, because in their view living animals are not rejected permanently].

(6) R. Johanan holds that the Sages insist that the second of the first pair must not be offered. Wherein then does R. Judah, in his additional remark ('Furthermore') differ from the Sages.

(7) Who holds that the second of the first pair is left to pasture.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 65a**

All agree that if he had obtained atonement through [the animal that] had not been lost, [the animal that] had been lost must be left to die;<sup>1</sup> but according to Rab it would be as if someone has set aside

two sin-offerings as a guarantee [that one of them should be available if the other be lost],<sup>2</sup> and R. Oshaia said: If someone had set aside two sinofferings for the purpose of guarantee, he gains atonement through one of them and leaves the other to pasture? — Since Raba said that Rab followed the view of R. Jose,<sup>3</sup> who holds the commandment properly attached to the first, it is as if it<sup>4</sup> had from the very beginning been set aside [in substitution] for the one that was lost. We learned: R. JUDAH SAYS: IT SHALL BE LEFT TO DIE. It is quite right in the view of R. Johanan who said that the second of the first pair must be left to pasture [that is, according to the Rabbis]<sup>5</sup> and [it is this one which] according to R. Judah be left to die,<sup>6</sup> so that he obtains atonement through the second one of the second pair; but if the view of Rab who said that the second of the second pair must be left to pasture, and [it is this one which] according to R. Judah must be left to die, then according to R. Judah<sup>7</sup> through which can he obtain atonement? — Do you understand that R. Judah refers to the second of the second pair? R. Judah refers to the second of the first pair.<sup>8</sup> Others framed the [above] question [against Rab]<sup>9</sup> in the following manner: Furthermore did R. Judah say: If the blood was poured away, the scapegoat is left to die; if the scapegoat died the blood is poured away.

Now it is in order according to Rab: In the first part [of the Mishnah] they are disputing about the sin-offering of the community, and in the latter part about [the rejection of] living animals,<sup>10</sup> but according to R. Johanan: What does 'Furthermore signify?'<sup>11</sup> — This difficulty remains.<sup>12</sup>

FURTHERMORE SAID R. JUDAH: IF THE BLOOD WAS Poured AWAY, THE SCAPEGOAT IS LEFT TO DIE. It is quite right that when the blood was poured away the scapegoat must die, because the command with it had not been fulfilled, but when the scapegoat died, why should the blood be poured away; surely the commandment therewith had been fulfilled? — The School of R. Jannai said: Scripture said: [The goat] shall be set alive before the Lord, to make atonement,<sup>13</sup> i.e., how long must he stay alive? Until the time that his fellow's blood is sprinkled.

We have learnt elsewhere: If the inhabitants of a town sent their shekels<sup>14</sup> and they were stolen or lost, then, if terumah<sup>15</sup> has been taken up already, they<sup>16</sup> swear an oath before the Temple treasurers; and if not they swear an oath before the people of the town; and the people of the town must pay the shekels anew. If they were found again or the thieves restored them, then both are taken as shekels<sup>17</sup> and they do not count as prepayment for the dues of the next year. R. Judah says: They count for the next year.<sup>18</sup> What is the reason of R. Judah's view? — Raba said: R. Judah holds that obligatory offerings of one year may be brought up in the following year. Abaye raised the following objection against him:<sup>19</sup> If the bullock or the he-goat of the Day of Atonement were lost and he had set aside others in their place, also, if the goats offered up for idolatry [were lost] and others were set aside for them, then they must all be left to die, this is the opinion of R. Judah. R. Eliezer and R. Simeon hold: They shall be left to pasture until they become blemished, when they should be sold and the money realized for them should go for freewill-offerings, for the sin-offerings of the community must not be left to die.<sup>20</sup> — He [Raba] answered:

---

(1) [If one had set aside an animal as sin-offering and the animal got lost, and after setting aside another in its stead, the lost animal was found, then according to Rabbi he obtains atonement with whichever he chooses and the other is left to die. The Sages, however, hold that it is left to pasture, as the law which requires that a sin-offering, the owner of which has obtained atonement by another, is to be left to die applies only if it was found after the atonement rites had been performed, but not if found before the atonement (V. Tem. 23a). Now in connection with this R. Abba said that there is no disagreement between Rabbi and the Sages where the atonement was obtained through the one which had not been lost, i.e., through the second, all agreeing in such a case that the first one is left to die. (In accordance with the established old law that if a sin-offering had been lost and the owner obtained atonement through another, when it is found again it is left to die). The dispute concerns a case where atonement was obtained through the first, after it had been lost and found again, Rabbi holding that what is set aside in substitution for that which had been lost is subject to the same law as the lost animal itself and hence must be left to die, whereas the Sages do not share the view. Now in our

Mishnah on the view of R. Johanan, who holds that the second of the first pair is left to pasture, it rightly gives as reason 'For no community sin-offering is left to die'; for had it been of an individual it would be left to die, since the atonement is being obtained through the one which had suffered no mishap, and had never been rejected.]

(2) [According to Rab who rules that the atonement is being obtained through the second of the first pair which had been rejected, how could the Mishnah state by implication that if it had been the sin-offering of an individual it would under similar circumstances be left to die? Not only would this not be the case according to the Sages, who rule that whatever is set aside in substitution for that which had been lost is not subject to the same law as the lost animal itself (v. previous note), seeing that he has obtained atonement through the one that had been rejected; but even according to Rabbi (v. ibid) it would not have to be left to die, since the second of the second pair has never been set aside as substitution for the one that had been lost, seeing that its predecessor is still alive. It was merely set aside as a companion to the other which had to be brought in place of the one (the first goat cast for Azazel) that had died. But since living animals cannot be permanently rejected, he should in such a case be able to offer either, just as in the case where one sets aside two offerings as a guarantee for each other.]

(3) V. supra 64a.

(4) [I.e., the second of the second pair, and hence but for the fact that it was a public sacrifice it would have been left to die.]

(5) The authority of the first view reported anonymously in the Mishnah.

(6) [It is now assumed that R. Judah's rule that it must be left to die has reference to the one which, according to the Rabbis, is left to pasture, since R. Judah perforce is of the opinion that living animals are permanently rejected as has been established, supra 64b.]

(7) [He surely cannot obtain atonement by means of the first, seeing that he holds that living animals are permanently rejected.]

(8) [For in the view of Rab, R. Judah differs from the Rabbis also on the question of the fitness of the second of the first pair for sacrifice; whilst the Rabbis hold that it is offered, R. Judah holds that it is left to die.]

(9) Raised supra 64b.

(10) The Rabbis holding that they are not permanently rejected, hence atonement is obtained through the second of the first pair, whereas R. Judah (as has just been explained) holds that the second in the first pair is left to die and the second in the second pair is offered up.

(11) The Rabbis, too, agree that the second in the first pair remains rejected.

(12) Even as stated supra 64b that the Mishnah is in support of Rab.

(13) Lev. XVI, 10.

(14) Through messengers to Jerusalem to pay their Temple dues.

(15) Lit., 'heave-offering', here denoting the contribution of Shekels taken up at stated times from out of the shekel-chamber in the Temple from which public sacrifices were bought, v. Shek. III, 1ff

(16) The messengers take the oath of bailees in accord with Ex. XXII, 10.

(17) For the current year.

(18) For notes v. Shek., Sonc. ed., II, 1.

(19) Shebu. 11a.

(20) Hence we see that R. Judah does not permit the obligation of one year to be kept in order to be brought up the following year, otherwise he would not have ruled that this should be left to die, which contradicts the view just expressed.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 65b**

You speak about community sacrifices? It is different with community sacrifices, even as R. Tabi said, in the name of R. Josiah. For R. Tabi said in the name of R. Josiah: Scripture said: This is the burnt-offering of every new moon throughout the months of the year.<sup>1</sup> The Torah indicates: Renew and bring Me an offering of the new terumah.<sup>2</sup> That will be right concerning the he-goat.<sup>3</sup> But can it be said in the case of the bullock? Preventive measure attaches to the bullock because of the he-goat. And because of preventive measure shall they be left to die?<sup>4</sup> And, furthermore, the statement of R. Tabi in the name of R. Josiah characterizes the action as merely a meritorious deed, for R. Judah said in the name of Samuel: It is a meritorious deed to offer the community sacrifices, which are due in

Nisan, from the new terumah. If he had offered them from the old, he has fulfilled his duty, but has omitted a meritorious deed! — Rather, said R. Zeira: [The reason why they cannot be offered in the following year is] because the lot of one year cannot determine for the following year. But let us cast lots again? — There is the fear that people might say the lots do determine from one year for the next. That will be reasonable as far as the he-goat is concerned, but what can be said about the bullock? — The prohibition attaches to the bullock because of the he-goat. And because of a preventive measure shall they be left to die? — The Rabbis before Abaye said that to be a preventive measure on account of a sin-offering whose owner had died.<sup>5</sup> That will be right in the case of the he-goat, but what of the case of the bullock? — The restriction in the case of the bullock derives from the he-goat. And because of a preventive measure shall they be left to die? — Rather is it a restriction because of a sin-offering whose year is past.<sup>6</sup> Is that [but] a preventive measure? This is itself a sin-offering whose year is past.<sup>7</sup> This is no difficulty, in accord with the view of Rabbi. For it was taught:<sup>8</sup> A full year,<sup>9</sup> one counts three hundred and sixty-five days according to the year of the sun, this is the view of Rabbi. The Sages say: One counts twelve months from day to day.

---

(1) Num. XXVIII, 14.

(2) V. R.H., Sonc. ed., p. 25, nn. 8 — 9.

(3) Which was provided from the funds of the shekel-chamber.

(4) It would seem sufficient that they be left to pasture.

(5) If the priest should die that year.

(6) I.e., the fear that by the next Day of Atonement it may be more than a year old. All the he-goats offered up as sin-offerings are invalidated after they have reached the age of one year.

(7) Obviously this sin-offering will be past one year this time next year.

(8) R. H. 6b.

(9) Lev. XXV, 30. The reference here is to the time (one year) during which the seller of a dwelling house in a walled city may redeem the property sold by cancellation of contract.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 66a

And if the year be a prolonged year, the advantage belongs to the seller.<sup>1</sup> That is right as far as the he-goat is concerned. But what can be said in the case of the bullock? — The preventive measure attaches to the bullock because of the he-goat. And because of a preventive measure shall he be left to die? And, furthermore, a sin-offering, whose [first] year is past, is left to pasture,<sup>2</sup> for Resh Lakish<sup>3</sup> said: As to a sin-offering which has passed its year, we look upon it as if it were standing on the cemetery<sup>4</sup> and it is left to pasture? — Rather, said Raba, is the restriction due to the fear of an offence,<sup>5</sup> for it was taught:<sup>6</sup> One may neither consecrate anything, nor vow any ‘valuation’,<sup>7</sup> nor declare anything as devoted<sup>8</sup> nowadays.<sup>9</sup> And if one had consecrated or vowed a ‘valuation’, or declared anything as devoted, if an animal, it should be uprooted,<sup>10</sup> if fruits, vessels or covers, one should let them rot; if money or metal vessels, they are to be taken to the Salt [Dead] Sea.<sup>11</sup> And what does ‘uprooting’ mean? Locking the door before it, so that it die of itself. What kind of offence [is here contemplated]? If an offence in connection with the offering up, that ought then to apply to other cases of pasturing animals also?<sup>12</sup> If an offence in connection with shearing or working it, then that ought to apply to other pasturing animals too? In truth the offence contemplated is one in connection with the offering-up, but with those which are not to be offered up<sup>13</sup> one is not pre-occupied, whereas with this one, since it is to be offered up, he would be pre-occupied. Now as to the question itself whether we fear the possibility of an offence, Tannas are disputing. For it was taught in one [Baraitha]: A Paschal lamb which was not offered up on the first Passover may be offered up on the second,<sup>14</sup> and if not offered up on the second, may be offered up in the following year. And another [Baraitha] taught: It must not be offered up. Is it not then that they dispute touching [the fear of] an offence? — No, all agree we are not apprehensive as to a possible offence; but here they are disputing in the matter at issue between Rabbi and the Sages,<sup>15</sup> and there is no contradiction [between the two Baraithas]; the one is in accord with Rabbi, the other with the Rabbis

[Sages].<sup>16</sup> — But was it not taught: The same applies to the money?<sup>17</sup> Hence rather infer from here that they are disputing in regard to the fear of the offence. — That inference is accepted.

MISHNAH. HE THEN CAME TO THE SCAPEGOAT AND LAID HIS TWO HANDS UPON IT AND HE MADE CONFESSION. AND THUS WOULD HE SAY: I BESEECH THEE, O LORD, THY PEOPLE THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL HAVE FAILED, COMMITTED INIQUITY AND TRANSGRESSED BEFORE THEE. I BESEECH THEE, O LORD, ATONE<sup>18</sup> THE FAILURES, THE INIQUITIES AND THE TRANSGRESSIONS WHICH THY PEOPLE, THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL, HAVE FAILED, COMMITTED AND TRANSGRESSED BEFORE THEE, AS IT IS WRITTEN IN THE TORAH OF MOSES, THY SERVANT, TO SAY: FOR ON THIS DAY SHALL ATONEMENT BE MADE FOR YOU, TO CLEANSE YOU; FROM ALL YOUR SINS SHALL YE BE CLEAN BEFORE THE LORD. AND WHEN THE PRIESTS AND THE PEOPLE STANDING IN THE TEMPLE COURT HEARD THE FULLY-PRONOUNCED NAME COME FORTH FROM THE MOUTH OF THE HIGH PRIEST, THEY BENT THEIR KNEES, BOWED DOWN, FELL ON THEIR FACES AND CALLED OUT: BLESSED BE THE NAME OF HIS GLORIOUS KINGDOM 'FOR EVER AND EVER. THEY HANDED IT OVER TO HIM WHO WAS TO LEAD IT AWAY. ALL WERE PERMITTED TO LEAD IT AWAY,<sup>19</sup> BUT THE PRIESTS MADE IT A DEFINITE RULE NOT TO PERMIT AN ISRAELITE<sup>20</sup> TO LEAD IT AWAY. R. JOSE SAID: IT ONCE HAPPENED THAT ARSELA OF SEPPHORIS LED IT AWAY, ALTHOUGH HE WAS AN ISRAELITE. AND THEY MADE A CAUSEWAY FOR HIM BECAUSE OF THE BABYLONIANS, WHO WOULD PULL ITS HAIR, SHOUTING TO IT: 'TAKE<sup>21</sup> AND GO FORTH, TAKE AND GO FORTH'.

GEMARA. But he did not say: 'The sons of Aaron, thy holy people'; which Tanna is of this opinion? — R. Jeremiah said: This is not in accord with R. Judah, for if it were in accord with R. Judah, surely he said: They, too, obtain atonement from the scapegoat?<sup>22</sup> Abaye said: You might even say that it is in accord with R. Judah: Are the priests not included in 'Thy people Israel'? Our Rabbis taught: A man<sup>23</sup> [means] to declare a non-priest eligible;<sup>24</sup> appointed<sup>23</sup>

---

(1) According to Rabbi, the count always goes according to the number of the days of the solar year, independent as to intercalation or non-intercalation of the extra month, so that the sin-offering need not necessarily have passed its first year by the next Day of Atonement.

(2) And not to die.

(3) Pes. 97a.

(4) Which no priest is permitted to enter, i.e., the animal must not be slaughtered.

(5) Lit., 'stumbling-block'.

(6) That the fear of an offence is taken into consideration.

(7) V. Lev. XXVII, 3.

(8) Ibid. 28.

(9) After the destruction of the Temple, things consecrated, valued or devoted in favour of it, since not available for the Sanctuary to which they are properly assigned, must be destroyed.

(10) This is soon explained.

(11) [So MS.M. Cur. edd.: he should take the value of the benefit derived from them to the Salt Sea.]

(12) If the offence lies in the possibility that it may be offered up instead of being left to pasture until it acquires a blemish, the same apprehension would be justified with regard to any other animal which is ruled to be left to pasture.

(13) In other cases where animals are ruled to be left to pasture, these animals themselves will never become fit for offering, since they are left to pasture till they become blemished, when they are sold and with the proceeds another animal is bought for offering. Hence he would not be preoccupied with the thought of offering them, as in the case of the animal which is to be offered up on the next Day of Atonement and which he might thus offer up before.

(14) The second Passover for those who were far away or ritually unclean on the fourteenth of Nisan. To some such person this lamb may be sold. V. Num. IX,9.

(15) As supra 65b, whether a complete year denotes a solar year or exactly twelve months.

(16) [According to Rabbi it would perforce be past its first year on the following Passover, when it would be disqualified for a Paschal lamb, hence it cannot be offered in the coming year; whereas, according to the Sages, it might still be under a year, hence it may be retained for the coming year.]

(17) [I.e., the same dispute which is found in connection with the Paschal lamb applies also to money which had been set aside for one year's Paschal lamb, whether it may be used for the next year. Now in the case of money, surely the point at issue between Rabbi and the Sages does not apply.]

(18) Lit., 'wipe off'.

(19) Var. lec., high priests.

(20) I.e., a non-priest.

(21) Sc. our sins.

(22) V. supra 61a.

(23) V. Lev. XVI, 21.

(24) For taking away the scapegoat into the wilderness.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 66b

[means] that he must be prepared [from the previous day]; 'appointed' [means] that [it is to send away]; even on the Sabbath 'appointed', even if in a state of uncleanness.<sup>1</sup> [You say]: 'Man [means] to declare a non-priest eligible', but that is obvious? — You might have thought that since [the term] Kapparah [atonement] is written in connection therewith,<sup>2</sup> therefore he informs us [as above]. — 'Appointed', i.e., even on the Sabbath. What does this teach?<sup>3</sup> — R. Shesheth said: It is to say that if it is sick, he may make it ride on his shoulder. According to whose view is this? Not according to R. Nathan, for R. Nathan said: A living being carries itself!<sup>4</sup> -You may even say that this is in accord with R. Nathan: when it is sick it is different,<sup>5</sup> however.

Rafram said: This is to say that [the laws of] 'erub<sup>6</sup> and carrying out<sup>7</sup> apply on Sabbath, but do not apply on the Day of Atonement.<sup>8</sup> 'Appointed', i.e., even in a state of uncleanness.<sup>9</sup> What does that teach? — R. Shesheth said: It is to say that if he who is to carry it away became unclean, he may enter in impurity the Temple Court<sup>10</sup> and carry it away.

R. Eliezer was asked: What about his carrying it on his shoulder? — He said: He could carry you and me.<sup>11</sup> If he who is to take it away became sick, may he send it away through someone else? — He said: I wish to keep well, I and you!<sup>12</sup> If he pushed it down and it did not die, must he go down after it and kill it? — He said to them: So perish all Thine enemies, O Lord.<sup>13</sup> But the Sages say: If it became sick, he may load it on his shoulder; if he pushed it down and it did not die, he shall go down and kill it. They asked R. Eliezer: 'What about So-and-so<sup>14</sup> in the world to come'? — He replied, 'Have you asked me only about this one'?<sup>15</sup> 'May one save the lamb from the lion'? — He said to them: 'Have you asked me only about the lamb'?<sup>15</sup> 'May one save the shepherd from the lion'? — He said to them: 'Have you asked me only about the shepherd'?<sup>16</sup> 'May a mamzer<sup>17</sup> inherit'? — [He replied]: 'May he marry the wife of his brother who died without issue'?<sup>18</sup> 'May one whitewash his house'?<sup>19</sup> — [He replied]: 'May one whitewash his grave'? — [His evasion was due] not to his desire to divert them with words [counter-questions], but because he never said anything that he had not heard from his teacher.<sup>20</sup>

A wise woman asked R. Eliezer: Since with regard to the offence with the golden calf all were evenly associated, why was not the penalty of death the same?<sup>21</sup> — He answered her: There is no wisdom in woman except with the distaff. Thus also does Scripture say: And all the women that were wise-hearted did spin with their hands.<sup>22</sup> It is stated: Rab and Levi are disputing in the matter. One said: Whosoever sacrificed and burned incense died by the sword; whosoever embraced and kissed [the calf] died the death [at the hands of Heaven];<sup>23</sup> whosoever rejoiced in his heart died of dropsy. The other said: He who had sinned before witnesses and after receiving warning,<sup>24</sup> died by the sword; he who sinned before witnesses but without previous warning, by death; and he who

sinned without witnesses and without previous warning, died of dropsy.

Rab Judah said: The tribe of Levi did not participate in the idolatry, as it is said: Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp.<sup>25</sup> Rabina was sitting and reporting this teaching, whereupon the sons of R. Papa b. Abba objected to Rabina: Who said of his father and of his mother: 'I have not seen him, etc.'?<sup>26</sup> — 'His father', that is the father of his mother, an Israelite; 'brother', the brother of his mother, an Israelite; 'sons', that means the sons of his daughter [which she had] from an Israelite.

AND THEY MADE A CAUSEWAY FOR HIM etc. Rabbah b. Bar Hana said: These were not Babylonians but Alexandrians, and because they [the Palestinians] hated the Babylonians,<sup>27</sup> they called them [the Alexandrians] by their [the Babylonians'] name. It was taught: R. Judah said, They were not Babylonians, but Alexandrians. — R. Jose said to him: May your mind be relieved even as you have relieved my mind!<sup>28</sup>

MISHNAH. SOME OF THE NOBILITY OF JERUSALEM USED TO GO WITH HIM UP TO THE FIRST BOOTH. THERE WERE TEN BOOTHS FROM JERUSALEM TO THE ZOK<sup>29</sup>

---

(1) This is soon explained.

(2) And this term as a rule occurs only in connection with a rite performed by priests.

(3) What Sabbath desecration could the taking of the scapegoat to the wilderness involve?

(4) V. Shab. 90a. Hence no transgression would be involved in carrying it.

(5) A sick being, unable to 'carry itself', might logically be assumed to be an exception to R. Nathan's rule.

(6) v. Glos.

(7) I.e., transferring an object from public to private grounds and vice versa, both of which were prohibited on the Sabbath.

(8) Since the word 'anointed' is here interpreted as referring to the suspension of the Sabbath law, the inference is justified that no such prohibition existed on the Day of Atonement, or else it would be illogical to say that a special statement permits the suspension of these laws on the Day of Atonement which fell on a Sabbath, since they would be operative on any Day of Atonement, even if it fell on a weekday. The laws of 'carrying out' and 'erub belong together, hence strictly speaking, the Gemara need not have mentioned both; when one is applied, the other automatically applies too.

(9) How should the laws on levitical uncleanness apply to the taking of the scapegoat to the wilderness?

(10) When he receives it from the high priest.

(11) R. Eliezer made a point of not answering any question concerning which he had not received a definite tradition or interpretation from his teachers.

(12) This, too, is an evasive answer: You and I are well, hope to keep well, why trouble about such hypothetical situations?

(13) Judg. V, 31.

(14) Pelsoni. It may have been a general question concerning 'John Doe', or it may refer to Solomon's (Rashi), or to Absalom's (R. Han.) regard for the Davidic Dynasty being responsible for the substitution of the vague Pelsoni. [Some see in Pelsoni a reference to Jesus, Finkelstein L. to Philo. Bokser, B.Z. Pharisaism in Transition pp. 18ff, rightly regards these identifications as hardly supported by any facts.]

(15) All his answers are evasive.

(16) Some see in the question about the shepherd a reference to David, who as lion (King) or as shepherd had taken the lamb (Bathsheba) from her husband. Others see the lamb in Uriah, Bathsheba's husband, whom the lion (David) sent to his death.

(17) May a bastard (the issue of a union forbidden under the penalty of extinction) inherit his father?

(18) Why don't you ask the whole question: How far does he participate in the rights and duties of normal Jews?

(19) May one whitewash one's house in spite of the fact that one ought to remain conscious all the time of the destruction of the Temple, etc.

(20) [V. Suk., Sonc. ed., p. 122. Bokser, op. cit. pp. 108f sees in these questions differences of opinion on important points of law. The question about sheep concerned the ban against cattle-raising which the Rabbis wished to enforce (v.

B.M. 84b) and which R. Eliezer opposed as having no precedent in tradition. The questions relating to the mamzer involved the imposition of certain discriminations against the mamzer of which R. Eliezer did not approve, and similarly he refused to accept the prohibition of the other Rabbis of plastering one's house in sad remembrance of the destruction of the Temple, not finding any support for it in tradition].

(21) Scripture mentions three forms of penalties: Some died by the sword (Ex. XXXII, 27), others by the plague (ibid. 35), the rest by dropsy as the result of their drinking the water containing the gold dust, which Moses had offered them in expiation (ibid. 20).

(22) Ex. XXXV, 25.

(23) I.e., died by the plague.

(24) Penalty could be imposed only when the offence had been committed in the presence of two witnesses who accuse the defendant, after he had been warned as to the consequences of his offence.

(25) Ex. XXXII, 26. (cont.) and said: 'Whoso is on the Lord's side, let him come unto me'. And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him.

(26) Deut. XXXIII, 9. Here seems scriptural proof that the Levites, in punishing the guilty, ignored relationships, such as father or mother, but executed punishment on all. Thus their relatives, other Levites, must have been guilty.

(27) This hatred caused them to look down upon the Babylonians as remiss in their religious duties, and to father upon them other people's wrongs.

(28) R. Jose was a Babylonian. He welcomes the interpretation, which freed his fellow-countrymen from the charge of such boorish conduct.

(29) Lit., 'the peak', the mountain top from which the scapegoat was precipitated. Also used to denote the precipice itself.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 67a**

[A DISTANCE OF] NINETY RIS, SEVEN AND A HALF OF WHICH MAKE A MIL.<sup>1</sup> AT EVERY BOOTH THEY WOULD SAY TO HIM: HERE IS FOOD AND HERE IS WATER. THEY WENT WITH HIM FROM BOOTH TO BOOTH, EXCEPT THE LAST ONE.<sup>2</sup> FOR HE WOULD NOT GO WITH HIM UP TO THE ZOK,<sup>3</sup> BUT STAND FROM AFAR, AND BEHOLD WHAT HE WAS DOING.

WHAT DID HE DO? HE DIVIDED THE THREAD OF CRIMSON WOOL, AND TIED ONE HALF TO THE ROCK, THE OTHER HALF BETWEEN ITS HORNS, AND PUSHED IT FROM BEHIND. AND IT WENT ROLLING DOWN AND BEFORE IT HAD REACHED HALF ITS WAY DOWN HILL IT WAS DASHED TO PIECES. HE CAME BACK AND SAT DOWN UNDER THE LAST BOOTH UNTIL IT GREW DARK. AND FROM WHEN ON DOES IT RENDER HIS GARMENTS UNCLEAN?<sup>4</sup> FROM THE MOMENT HE HAS GONE OUTSIDE THE WALL OF JERUSALEM. R. SIMEON SAYS: FROM THE MOMENT HE PUSHES IT INTO THE ZOK.<sup>5</sup>

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: There were ten booths and twelve mils<sup>6</sup> [distance] — this is the view of R. Meir. R. Judah says Nine booths and ten mils; R. Jose says: Five booths and ten mils. And they are all available by means of an 'erub.<sup>7</sup> R. Jose said: My son Eliezer suggested to me: As long as I have an 'erub, two booths would do even for ten mils.<sup>8</sup> With whose view will agree what was taught: But not from the last booth, for nobody would go with him up to the Zok, but standing afar, would behold what he was doing? According to whom [is this]? According to R. Meir.<sup>9</sup>

AT EVERY BOOTH THEY WOULD SAY TO HIM: HERE IS FOOD AND WATER: A Tanna taught: Never did any one [who carried the goat away] find it necessary to use it, but<sup>10</sup> [the reason of this provision is because] you cannot compare one who has bread in his basket with one who has no bread in his basket.<sup>11</sup>

WHAT DID HE DO? HE DIVIDED THE THREAD OF CRIMSON WOOL: But let him tie the

whole [thread] to the rock? — Since it is his duty [to complete his work with] the he-goat, perhaps the thread might become fast white, and he would be satisfied.<sup>12</sup> But let him tie the whole thread between its horns? — At times its head [in falling] is bent and he would not pay attention.<sup>13</sup> Our Rabbis taught:<sup>14</sup> In the beginning they would tie the thread of crimson wool on the entrance of the Ulam<sup>15</sup> without: if it became white they rejoiced; if it did not become white, they were sad and ashamed. Thereupon they arranged to tie it to the entrance of the Ulam within. But they were still peeping through and if it became white, they rejoiced, whereas, if it did not become white, they grew sad and ashamed. Thereupon they arranged to tie one half to the rock and the other half between its horns. R. Nahum b. Papa said in the name of R. Eleazar ha-Kappar: Originally they used to tie the thread of crimson wool to the entrance of the Ulam within, and as soon as the he-goat reached the wilderness, it turned white. Then they knew that the commandment concerning it had been fulfilled, as it is said: If your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white wool.<sup>16</sup>

**BEFORE IT HAD REACHED HALF ITS WAY DOWN HILL:** The question was raised: As to those limbs [pieces] are they permitted for general use?<sup>17</sup> Rab and Samuel are in dispute on this point, one saying: They are permitted, the other they are forbidden. The one who holds they are permitted [argues thus]:

(1) [So that ninety ris is the equivalent of twelve mils.]

(2) I.e., the one who accompanied him to the last booth, the one before the Zok.

(3) [Because according to calculation there was a distance of two mils between the last booth and the Zok which was beyond the walking limits of the Sabbath or Festivals.]

(4) V. Lev. XVI, 26.

(5) Cf. p. 312, n. 6.

(6) [V. n. 1. This allowed for one mil(=2000 cubits) the permissible walking distance between one booth and another and two mils from the last booth to the Zok].

(7) This 'erub signified the transferring of one's abode to the place where certain foods were deposited, with the consequence that his movements on the Sabbath would be assumed to start from that abode and were permitted within 2000 cubits in every direction.

(8) Suppose some Jerusalemites deposited on the eve of the Day of Atonement some eatables at the end of the 2000 cubits which are the legal maximum for walking out of the city on the Sabbath. Then they are permitted to accompany the man appointed to take away the scapegoat a distance of 2000 more cubits (the maximum as from the present fictitious abode). The guard of other booths eight and four mils off Jerusalem could do the same, in every direction. Now one may go 2000 cubits with him from Jerusalem, where guards from the first booth join him up to the second and so on, until his destination is reached.

(9) According to R. Jose and R.'Judah even the last reaches the Zok.

(10) V. supra 18b.

(11) The craving of him who lacks the opportunity to gratify it is much more intense than the craving of him who has such opportunity.

(12) If the thread should turn white suddenly before the goat had yet been hurled down, the appointed man might be so happy with the sign of forgiveness obtained as to neglect going through with the prescribed ceremony of pushing the he-goat downward, thus leaving the command unfulfilled.

(13) To the change in colour, since the thread would be out of his sight.

(14) V. R.H. 31b.

(15) The Hall leading to the interior of the Temple.

(16) Isa. I, 18.

(17) I.e., may they e.g., be sold so that the profit therefrom be enjoyed. Hana'ah (general use) stands for any enjoyment except akilah, eating for human consumption, therefore using it for profit, as a gift, etc.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 67b**

For it is written: 'in the wilderness';<sup>1</sup> the one who holds they are forbidden [argues]: Because

Scripture says: cut off.<sup>2</sup> But as for him who considers them forbidden, for what purpose does he use the word 'wilderness'? He needs it in accord with what was taught: 'Into the wilderness', 'to the wilderness', 'in the wilderness',<sup>3</sup> that means to include Nob, Gibeon, and Shiloh and the Permanent House.<sup>4</sup> And what does the other [teacher] do with 'cut off'? — He needs it, in accord with what was taught: Gezerah,<sup>5</sup> [the term] 'gezerah' means something that is 'cut off';<sup>6</sup> another explanation: Gezerah means something that goes to pieces as it goes down; another interpretation: 'gezerah'<sup>7</sup> — perhaps you might say this is a vain thing? Therefore the text reads: I am the Lord, I have decreed<sup>7</sup> it and you are not permitted to criticize it.

Raba said: The view of him who says they are permitted is more reasonable, for the Torah did not say 'Send away'! to create [possibility of] offence.<sup>8</sup> Our Rabbis taught: Azazel — it should be hard and rough.<sup>9</sup> One might have assumed that it is to be in inhabited land, therefore the text reads: 'In the wilderness'. But whence do we know that it [is to be in] a Zok?<sup>10</sup> — Therefore the text reads: 'Cut off'.<sup>11</sup> Another [Baraita] taught: Azazel, i.e., the hardest of mountains, thus also does it say: And the mighty [ele] of the land he took away.<sup>12</sup> The School of R. Ishmael taught: Azazel — [it was so called] because it obtains atonement for the affair of Uza and<sup>13</sup> Aza'el.-

Our Rabbis taught: Mine ordinances shall ye do,<sup>14</sup> i.e., such commandments which, if they were not written [in Scripture], they should by right have been written and these are they: [the laws concerning] idolatry [star-worship], immorality and bloodshed, robbery and blasphemy. And My statutes shall ye keep,<sup>14</sup> i.e., such commandments to which Satan objects, they are [those relating to] the putting on of sha'atnez,<sup>15</sup> the halizah<sup>16</sup> [performed] by a sister-in-law, the purification of the leper, and the he-goat-to-be-sent-away. And perhaps you might think these are vain things, therefore Scripture says: I am the Lord,<sup>14</sup> i.e., I, the Lord have made it a statute and you have no right to criticize it.

FROM WHEN ON DOES IT RENDER HIS GARMENTS UNCLEAN? Our Rabbis taught: Only he who is to take the goat away renders his garments unclean, but he who sends the appointed man away<sup>17</sup> does not render his garments unclean. One might have assumed that [he does so] as soon as he goes forth outside from the wall of the Temple court, therefore the text reads: He that letteth go.<sup>18</sup> If [you derive from] 'he that letteth go' [one might infer that] only when he reaches Zok, therefore the text reads: 'And he that letteth go'.<sup>19</sup> How then is it? R. Judah says: As soon as he goes out of the walls of Jerusalem. R. Jose says: Azazel and wash [are written in close proximity] i.e., only when he reaches the Zok. R. Simeon says: And he that letteth go the goat for Azazel shall wash his clothes, i.e., he flings it down headlong and his garments become then unclean.

MISHNAH. HE [THE HIGH PRIEST] CAME TO THE BULLOCK AND THE HE-GOAT THAT WERE TO BE BURNT,<sup>20</sup> HE CUT THEM OPEN AND TOOK OUT THE SACRIFICIAL PORTIONS<sup>21</sup> AND PUT THEM ON A TRAY, AND BURNT THEM UPON THE ALTAR. HE TWISTED THEM [THE BEASTS] AROUND CARRYING POLES AND BROUGHT THEM OUT TO THE PLACE OF BURNING. FROM WHAT TIME DO THEY RENDER GARMENTS UNCLEAN?<sup>22</sup> AFTER THEY HAVE GONE OUTSIDE THE WALL OF THE TEMPLE COURT. R. SIMEON SAYS: FROM THE MOMENT THE FIRE HAS TAKEN HOLD OF MOST OF THEM.

GEMARA. And he burnt them up? How could that thought arise in you?<sup>23</sup> — Rather say: To burn them [later] on the altar.

HE TWISTED THEM AROUND CARRYING POLES: R. Johanan said: So in the form of a net-work. — A Tanna taught: He did not cut them up as one cuts up the flesh of a burnt-offering, but [he left] the skin on the flesh. Whence do we know this? Because It was taught:<sup>24</sup> Rabbi said: It is said here: skin . . . flesh . . . and dung<sup>25</sup> and it is said there: skin . . . flesh . . . and dung<sup>26</sup>

- 
- (1) Lev. XVI, 22. This phrase is superfluous and comes to teach that just as the wilderness belongs to all so are the broken limbs of the he-goat it contains free for the use of all.
- (2) Ibid. i.e., cut off from use, forbidden.
- (3) Ibid. vv. 10, 21, 22.
- (4) I.e., The Jerusalem Temple. The law applies to all these places.
- (5) The Hebrew for the 'cut off'.
- (6) I.e., something that rises steep, and not in a slope.
- (7) The root meaning of the word is: cut off, guard. Thus: to institute a preventive measure, to enact a prohibition, to decree. All these root-meanings are here brought into play: It is 'cut off', hence descending precipitately. — It is cut, 'split', hence dashed in pieces. — It is a decree, divine, hence no criticism is allowed.
- (8) It would be an offence for an unwary man who found them to make use of these animals, and the Torah would place no such stumbling-block in the way of the average person. Hence the assumption that the members of the goat's body are free to be used.
- (9) Az and el mean strong, irresistible, impudent.
- (10) Zok means a mountain peak; it may be the special name of the mountain whence the he-goat was flung down.
- (11) V. Supra p. 315, n. 7.
- (12) Ezek. XVII, 13.
- (13) This is a reference to the legend of fallen angels, based partly on Gen. VI, 4 and also on foreign lore. V. Jung, L. 'Fallen Angels in Jewish, Christian and Mohammedan literature'.
- (14) Lev. XVIII, 4.
- (15) A web of wool and linen, v. Deut. XXII, 11. All the laws mentioned in this group cannot be explained rationally; they are to be taken on faith, as the decree of God.
- (16) The ceremony of taking off the brother-in-law's shoe, v. Deut. XXV, 5ff.
- (17) I.e., those who accompany him.
- (18) Lev. XVI, 26.
- (19) [This argument is not clear. v. Rashi. Tosef. (Yoma III) reads: One might have assumed as soon as he goes forth outside the wall of the Temple court, therefore the text reads: 'For Azazel shall wash his clothes'. If 'for Azazel shall wash his clothes', I might [infer] only when he reaches Zok etc.]
- (20) Ibid. 27: And they shall burn in the fire their skin, and their flesh.
- (21) Lev. IV, 8-10.
- (22) V. Lev. XVI, 28.
- (23) That took place much later.
- (24) Zeb. 50a.
- (25) Lev. XVI, 27.
- (26) With reference to the bullock brought by an anointed priest for a sin-offering. Ibid. IV, 11.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 68a**

just as above it is [carried forth] by means of cutting up and not by flaying, so here also it is by means of cutting up and not by flaying. Whence do we know it there? — For it was taught: 'And its inwards, and its dung, and he shall carry forth',<sup>1</sup> that teaches that he must carry it forth complete.<sup>2</sup> One might have assumed that he must also burn it complete, therefore it is said here: 'with its head and with its legs' and there also it is said: its head and its legs,<sup>3</sup> hence just as there it is [offered] by means of cutting up, so here also it is [carried forth] by means of cutting up. One might assume that just as there it is by means of flaying, so here too, therefore the text reads: 'And its inwards and its dung'. How is this implied [in the Scriptural text]? — R. Papa answered: Just as the dung is enclosed in the inwards, so shall the flesh be enclosed in the skin.<sup>4</sup>

FROM WHAT TIME DO THEY RENDER GARMENTS UNCLEAN? [etc.] Our Rabbis taught:<sup>5</sup> [And the bullock and . . . the he-goat] he shall carry forth without the camp and they shall burn. There<sup>6</sup> you allot them three<sup>7</sup> camps and here only one camp?<sup>8</sup> Then, why does it read: 'without the

camp'? To tell you: As soon as he goes outside the one camp, the garments are rendered unclean. Whence do we know it there?<sup>9</sup> — For it was taught:<sup>10</sup> Even the whole bullock shall he carry forth without the camp,<sup>11</sup> i.e., without the three camps. — You say: Without the three camps, but perhaps it means [only] 'without one camp'? When Scripture says, in connection with the bullock of the congregation: 'without the camp', whereas no such statement [of the text] is necessary, for it is said already: And he shall burn it as he burned the first bullock,<sup>12</sup> why then was 'without the camp' stated? To allot it another camp; and when Scripture says, Without the camp', in connection with the removal of the ashes whereas no such statement is necessary,<sup>13</sup> since it is said already: Where the ashes are poured out,<sup>11</sup> this means to allot it a third camp. What does R. Simeon<sup>14</sup> do 'Without the camp'?<sup>15</sup> He needs it, as it was taught: R. Eliezer says: It is said here: 'Without the camp', and it is said there: Without the camp:<sup>16</sup> Just as here it means outside the three camps, so does it mean there outside the three camps; and just as there it means to the east of Jerusalem,<sup>17</sup> so does it mean here to the east of Jerusalem. But according to the view of the Sages where were they burnt? In accordance with what was taught: Where were they burnt?

---

(1) Lev. IV, 11-12.

(2) But the skin of the bullock, and all its flesh, with its head, and with its legs, and its inwards, and its dung, omitting no part of the animal's anatomy, hence justifies the statement that 'shall he carry forth', in the following verse, means he shall carry it forth complete.

(3) Lev. I, 8, 9. With reference to a burnt-offering of the flock.

(4) The skin of the bullock and all its flesh, occurring in the same passage with and its dung justifies the analogy: as the dung is enclosed, etc.

(5) Zeb. 105b.

(6) In connection with the bullock which the congregation or the anointed priest had to offer up as a sin-offering for an offence committed in error.

(7) Three camps, outside of which it is to be burnt, are 'allotted', designated in connection with it: the priestly camp, the camp of the Levites, the camp (the city) of Israel as shown infra.

(8) This bullock would apparently be burnt outside of the first camp (as 'without the camp' is mentioned only once). What difference justifies such discrimination? The difference would lie in the nature of the sacrifice, but there is practically no such difference, both being offered up inside and having the same regulation with regard to their burning and to their defiling of the garments.

(9) V. p. 318, n. 8.

(10) Sanh. 42b.

(11) Lev. IV, 12.

(12) Ibid. v. 21.

(13) V. ibid. VI, 4.

(14) Who, in our Mishnah, says: The garments are rendered unclean only from the moment the fire has taken hold of most parts of the sacrifice.

(15) Lev. XVI, 27.

(16) Num. XIX, 4. With reference to the red heifer.

(17) As indicated in the words towards the face of the tent of meeting, that is, he stands in the east facing the entrance of the Tabernacle to the west.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 68b**

to the north<sup>1</sup> of Jerusalem, and without the three camps. R. Jose says: They were burnt in the place<sup>2</sup> where the ashes of the sacrifices were deposited.

Raba said: Who is the Tanna disputing with R. Jose. It is R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for it was taught: [The bullock shall he carry forth to] where the ashes are poured out, and burn it, i.e., there shall be ashes [from before].<sup>3</sup> R. Eliezer b. Jacob says: It means that its place shall be sloping. Said Abaye: Perhaps they are disputing as to whether the place shall be sloping!<sup>4</sup> — Our Rabbis taught: And he

that burneth them<sup>5</sup> i.e., he that burneth renders his garments unclean, but not he who kindles the fire, nor he who puts the wood in order. And who is 'He that burneth'? He who assists at the time of the burning. One might have assumed that even after they have become ashes, they shall still defile the garments, therefore Scripture says: 'them, i.e., only as long as they [are 'they'] do they defile the garments, but not once they have become ashes. R. Eliezer son of R. Simeon says: The bullock [itself] defiles the garments, but when the flesh is burnt to hard lumps it no more defiles the garments. What is the difference between the two views? — If it has been reduced to lumps of charred flesh.<sup>6</sup>

MISHNAH. THEY SAID TO THE HIGH PRIEST: THE HE-GOAT HAS REACHED THE WILDERNESS. AND WHENCE DID THEY KNOW THAT THE HE-GOAT HAD REACHED THE WILDERNESS? THEY USED TO SET UP GUARDS AT STATIONS<sup>7</sup> AND FROM THESE TOWELS WOULD BE WAVED, THUS WOULD THEY KNOW THAT THE HE-GOAT HAD REACHED THE WILDERNESS. R. JUDAH SAID: BUT DID THEY NOT HAVE A GREAT SIGN? FROM JERUSALEM TO BETH HIDODO<sup>8</sup> WAS THREE MILS. THEY COULD WALK A MIL, RETURN THE MIL, THEN TARRY THE TIME IT TAKES TO WALK A MIL, AND THUS KNOW THAT THE HE-GOAT HAD REACHED THE WILDERNESS. — R. ISHMAEL SAID: BUT THEY HAD ANOTHER SIGN TOO: A THREAD OF CRIMSON WOOL WAS TIED TO THE DOOR OF THE TEMPLE, AND WHEN THE HE-GOAT REACHED THE WILDERNESS THE THREAD TURNED WHITE, AS IT IS WRITTEN: THOUGH YOUR SINS BE AS SCARLET THEY SHALL BE AS WHITE AS SNOW.<sup>9</sup>

GEMARA. Abaye said: One may infer from here that Beth Hidodo is in the wilderness and this is what he [the Tanna of the Mishnah] informs us: that R. Judah holds: As soon as the he-goat has reached the wilderness the commandment concerning it is fulfilled.

## CHAPTER VII

MISHNAH. THE HIGH PRIEST [THEN] CAME TO READ. IF HE WISHED TO READ IN LINEN GARMENTS HE COULD DO SO, OTHERWISE HE WOULD READ IN HIS OWN WHITE VESTMENTS. THE SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANT<sup>10</sup> WOULD TAKE A SCROLL OF THE LAW AND GIVE IT TO THE HEAD OF THE SYNAGOGUE,<sup>11</sup> AND THE HEAD OF THE SYNAGOGUE GAVE IT TO THE SEGAN,<sup>12</sup> AND THE SEGAN GAVE IT TO THE HIGH PRIEST, AND THE HIGH PRIEST STANDS AND RECEIVES IT, AND READS [THE SECTION] BEGINNING] 'AFTER THE DEATH . . .'<sup>13</sup> AND 'HOWBEIT ON THE TENTH. . .'<sup>14</sup> THEN HE WOULD ROLL UP THE SCROLL OF THE LAW AND PUT IT IN HIS BOSOM AND SAY, 'MORE THAN WHAT I HAVE READ OUT BEFORE YOU IS WRITTEN HERE. AND ON THE TENTH . . .'<sup>15</sup> WHICH IS IN THE BOOK OF NUMBERS HE RECITES BY HEART. THEN HE RECITES IN CONNECTION THEREWITH EIGHT BLESSINGS: FOR THE LAW, FOR THE TEMPLE SERVICE, FOR THE THANKSGIVING, FOR THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS AND FOR THE TEMPLE SEPARATELY,<sup>16</sup> AND FOR ISRAEL SEPARATELY AND FOR JERUSALEM SEPARATELY,<sup>17</sup> FOR THE PRIESTS SEPARATELY AND FOR THE REST OF THE PRAYER.<sup>18</sup> HE WHO SEES THE HIGH PRIEST WHEN HE READS DOES NOT SEE THE BULLOCK AND THE HE-GOAT THAT ARE BEING BURNT, AND HE THAT SEES THE BULLOCK AND THE HE-GOAT THAT ARE BEING BURNT DOES NOT SEE THE HIGH PRIEST WHEN HE READS: NOT THAT HE WAS NOT PERMITTED BUT BECAUSE THE DISTANCE APART WAS GREAT AND BOTH RITES WERE PERFORMED AT THE SAME TIME.

GEMARA. Since it states: IN HIS OWN WHITE VESTMENT,<sup>19</sup> the inference is that reading is not a [Temple] service, and then it states: IF HE WISHED TO READ IN THE LINEN GARMENTS HE COULD DO SO, from which one may learn that priestly garments may be enjoyed for private

use!<sup>20</sup> Perhaps it is different with reading, because it is a necessity for the [Temple] service. For the question was raised: Are the priestly garments allowed for private use or not allowed! — Come and hear: They would not sleep in the holy garments.<sup>21</sup> Now they could not sleep in them, but they could eat in them!<sup>22</sup> — Perhaps it is different with the eating, because it is necessary for the service, for it was taught: And they shall eat those things wherewith atonement was made;<sup>23</sup> this teaches that the priests eat and the owner obtains atonement. ‘They could not sleep in them’, but could they walk around in them? — In truth they might not walk around in them either

- 
- (1) For all the ceremony in connection with the sin-offering took place in the north.
- (2) Before Beth ha-Deshen; when ashes have been deposited there it is Beth ha-Deshen. After they have been deposited it is Shefek ha-Deshen, the place where ashes have been poured out. (v. Rashi).
- (3) V. Lev. IV, 12.
- (4) I.e., the discussion may concern only the question as to whether the place must be sloping, and not whether ashes must have been deposited there first, R. Eliezer b. Jacob agreeing that ashes must have been deposited there before.
- (5) Lev. XVI, 28.
- (6) In this case the flesh has been dissolved without having become ashes. According to the first Tanna they render the garments unclean as long as they are not ashes, hence, in this case would still have this defiling effect. According to R. Eliezer son of R. Simeon it is only as long as they are bullocks, i.e., whole, that they render garments impure, whereas as charred flesh they are no more bullocks, hence do not affect the garments any more.
- (7) Jastr. from Grk. Diadoche — relays, guard at stations, corrupted into dirchaot.
- (8) Not definitely identified. J.T. Beth Horon, var. lec. Haroro, Beth Hadure.
- (9) Isa. I, 18.
- (10) [Hazzan. There is no certainty in regard either to the origin or rank of the Hazzan. Here he appears a second in rank to the Head of the Synagogue].
- (11) [ראש הכנסת Identified with the \*\*, the officer who administered the external affairs of the synagogue, v. Krauss, Synagogale Altertumer, p. 116ff. and J.E. II, 86.]
- (12) V. Glos.
- (13) Lev. XVI.
- (14) Lev. XXIII, 26-32.
- (15) Num. XXIX, 7-11.
- (16) What ‘separately’ means is not clear. Some texts including, J.T. omit. V. also Sotah 40b.
- (17) [J.T. and separate editions of the Mishnah omit ‘for Jerusalem’, which makes the number exactly eight].
- (18) V. Gemara.
- (19) Robe, garment; either the Greek stole, or a derivation of talal, cf. talith — Jast, and does not necessitate sacred priestly vestments.
- (20) For private clean use, as against the possibility of impurity in sleep.
- (21) Tamid 25b.
- (22) Although eating is not part of the service, it is permissible for priests to eat in their official garments.
- (23) Ex. XXIX, 23.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 69a

but it is necessary [to make special mention of sleep] on account of the last clause:<sup>1</sup> they may take them off, fold them, and put them under the head.

‘They may take them off, fold them, and put them under the head’! You may infer, then, hence that priestly garments may be enjoyed for private use? — R. Papa said: Do not say, ‘Under their heads’, but rather say, ‘Next to their heads’. R. Mesharsheya said: You may infer, thence, that one may keep the tefillin next to oneself whilst asleep. It is also logical that [the meaning here is] next to their heads’. For if the thought should arise in you that [it means] ‘under their heads’, surely you ought to derive [the prohibition of that] on account of the mixed texture [of wool and linen], for among [the garments which consisted of a mixed texture] is also the girdle, so that even if the private

enjoyment [of priestly garments] is permitted, surely here he is deriving benefit from a mixed texture! — That will be right according to the view that the girdle of the high priest [on the Day of Atonement] is identical with the girdle of the common priest during the rest of the year; but what can be said according to the view that the girdle of the high priest is not identical with that of the commoner?<sup>2</sup> — And if you were to say mixed textures are forbidden only for wearing and putting on, but not for lying on, surely was it not taught: Neither shall there come upon thee,<sup>3</sup> i.e., but you may spread it under you; but the Sages declare that this too is forbidden, because a fringe [of the mattress etc.] might wind itself round the flesh. And if you were to say: Something was placed in between, but did not R. Simeon b. Pazzi in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi say on the authority of Rabbi, in the name of the Holy Community of Jerusalem: Even if there were ten mattress covers, one on top of the other, with mixed textures under them, it would still be forbidden to sleep on them. Rather, therefore, must you say [the meaning is]: ‘Next to their heads’. This is conclusive. R. Ashi said: In reality, read: ‘Under their heads’. [And as to the question]<sup>2</sup> But he would enjoy mixed textures? [the answer is], Priestly garments are stiff, for even so did R. Huna, son of R. Joshua say: The shrunk felt-cloth of Naresh<sup>4</sup> is permitted.<sup>5</sup>

Come and hear: As to priestly garments, it is forbidden to go out in them in the province,<sup>6</sup> but in the Sanctuary whether during or outside the time of the service, it is permitted to wear them, because priestly garments are permitted for private use. This is conclusive. But in the province [it is] not [permitted]? Surely it was taught: The twenty-fifth of Tebeth is the day of Mount Gerizim,<sup>7</sup> on which no mourning is permitted. It is the day on which the Cutheans demanded the House of our God from Alexander the Macedonian so as to destroy it, and he had given them the permission, whereupon some people came and informed Simeon the Just.<sup>8</sup> What did the latter do? He put on his priestly garments, robed himself in priestly garments, some of the noblemen of Israel went with him carrying fiery torches in their hands, they walked all the night, some walking on one side and others on the other side, until the dawn rose. When the dawn rose he [Alexander] said to them: Who are these [the Samaritans]? They answered: The Jews who rebelled against you. As he reached Antipatris,<sup>9</sup> the sun having shone forth, they met. When he saw Simeon the Just, he descended from his carriage and bowed down before him. They said to him: A great king like yourself should bow down before this Jew? He answered: His image it is which wins for me in all my battles. He said to them: What have you come for? They said: Is it possible that star-worshippers should mislead you to destroy the House wherein prayers are said for you and your kingdom that it be never destroyed! He said to them: Who are these? They said to him: These are Cutheans who stand before you. He said: They are delivered into your hand. At once they perforated their heels, tied them to the tails of their horses and dragged them over thorns and thistles, until they came to Mount Gerizim, which they ploughed and planted with vetch, even as they had planned to do with the House of God. And that day they made a festive day.<sup>10</sup> If you like say: They were fit to be priestly garments, or, if you like, say: It is time to work for the Lord: they have made void Thy law.<sup>11</sup>

**THE SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANT WOULD TAKE A SCROLL OF THE LAW.** One may infer from here that one may shew honour to the disciple in the presence of his master?<sup>12</sup> — Abaye said: It is all done for the sake of the high priest.<sup>13</sup>

**AND THE HIGH PRIEST STANDS.** From this you can infer that he was sitting before, but surely we have learnt:<sup>14</sup>

(1) Which permits the sleeping on them, independent of any fear that impurity may occur in the sleep, since the garments were taken off the body.

(2) According to the first view both are of linen, without any mixture, hence may be worn. But according to the second view, the commoner did wear a different kind of belt, made up of mixed texture, v. supra 6a notes, hence the difficulty.

(3) Lev. XIX, 19.

(4) Near Sura.

- (5) That felt-cloth was so hard that one could not have worn a garment of that material. The prohibition of mixed texture, however, applies only to such material as may be worn as garments and warm the body.
- (6) I.e., outside the Temple.
- (7) On which the Samaritans (Cutheans) had their Temple.
- (8) One of the surviving members of the Great Synod, v. Aboth, Sonc. ed., p. 2, n. 1.
- (9) Antipatris, in Judah, on the way from Jerusalem to Caesarea, was built by King Herod and called after his father, Antipater.
- (10) Prohibiting every public mourning. This shews that Simeon wore the priestly garments outside Jerusalem.
- (11) Ps. CXIX, 126. [In Megillath Ta'anith the day of the destruction of the Temple on Mount Gerizim is 21st Kislev. According to Josephus it was destroyed by Hyrcanus in the year 128 B.C.E. For the literature on the subject v. Lichtenstein, H., HUCA, vol. VIII-IX, p. 288].
- (12) The question is, shall we consider this an answer to the problem propounded elsewhere and not answered (B.B 119b; Sotah 40b) as to whether it is legitimate to shew honour to a subordinate in the presence of his superior, (disciple in presence of master). The solution, inferred from here, would be the affirmative.
- (13) I.e., what happens here serves but to indicate how many subordinates the high priest has, i.e., how exalted his position is. The problem is still unsolved as to a situation in which the honour would be intended exclusively for the benefit of the disciple or subordinate.
- (14) [Read with var. lec.: 'A Master said', as what follows is no Mishnah].

### **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 69b**

Nobody may sit down in the [Temple] Court except the kings of the house of David alone, as it is said: Then David the king went in and sat before the Lord?<sup>1</sup> — It is as R. Hisda had explained [elsewhere]: In the women's court, so also here. 'In the women's court'. — Where was R. Hisda's statement made? — In connection with the following: An objection was raised, it was taught: Where did they read therein?<sup>2</sup> In the Temple. R. Eliezer b. Jacob said: On the Temple Mount, as it is said: And he read therein before the broad place that was before the water gate;<sup>3</sup> and R. Hisda said: In the women's court.<sup>4</sup> And Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God.<sup>5</sup> What does 'great' imply? — R. Joseph said in the name of Rab: He magnified Him by [pronouncing] the Ineffable Name.<sup>6</sup> R. Giddal said: [He recited], Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, from everlasting even to everlasting.<sup>7</sup> Said Abaye to R. Dimi: But perhaps it means that he magnified Him by [pronouncing] the Ineffable Name? — He answered: One does not pronounce the Ineffable Name outside [the limits of the Temple]. But may one not? Is it not written: And Ezra the scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood, which they had made for the purpose. [. . . and Ezra praised the great God].<sup>8</sup> And R. Giddal [commenting thereupon] said: He magnified Him by [pronouncing] the Ineffable Name?—That was a decision in an emergency.<sup>9</sup> And [they] cried with a great [loud] voice unto the Lord, their God.<sup>10</sup> What did they cry? — Woe, woe, it is he<sup>11</sup> who has destroyed the Sanctuary, burnt the Temple, killed all the righteous, driven all Israel into exile, and is still dancing around among us! Thou hast surely given him to us so that we may receive reward through him.<sup>12</sup> We want neither him, nor reward through him! Thereupon a tablet fell down from heaven for them, whereupon the word 'truth'<sup>13</sup> was inscribed. (R. Hanina said: One may learn therefrom that the seal of the Holy One, blessed be He, is truth). They ordered a fast of three days and three nights, whereupon he<sup>11</sup> was surrendered to them. He came forth from the Holy of Holies like a young fiery lion. Thereupon the Prophet said to Israel: This is the evil desire of idolatry, as it is said: And he said: This is wickedness.<sup>14</sup> As they took hold of him a hair of his beard fell out, he raised his voice and it went [was audible] four hundred parasangs. Thereupon they said: How shall we act? Perhaps, God forbid, they might have mercy upon him from heaven! — The prophet said unto them: Cast him into a leaden pot, closing its opening with lead. Because lead absorbs the voice, as it is said: And he said: This is wickedness. And he cast her down into the midst of the measure, and he cast the weight of lead upon the mouth thereof.<sup>14</sup> They said: Since this is a time of Grace, let us pray for mercy for the Tempter to evil.<sup>15</sup> They prayed for mercy, and he was handed over to them. He said to them: Realize that if you kill him, the world goes down. They imprisoned him for three days, then looked in the whole land of

Israel for a fresh egg and could not find it.<sup>16</sup> Thereupon they said: What shall we do now? Shall we kill him? The world would then go down. Shall we beg for half-mercy?<sup>17</sup> They do not grant ‘halves’ in heaven.<sup>17</sup> They put out his eyes and let him go. It helped inasmuch as he no more entices men to commit incest.<sup>18</sup> In the West [Palestine] they taught it thus: R. Giddal said: [And Ezra praised...the] great [God]:<sup>19</sup> i.e., he magnified Him by pronouncing the Ineffable Name. R. Mattena said: He said: The great, the mighty, and the awful God.<sup>20</sup> The interpretation of R. Mattena seems to agree with what R. Joshua b. Levi said: For R. Joshua b. Levi said: Why were they called men of the Great Synod? Because they restored the crown of the divine attributes to its ancient completeness.<sup>21</sup> [For] Moses had come and said: The great God, the mighty, and the awful.<sup>22</sup> Then Jeremiah came and said: Aliens are destroying<sup>23</sup> His Temple. Where are, then, His awful deeds? Hence he omitted<sup>24</sup> [the attribute] the ‘awful’. Daniel came and said: Aliens are enslaving his sons. Where are His mighty deeds? Hence he omitted the word<sup>25</sup> ‘mighty’. But they came and said: On the contrary! Therein lie His mighty deeds that He suppresses His wrath,<sup>26</sup> that He extends long-suffering to the wicked. Therein lie His awful powers: For but for the fear of Him, how could one [single] nation persist among the [many] nations! But how could [the earlier] Rabbis<sup>27</sup> abolish something established by Moses? R. Eleazar said: Since they knew that the Holy One, blessed be He, insists on truth, they would not ascribe false [things] to Him.<sup>28</sup>

AND HE READ: AFTER THE DEATH’ AND ‘HOWBEIT ON THE TENTH DAY’: A question was raised: One may skip in reading from the Prophets, but one may not skip in reading from the Torah!<sup>29</sup> — That is no difficulty: The one [prohibition] applies where [the passage skipped is] sufficiently long to interrupt the interpreter, the other where it is not sufficiently long to interrupt the interpreter.<sup>30</sup> — But surely it is in connection therewith that it was taught: One may skip in reading from the Prophets, but one may not skip in reading from the Torah; and how much may be skipped [in the Prophets]? So much as is not sufficiently long to interrupt the interpreter. This implies that in reading from the Torah one may not skip at all? — Said Abaye: There is no difficulty: [The permission applies] here, where one theme is concerned, [the prohibition] there, where two themes are concerned.<sup>31</sup> Thus also it was taught: One may skip in the reading from the Torah, if the theme be one and same, in reading from the Prophets, even if two themes be involved; in each case, however, only when it is not sufficiently long to interrupt the interpreter. Nor may one skip from one Prophetic Book to another, but in case of one of the twelve Minor Prophets one may skip even [from one Book to another],

---

(1) I Chron. XVII, 16. Only the descendants of David who, through his son, built the Temple, are permitted to feel sufficiently at home there to be permitted to sit down in the Temple Court, as Scripture indicates.

(2) I.e., when any public reading took place in the Temple.

(3) Neh. VIII, 3. Ezra read the Law ‘in the presence of the men and the women’.

(4) [The text from ‘it is as R. Hisda explained’ to this point is in disorder. MS.M. reads: ‘Said R. Hisda, In the women’s court. An objection was raised: Where did they read therein? In the (Temple) Court . . . water-gate? — Said R. Hisda, In the women’s court’. Ronsburg (Glosses) deletes ‘An objection was raised’. In any case our present text seems to be a conflation of two readings].

(5) Neh. VIII, 6.

(6) [Shem ha-Meforash. Lit., ‘the Distinguished Name’ synonymous with the Shem ha-Meyuhad ‘the Unique Name’, and generally held identical with the Tetragrammaton uttered as written, v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 408, n. I].

(7) I Chron. XVI, 36.

(8) Neh. VIII, 4-6.

(9) Not to be taken as precedent. Lit. ‘a decision for the moment’.

(10) Ibid. IX, 4. [Here too the text is in disorder as the verse has no connection with the preceding verse to which it is adduced in explanation of the emergency referred to, the incident in the first verse having taken place on the first of the seventh month, whilst that of the second verse on the twenty-fourth. Var. lec. accordingly omit the first quotations from ibid. VIII, 4 and substitute in its place the second verse ibid. IX, 4; v. Bah.]

(11) The evil desire, tempter of idolatry.

- (12) For resisting him successfully Israel would be rewarded.
- (13) I.e., I agree with you: you spoke the truth.
- (14) Zech. V, 8.
- (15) The evil desire, for idolatry is also the evil desire for immorality. The two were found to go hand in hand.
- (16) Whereas there is no good in idolatry there is at least some good in the desire for sex indulgence. Perpetuation of the race depends upon it. So does human food. The people who found themselves with the opportunity to destroy the temptation of flesh-love discovered that, when the genius of sex-love is cancelled, no eggs are available.
- (17) To ask that temptation or the tempter should live, but not tempt, is to ask a thing that Heaven will not grant. The tempter lives to tempt. But by depriving its flame of its major glare, by keeping it within lawful limits, one promotes domesticity and prevents depravity.
- (18) Lit., ‘against relatives’.
- (19) [On the variant given supra p. 327. n. 6, the reference is to ‘great’ mentioned in Neh. IX, 4.]
- (20) Ibid. 32.
- (21) The crown, I.e., the praise of the Lord. By re-embodiment the attributes, which Jeremiah and Daniel had omitted.
- (22) Deut. X, 17.
- (23) Or, revel in.
- (24) In his prayer, Jer. XXXII, 17f.
- (25) In his prayer, Dan. IX, 4ff.
- (26) So MS.M. cur. edd. He subdues his inclination.
- (27) Jeremiah, Daniel.
- (28) Since to them the circumstances indicated that He desired to hide His mighty or awful deeds.
- (29) Meg. 24a.
- (30) The interpreter would follow immediately the reader. If the rolling did not involve so much time that, at the end of his interpretation of the passage just read, the interpreter would have to stop to await the reading of the new Hebrew passage, well and good. For to keep the congregation waiting for the continuation of the service is unseemly. But ‘Howbeit on the tenth day’ is so near Lev. XVI, that before the interpreter would have concluded his Aramaic interpretation of the last Hebrew passage, the new passage would have been started and read, for him to interpret without loss of time.
- (31) This distinction is not technical, but pedagogical. If both passages although near — so that the interpreter need not keep the congregation waiting — deal with two subjects, one shall not skip from one to another, because closer attention is necessary for an understanding of the laws of the Torah. But where one subject only is involved, as in the reading on the Day of Atonement, such skipping is permitted. Meg. 24a.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 70a**

provided one does not skip from the end of the Book to its beginning.

THEN HE WOULD ROLL UP THE SCROLL OF THE LAW etc.: Why all that?<sup>1</sup> — So as not to discredit the scroll of the Law.<sup>2</sup>

AND ON THE TENTH, WHICH IS IN THE BOOK OF NUMBERS, HE RECITED BY HEART: Why that? Let him roll up [the scroll] and read from it [again]? — R. Huna the son of R. Joshua said in the name of R. Shesheth: Because it is not proper to roll up a scroll of the Law before the community, because of respect for the community.<sup>3</sup> Then one should bring another scroll and read therefrom? — R. Huna, son of R. Judah said: Because it would discredit the first [scroll]. Resh Lakish said: Because of an unnecessary blessing.<sup>4</sup> But we do take into consideration [the reason that it would] discredit [the first scroll]? Has not R. Isaac, the Smith, said: If the beginning of the month of Tebeth falls on the Sabbath, one brings three scrolls of the Torah, and reads from one about the affairs of the day,<sup>5</sup> in the second about the new moon, in the third about Hanukkah?<sup>6</sup> — Three men [reading] from three scrolls do not imply a discredit [for the first and second scroll], one man reading from two scrolls does.<sup>7</sup>

THEREUPON HE PRONOUNCED EIGHT BLESSINGS: Our Rabbis taught: For the Torah, as one pronounces it in the Synagogue;<sup>8</sup> for the Temple service; for the thanksgiving;<sup>9</sup> for the forgiving of iniquity, as usual;<sup>10</sup> for the Sanctuary separately; for the priest separately; for Israel separately; and for the rest of the prayer.

Our Rabbis taught: The rest of the prayer: [Accept my] song, petition, supplication before Thee for Thy people Israel, which are in need of salvation.' He would conclude with: '[Blessed art Thou, O Lord] who hearkenest unto prayer.' Thereupon each would bring a scroll of the Torah from his house and read therefrom, in order to shew the multitude its beauty.<sup>11</sup> HE WHO SEES THE HIGH PRIEST . . . NOT THAT IT WAS NOT PERMITTED etc.: That is self-evident? — You might have thought as Resh Lakish does: For Resh Lakish said: One must not permit a mizwah to pass by unnoticed; and what mizwah is there here? In the multitude of the people is the king's glory.<sup>12</sup> Therefore we are informed<sup>13</sup> [that it was permitted].

MISHNAH. IF HE READ IN THE GARMENTS OF LINEN, HE WOULD THEN SANCTIFY HIS HANDS AND FEET, STRIP OFF HIS CLOTHES, GO DOWN AND IMMERSE HIMSELF, COME UP AND DRY HIMSELF. THE GOLDEN VESTMENTS WOULD BE BROUGHT TO HIM, HE PUT THEM ON, SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET, WENT OUT, OFFERED UP HIS OWN RAM AND THE RAM OF THE PEOPLE,<sup>14</sup> AND THE SEVEN UNBLEMISHED, ONE-YEAR-OLD-LAMBS.<sup>15</sup> THIS IS THE VIEW OF R. ELIEZER. R. AKIBA SAID: THESE WERE OFFERED UP TOGETHER WITH THE DAILY WHOLE-OFFERING OF THE MORNING, WHEREAS THE BULLOCK FOR THE WHOLE-OFFERING<sup>15</sup> AND THE HE-GOAT WHICH IS OFFERED UP OUTSIDE<sup>16</sup> WERE OFFERED UP TOGETHER WITH THE DAILY WHOLE-OFFERING OF THE AFTERNOON. HE THEN SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET, STRIPPED OFF HIS CLOTHES, WENT DOWN AND IMMERSSED HIMSELF, CAME UP AND DRIED HIMSELF. THE WHITE VESTMENTS WOULD BE BROUGHT TO HIM, HE PUT THEM ON AND SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND HIS FEET. THEN HE WOULD GO IN TO BRING OUT THE LADLE AND THE FIRE-PAN. HE WOULD SANCTIFY HIS HANDS AND FEET, STRIP OFF HIS CLOTHES, GO DOWN AND IMMERSE HIMSELF, COME UP AND DRY HIMSELF. THE GOLDEN GARMENTS WOULD BE BROUGHT TO HIM. HE PUT THEM ON, SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET, AND WENT IN TO BURN UP THE AFTERNOON INCENSE, AND TO TRIM THE LAMPS. HE SANCTIFIED HIS HANDS AND FEET AND STRIPPED. THEN HE WENT DOWN, IMMERSSED HIMSELF, CAME UP AND DRIED HIMSELF. THEY WOULD THEN BRING TO HIM HIS OWN GARMENTS, HE PUT THEM ON. THEY WOULD ACCOMPANY HIM TO HIS HOUSE. HE WOULD ARRANGE FOR A DAY OF FESTIVITY FOR HIS FRIENDS WHENEVER HE HAD COME FORTH FROM THE SANCTUARY IN PEACE.

GEMARA. The question was raised: How does he [R. Akiba] mean: They [the seven lambs] were offered up together with the daily whole-offering of the morning, whereas the bullock for the whole-offering and the he-goat which is offered up outside were offered up together with the daily whole-offering of the afternoon; or did he mean, perhaps, this: they were offered up together with the daily whole-offering of the morning and together also with them the bullock for the whole-offering, whereas the he-goat which is offered up outside is offered up together with the daily whole-offering of the afternoon?<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, when, according to R. Eliezer who omits reference to him, is the bullock for the whole-offering being sacrificed? Furthermore, according to both R. Eliezer and R. Akiba, when are the sacrificial portions of the sin-offering<sup>18</sup> smoked? — Raba said: You have no properly arranged order [of the service] except you adopt either the view of R. Eliezer, as taught in the School of Samuel, or the view of R. Akiba as reported in the Tosefta. For the School of Samuel taught: R. Eliezer said, He went forth, prepared his own ram, and the ram of the people and the sacrificial portions of the sin-offering, but the bullock for the whole-offering and the seven lambs, and the he-goat that was offered up outside were offered up together with the daily whole-offering of

the afternoon. What is the teaching of R. Akiba as recorded in the Tosefta?<sup>19</sup> — For it was taught: R. Akiba said, The bullock for the whole-offering, and the seven lambs were offered up together with the Daily whole-offering of the morning, as it is said: [Ye shall offer these] beside the burnt-offering of the morning which is for a continual burnt-offering.<sup>20</sup> After that the service of the day

- 
- (1) Why was it necessary for him to say: More than I have read before you is written here?
  - (2) His reciting by heart may suggest to the congregation that the passage in question is missing from the scroll.
  - (3) Whom one should not keep waiting for the continuation of the service.
  - (4) Any unnecessary mention of His name is a transgression of the third command, wherefore in doubtful circumstances a blessing should rather be unpronounced than repeated. A new scroll would require a new blessing and is therefore to be avoided, as leading to an unnecessary, i.e., unlawful mention of His name.
  - (5) The portion of the Torah, due to be read on that Sabbath, one of the fifty-two Sabbaths of the year, to each of which is apportioned a Sidrah from the Pentateuch.
  - (6) V. Meg. 29b.
  - (7) The suggestion that one of the scrolls is defective is more reasonable in the case of one and the same person reading from two, than in the case of three different persons, each of whom reads his portion from one special scroll.
  - (8) V. P.B. p. 147.
  - (9) Op. cit. p. 50ff.
  - (10) As we have it in the Day of Atonement Liturgy.
  - (11) To 'adorn oneself' before Him in the performance of His commandments, i.e., to perform them in a manner aesthetically satisfactory is a duty which our Rabbis derived from Ex. XV, 2: He is my God and I will glorify Him. In pursuit of that ideal, a pious Jew would build his tabernacle in most careful and beautiful form, would have his scroll written by excellent scribes, would have his prayer shawl adorned, or made from costly wool or silk. To shew his scroll to the people would be an exhibition of his natural pride in that precious possession.
  - (12) Prov. XIV, 28. Consequently it might be thought that one must not depart from witnessing one rite in favour of the other.
  - (13) That it is permitted to pass by a mizwah unnoticed, if one is engaged in the performance of another. The prohibition to ignore the opportunity of performing a mizwah applies only when one is not engaged, or about to be engaged, in another good deed.
  - (14) Lev. XVI, 24.
  - (15) Num. XXIX, 8.
  - (16) I.e., its blood was sprinkled on the outer altar. Ibid. v. 11.
  - (17) R. Akiba's statement is not clear enough. Either of the two interpretations are possible, dependent on where the end of the clause is placed.
  - (18) Mentioned in the Mishnah Supra 67b.
  - (19) A collection of oral laws, outside of the Mishnah, but considered authoritative. Several such collections are mentioned and ascribed to various Sages.
  - (20) Num. XXVIII, 23.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 70b**

and after that the he-goat which is to be offered outside, as it is said: One he-goat for a sin-offering, beside the sin-offering of atonement;<sup>1</sup> and after that his own ram and the ram of the people, after that the sacrificial portions of the sin-offering, and after that the Daily whole-offering of the afternoon.

What is the reason for R. Eliezer's view? — He [the high priest] performs [the service] in accord with the order written [in Scripture's text]: first he performs what Leviticus enjoins and then he performs what Numbers prescribes.<sup>2</sup> And R. Akiba? — It is in accord with the reason he himself states: Beside the burnt-offering of the morning, which is for a continual burnt-offering which shews that the additional sacrifices were offered up together with the Daily whole-offering of the morning. What does R. Eliezer do with the passage: Beside the sin-offering of atonement?<sup>3</sup> He uses it [for the teaching]: Both<sup>4</sup> atone for similar kinds of sins.<sup>5</sup> R. Judah said in his [R. Akiba's] name: One<sup>6</sup> is

offered up together with the Daily whole-offering of the morning, and six<sup>6</sup> with the Daily whole-offering of the afternoon. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon said in his name: Six were offered up with the Daily whole-offering of the morning and one together with the Daily whole-offering of the evening. What is [the reason] of the Rabbis? — There are two verses written: It is written: ‘Beside the burnt-offering of the morning’<sup>7</sup> and it is written: ‘And he come forth and offer his burnt-offering’.<sup>8</sup> He therefore prepares one part with the one, and the other with the other. Wherein are they disputing? — R. Judah holds: He offered one first, as it is written: ‘Beside the burnt-offering of the morning’, and then he performed the service of the day, because of a [possible] weakness of the high priest. R. Simeon b. Eleazar holds: Since he once started, he performs the service of the six, lest he be negligent [and will not offer them after the service of the day]. But as to the service due that day, he is zealous.<sup>9</sup>

All, at any rate, agree that it was but one ram;<sup>10</sup> according to whose view is that? — In accord with Rabbi. For it was taught: Rabbi says:<sup>11</sup> [The] ‘one ram’<sup>12</sup> spoken of here is the same ram which is mentioned in the Book of Numbers.<sup>13</sup> R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon says: Two rams are involved, one mentioned here, the other in the Book of Numbers. What is the ground of Rabbi's view? Because Scripture says: ‘One’. — And R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon: ‘One’ here means, the [unique] outstanding one of his flock. And Rabbi? — He infers that from, and all your choice vows.<sup>14</sup> And R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon? — One refers to obligatory offerings, the other to voluntary ones and [a statement concerning both] is necessary.<sup>15</sup>

HE WOULD SANCTIFY HIS HANDS AND FEET. Our Rabbis taught: And Aaron shall come in to the tent of meeting.<sup>16</sup> For what purpose does he enter? To fetch ladle and fire-pan

---

(1) Ibid. XXIX, 11.

(2) [Hence the additional offerings and the Daily afternoon whole-offering prescribed in Numbers are offered last].

(3) [Which implies that the he-goat offered outside is offered before his own ram and the ram of the people].

(4) [The he-goat whose blood is sprinkled outside and the he-goat, the sin-offering of the atonement, whose blood is sprinkled within].

(5) Sheb. 2a. Atonement is made by the he-goat whose blood is sprinkled outside, as well as by: Beside the sin-offering of atonement.

(6) Of the seven lambs.

(7) Which shews that the additional offerings were offered in conjunction with the Daily offering of the morning.

(8) Lev. XVI, 24. [How this implies that the additional offerings were to be offered in conjunction with the Daily offering of the evening is not clear. V. Strashun Glosses].

(9) His zeal for the service of the Day of Atonement will enable him to overcome any weakness that may supervene.

(10) Which is offered up on the Day of Atonement on behalf of the congregation.

(11) V. supra 3a.

(12) Lev. XVI, 5.

(13) Num. XXIX, 8.

(14) Deut. XII, 11.

(15) One could not have inferred the law that the choicest of animals have to be brought in the case of voluntary offerings from the obligatory ones, or vice versa, because to one view the former is preferable, more pleasing because spontaneous, whereas to the other the performance of one's duty takes preference. Hence two texts are necessary to include both kinds of offerings.

(16) Lev. XVI, 23.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 71a

for the whole portion here follows the order with the exception of this verse.<sup>1</sup> Why? — R. Hisda said: We have it on tradition<sup>2</sup> that the high priest underwent five immersions and ten sanctifications on that day. And if you were to say that they are recorded in their normal order, you would find but

three immersions and six Sanctifications.<sup>3</sup> To this R. Zera demurred: But perhaps<sup>4</sup> he interrupted [the service of the day] with the he-goat that was to be offered up outside? — Abaye replied: Scripture said, ‘He come forth and offer his burnt-offering’<sup>5</sup> i.e., on his first coming forth he is to offer his burnt-offering, and that of the people.<sup>5</sup> Raba said: Scripture said, And shall put off the linen garments [etc.].<sup>6</sup> . Now it was necessary [to add] ‘which he put on’, for can a man put off except what he had put on before? What then is the purpose of stating ‘which he put on’? I.e., which he had put on before.<sup>7</sup> — To this Rabba son of R. Shila demurred: But perhaps he interrupted with the he-goat to be offered up outside? — Surely it is written: ‘He come forth and offer, etc.’ — But is the rest of the section written in accord with the actual order? Surely the verses say: And the fat of the sin-offering shall he make smoke on the altar,<sup>8</sup> and then: And the bullock of the sin-offering and the goat of the sin-offering,<sup>9</sup> whereas we learned: HE WHO SEES THE HIGH PRIEST WHEN HE READS DOES NOT SEE THE BULLOCK AND THE HE-GOAT THAT ARE BURNT,<sup>10</sup> whereas the sacrificial portions of the sin-offering were smoked up afterwards?<sup>11</sup> — Read: From this passage on.<sup>12</sup> But what makes you find fault<sup>13</sup> with the verses, why don't you find fault with the Mishnah rather? — Said Abaye: Scripture states: And he that letteth go... and he that burneth,<sup>14</sup> i.e., just as the letting go takes place before, so does the burning.<sup>15</sup> — On the contrary! [Say:] Just as the burning takes place now,<sup>16</sup> so does the letting go take place now!<sup>17</sup> — ‘And he that letteth go’ implies [to that which was referred to] before.<sup>18</sup> Raba said, Scripture says: [But the goat . . . for Azazel] shall be set alive.<sup>19</sup> How long must it needs be set alive? Until the time of Atonement — Now when is the time of Atonement? At the time when the blood is sprinkled, not beyond it.<sup>20</sup>

When he who was to take [the he-goat] away came back and met the high priest in the street, he would say to him: Sir high priest, we have fulfilled your request. If he met him in his house, he would say to him: We have fulfilled the request of Him Who grants life to all who live.

Rabbah said: When Rabbis in Pumbeditha would take leave of each other, they would say: May He Who grants life to all who live, grant you a long, happy, and right life! — I shall walk before the Lord in the lands of the living.<sup>21</sup> Rab Judah said: That means the place of markets [public thoroughfare].<sup>22</sup> For length of days, and years of life, and peace, will they add to you.<sup>23</sup> But are there years, which are years of life, and years, which are not years of life? — R. Eleazar said: These are such years of man as have changed from evil to good.<sup>24</sup>

Unto you, O men, I call.<sup>25</sup> R. Berekiah said: They are the disciples of the wise, who resemble women, and do mighty deeds like man.<sup>26</sup>

R. Berekiah also said: If a man wishes to offer a libation upon the altar, let him fill the throat of the disciples of the wise with wine, as it is said: ‘Unto you, O men, [ishim]<sup>27</sup> I call’. Furthermore did R. Berekiah say: If a man sees that Torah ceases from his seed, let him marry the daughter of a disciple of the wise, as it is said: Though the root thereof wax old in the earth, and the stock thereof die in the ground

---

(1) The whole of chapter XVI of Leviticus describes the service of the Day of Atonement, as it actually took place, with the exception of v. 23 which, followed by the statement, And he shall bathe . . . and come forth, and offer his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of his people (v. 24), would cause one to infer that the high priest had first entered to fetch the ladle and the fire-pan, and afterwards had offered up his burnt-offering and that of his people; whereas actually he fetched ladle and fire-pan after having offered up these burnt-offerings. V. Supra 32b notes.

(2) The Mishnah cites the traditional number of immersions and sanctifications, supra 19a, 30a and 31a. Every change of garments necessitated two sanctifications and one immersion.

(3) And if one were to assume that the order is exactly described also in vv. 23-24 i.e., that the offering of the two burnt-offerings did not interrupt the service of the Day of Atonement by taking place before the fetching of ladle and fire-pan, then only three changes of garments would be involved, viz., the offering of the continual sacrifice of the morning, performed in the golden garments, the service of the day including the fetching of ladle and fire-pan, in white

garments, and the offering up of the two burnt-offerings and the rest of the service, in golden garments again, thus three changes involving but three immersions and six sanctifications. The Biblical account would thus contradict, or render impossible, the tradition as preserved in the Mishnah. To harmonize the two the interpretation is offered that in reality the offering of the burnt-offerings came between the service of the day and the fetching of censer and fire-pan, implying two more changes of garments; for the high priest would offer the two burnt-offerings in white garments, into which and from which he would change from and into the golden garments, so that the five traditional changes and immersions as well as the ten sanctifications traditionally reported are thus established: the continual offering of the morning, due in the golden garments, the service of the day in white ones, the offering up of the two burnt-offerings in the golden garments, the fetching of censer and fire-pan in the white ones, and finally, the additional sacrifices and the continual offering of the evening, in the golden ones.

(4) Since all that is required is harmony between the Mishnaic statement as to five immersions and six sanctifications, it is not necessarily the last suggestion that must be adopted. The he-goat to be offered up outside, prescribed in Num. XXIX, 11 ('the sin-offering of the atonement') too, required two immersions and four sanctifications, hence the number of sanctifications and immersions could be harmonized on this assumption too. The interruption of the service of the day with the he-goat of which no mention is made in the service of the day prescribed in Leviticus, would involve no rearrangement of the Biblical text, such as the first suggestion implied.

(5) Lev. XVI, 24 states that he offers up the two rams, his own and the people's, as soon as he has left the Holy of Holies. Whereas, if he were to have fetched the ladle and the coal-pan first, he would have offered them after his second coming forth from the Holy of Holies.

(6) Lev. XVI, 23. Raba does not endeavour to answer the question propounded by R. Zera, he endeavours to explain the Baraitha, which would emend the Scriptural account by having the order of the service interrupted as above.

(7) That was thus the second stripping off of the garments. Hence there must have been a change of garments between the service of the day and the fetching of the censer and coal-pan, whence it follows that this verse refers to the second stripping off of garments, and comes after the offering up of the two rams by the high priest.

(8) Lev. XVI, 25.

(9) Ibid. v. 27.

(10) Because the burning and the reading took place at the same time, which is when the priest is still wearing the white garments, in which as the Mishnah states he reads.

(11) I.e., at the third immersion when he offers the two rams, i.e., after changing into the golden garments (v. Mishnah supra 70a). This clearly contradicts the order of Biblical verses.

(12) Read, instead of 'except this verse', 'except from this verse on', when the Scriptural verses no more take into account the actual order.

(13) Why don't you rather emend the Mishnah and say that the burning of bullock and he-goat did not take place at the time the high priest read the portion from the Torah, but after the portions of the sin-offering had been smoked, as the Scriptural verses have it.

(14) Lev. XVI, 26 and 28.

(15) Scripture here uses the same participial form in referring to him that letteth go and to him that burneth. That implies a certain analogy. In both passages follows the statement: And the fat of the sin-offering shall he make smoke on the altar. (Ibid. v. 25.) Now the sending away of the he-goat for Azazel preceded that, as v. 21 reads: And he shall send him away by the hand of an appointed man into the wilderness. Of necessity 'He that letteth go' refers to previous passages, as to say: With reference to the letting go of which you were commanded before, i.e., before the smoking of the sacrificial portions of the sin-offering (he that letteth go defiles the garments). The above-mentioned analogy justifies the inference that 'he that burneth' similarly refers to the burning done before.

(16) I.e., after the smoking of his sacrificial portions.

(17) One could also argue just to the contrary, for the analogy could be made in either way: just as the burning takes place after the sacrificial pieces of the sin-offering have been smoked, thus is the reference to him that letteth go, for now. The statement in v. 21 'And he shall send it away' then means, now that the time for this has arrived.

(18) As explained in n. 3.

(19) Lev. XVI, 10: alive, to make atonement for him.

(20) Hence it could not be maintained that the he-goat was to be sent away after the portions of the sacrifice were smoked. That disposes of the last question.

(21) Ps, CXVI, 9.

(22) Markets may be lands of life, because there is much life in them, or because they furnish 'a living' to many.

(23) Prov. III, 2.

(24) When sunshine comes again, the memory of evil days is so obliterated that they do not seem to have been experienced, lived at all.

(25) Prov. VIII, 4.

(26) Study makes them weak, like women. But in the fields of halachah they are mighty heroes. This maxim is included here, because the word 'ish' (Sir high priest) recalls a homiletical interpretation of the same word elsewhere.

(27) Connecting ishim with ishe, fire-offerings.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 71b**

yet through the scent of water it will bud, and put forth boughs like a plant.<sup>1</sup>

AND A FESTIVE DAY HE WOULD ARRANGE FOR HIS FRIENDS: Our Rabbis taught: It happened with a high priest that as he came forth from the Sanctuary, all the people<sup>2</sup> followed him, but when they saw Shemayah<sup>3</sup> and Abtalion, they forsook him and went after Shemayah and Abtalion. Eventually Shemayah and Abtalion visited him, to take their leave of the high priest. He said to them: May the descendants of the heathen come in peace!<sup>4</sup> — They answered him: May the descendants of the heathen, who do the work of Aaron, arrive in peace, but the descendant of Aaron, who does not do the work of Aaron, he shall not come in peace!<sup>5</sup>

MISHNAH. THE HIGH PRIEST PERFORMS THE SERVICE IN EIGHT PIECES OF GARMENTS, AND THE COMMON PRIEST IN FOUR: IN TUNIC, DRAWERS, MITRE, AND GIRDLE. THE HIGH PRIEST ADDS THERETO THE BREASTPLATE, THE APRON, THE ROBE AND THE FRONTLET. IN THESE WERE THE URIM AND THUMMIM<sup>6</sup> INQUIRED OF. BUT THEY WERE NOT INQUIRED OF EXCEPT FOR THE KING, FOR THE AB BETH DIN<sup>7</sup> OR FOR ONE WHOM THE COMMUNITY NEEDS.<sup>8</sup>

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: [All] things, in connection with which the word shesh ['fine linen'] is said, had their threads sixfold: 'twined' [denotes] eightfold [threads]; the robe [had its threads] twelvefold; the curtain,<sup>9</sup> twenty-four-fold; the breastplate and apron twenty-eight-fold. Whence do we know that they had their threads sixfold? — Scripture said: And they made the tunics of fine linen, the mitre of fine linen and the goodly headtires of fine linen, and the linen breeches of fine twined linen.<sup>10</sup> Here are five Scriptural references: One is necessary for the subject itself, that they must be made of flax; one, that their thread shall be sixfold; one to indicate that they must be twisted; one, that this applies also to other garments in connection with which the term 'shesh' is not used, and once, that it is indispensable. What indicates that the word 'shesh' means flax? — R. Jose b. Hanina said: Scripture says: Bad [linen] i.e., whatever comes out of the soil singly.<sup>11</sup> But say, perhaps, it is wool? — Wool splits off.<sup>12</sup> But flax also splits? Flax splits into branches through beating.<sup>13</sup> Rabina said: [I infer it] from this. They shall have linen tires upon their heads, and shall have linen breeches upon their loins.<sup>14</sup> Said R. Ashi to him: But whence did they know that before Ezekiel came? — But, according to your argument, what of R. Hisda's statement: This matter<sup>15</sup> we have learnt not from the Torah of Moses, but from the words of Ezekiel b. Buzi: No alien, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into My sanctuary?<sup>16</sup> Who taught this before Ezekiel came? Rather must you say that it was traditionally handed down and when Ezekiel came he strengthened it by attaching it to Scripture; in our case [here] too it was a traditional teaching and Ezekiel strengthened it by attaching it to Scripture.

Whence do we know that 'twined' [denotes] eightfold [threads]? — Scripture says: And they made upon the skirts of the robe pomegranates of blue, and purple, and scarlet, twined.<sup>17</sup> One may infer from the analogy of 'twined' used in connection with the curtain: just as there [each twined thread] was twenty-four-fold,<sup>18</sup> so also here was it twenty-four-fold, the thread of each kind of

material being eightfold.<sup>19</sup> - But one should infer from breast-plate and apron: just as there it was twenty-eightfold, so also here twenty-eight-fold?<sup>20</sup> — One may infer a thing in connection with which gold is not mentioned from another thing, in connection with which gold is not mentioned;<sup>21</sup> that excludes the breast-plate and apron in connection with which gold is mentioned. On the contrary! One should, rather, infer concerning one garment from another garment, which would exclude the curtain, because that [in a sense] is a tent! — Rather, if it is inferred from the girdle,<sup>22</sup> thus inferring concerning a garment, in connection with which gold is not mentioned from another garment, in connection with which gold is not mentioned; but not inferring concerning anything, in connection with which gold is mentioned from something in connection with which gold is mentioned. R. Mari said: Scripture said: Thou shalt make it,<sup>23</sup> i.e., only, nothing else.<sup>24</sup> R. Ashi said: And thou shalt make,<sup>25</sup> i.e., all the work in connection therewith must be the same. Now how is that possible? If he were to make the three kinds tenfold each, there would be thirty [threads]. And if one made two ninefold and one tenfold, but Scripture said: ‘And thou shalt make’, i.e., all the work in connection therewith must be alike.

Whence do we know that the robe [had its threads] twelvefold? Because Scripture said: And thou shalt make the robe of the ephod

- 
- (1) Job XIV, 8, 9. The Torah is compared to water. Such fragrant water the children of the disciples of the wise will bring with them into the new home.
- (2) Lit., ‘world’.
- (3) They were the famous teachers of Hillel and Shammai of the Mishnah, v. Aboth I. Descendants of non-Jews, according to one tradition (Git. 57b), scions of Sennacherib's.
- (4) In this manner this graceless high priest gave vent to his jealous anger at the honour which the people had bestowed upon these masters of the Law.
- (5) Aaron pursued peace; his disciples, too, were very peaceful. So were Shemayah and Abtalion increasing peace in the world, but this high priest, whose arrogance caused strife, was not a worthy descendant of Aaron.
- (6) v. Ex. XXVIII, 30.
- (7) Lit., ‘Father of the Court’. V. Glos.
- (8) v. Mak. 11b.
- (9) V. Ex. XXVI, 31.
- (10) Ex. XXXIX, 27-8.
- (11) Bad from badad means single, single stalk. Bad also means linen; hence the interpretation using both homonyms. Similarly, shesh means both ‘fine linen’ and ‘six’, whence support for the teaching that it must be sixfold. Flax has no branches, but leaves, the flax coming from the middle stem.
- (12) On the sheep; does not grow in single threads like stalks.
- (13) Whilst normally it grows in single stalks.
- (14) Ezek. XLIV, 18, whilst in the Pentateuch these tires are prescribed to be of shesh which proves shesh to be flax.
- (15) That an uncircumcised priest (no matter whether uncircumcised because of disobedience to the Torah, which would render him also uncircumcised in heart, whose actions ‘alienate’ him from the Lord, or because his brethren had died as the result of circumcision, which circumstances would free him from the obligation of the circumcised) may not enter the Sanctuary.
- (16) Ezek. XLIV, 9.
- (17) Ex. XXXIX, 24.
- (18) [The curtain had four kinds of material, each having its thread sixfold, since the word shesh is mentioned in connection therewith, v. Ex. XXVI, 31. Thus each twined thread which consisted of the four materials was twenty-fourfold].
- (19) I.e., with the robe where only three kinds of materials were used, the threads of each strand had to be eightfold to make each twined thread of all the material twenty-eightfold].
- (20) As shewn infra.
- (21) I.e., the robe from the curtain neither of which had gold.
- (22) [Which also had four kinds of material each of sixfold threads, since shesh is written in connection therewith, v. Ex.

XXXIX, 29].

(23) Ex. XXVIII,15 is with reference to the breast-plate.

(24) Only breast-plate and apron, 'it', hence no precedence for any other garment, taking 'it' to indicate 'it' exclusively.

(25) Ex. XXVIII, 33, repeated in connection with the pomegranates, indicates that all the material used there must have been made alike. Hence it is impossible for the twined thread in the robe to be of a twenty-eightfold, as he goes on to explain.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 72a

plaited of blue.<sup>1</sup> And one may infer from the analogy of 'blue', used also in connection with the curtain, just as there [each of the materials had its threads]<sup>2</sup> sixfold, so also sixfold here.<sup>3</sup> But let us infer from the skirt and the pomegranates, just as there it was eightfold thus also here eightfold? — One may infer for one garment from another, but one may not infer for a garment from an adornment to a garment. On the contrary! One may infer concerning a matter from the matter itself,<sup>4</sup> but one may not infer for a thing from something outside thereof. For that reason we said:<sup>5</sup> One, to inform us concerning other garments in connection with which 'shesh' is not used. The curtain twenty-fourfold. Four [strands of material] each of sixfold [threads], there being here neither controversy nor decision.<sup>6</sup>

Whence do we know that [each twined thread of] breast-plate and apron was twenty-eightfold? Because it is written: And thou shalt make a breast-plate of judgment, the work of the skillful workman; like the work of the ephod thou shalt make it; of gold, of blue and purple, and scarlet and fine twined linen<sup>7</sup> — four kinds of material, each sixfold, amount to twenty-four threads, and of the gold, one thread to each of the sixfold threads of the four materials, four [threads], together twenty-eightfold [twine]. Perhaps the gold too was sixfold? — R. Aha b. Jacob said: Scripture said: And they [did beat the gold into thin plates and] cut it into threads — that means four.<sup>8</sup> R. Ashi said: Scripture states: To work it in the blue and in the purple.<sup>9</sup> How should that be done? Shall one make [the gold] four times in twofold, that would amount to eight [fold gold threads]! Shall one make it twice twofold and twice a one single thread? — Surely the word 'make' indicates that all the work in connection therewith must be alike!

Rehaba said in the name of R. Judah: One who makes a tear in priestly garments is to be punished with lashes, for Scripture said: That it be not rent.<sup>10</sup> R. Aha b. Jacob demurred to this: Perhaps this is what the Divine Law Says: Make a hem lest it be torn?<sup>11</sup> — But is it written: Lest it be torn?

R. Eleazar said: One who removes the breast-plate from the apron, or who removes the staves of the ark receives the punishment of lashes, because it was said: That it be not loosed from the ephod,<sup>12</sup> and [the staves] they shall not be removed from it.<sup>13</sup> — To this R. Aha b. Jacob demurred: But perhaps this is what the Divine Law says: Fasten them and arrange them properly [by forcing the chords through the ring], so that they 'be not loosed', or that they 'be not removed'? — Is it written: 'that they be not loosed' or 'that they be not removed'?

R. Jose b. Hanina pointed out a contradiction. It is written: The staves shall be in the rings of the ark: they shall not be taken from it,<sup>12</sup> and it is also written: The staves thereof shall be put into the rings.<sup>14</sup> How is that possible? They were movable, but could not slip off.<sup>15</sup> Thus also was it taught: 'The staves shall be in the rings of the ark'. One might have assumed that they could not be moved from their place. Therefore the text reads: 'And the staves thereof shall be put into the rings'. If I had this verse [to go by] one might have assumed that they could be taken out and put in again. Therefore the text says: 'the staves shall be in the rings of the ark'. How that now? They were movable but could not slip off.

R. Hama b. Hanina said: What is the meaning of the verse: [Thou shalt make the boards of the

tabernacle] of acacia wood, standing up,<sup>16</sup> i.e., they should stand up, even as they grow.<sup>17</sup> Another interpretation: 'Standing up — i.e., they kept up [the gold] they were overlaid with.'<sup>18</sup> Another interpretation: 'Standing up' — one might assume; Their hope [of restoration] is gone,<sup>19</sup> their expectation is frustrated, therefore the text says: 'Standing up, i.e., standing up for ever and ever.

Rabbi Hama b. Hanina said: What is the meaning of the text: The plaited

- 
- (1) E.V. 'all of blue', *ibid.* 31.
  - (2) V. *supra* p. 341, n. 8.
  - (3) [And the term plaited' implies at least another strand of six threads, hence twelvefold].
  - (4) Skirt and pomegranates are part of the upper garment, hence an inference from them appears more legitimate.
  - (5) V. *supra* p. 340.
  - (6) That is too simple for any dispute, requires no case, and no judge to sit upon it.
  - (7) Ex. XXVIII, 15.
  - (8) *Ibid.* XXXIX, 3. Threads being plural means at least two. When these are cut, at least, or—since there is no qualifying suggestion—four.
  - (9) *Ibid.* [This implies that there must be an admixture of gold with every kind of material].
  - (10) *Ibid.* XXVIII, 32. Since a precaution is prescribed to prevent a rent, obviously the rending thereof is prohibited and transgressions as with any other not otherwise specified offence, incur punishment of lashes.
  - (11) It is a precautionary command but its significance is not that of a prohibition, the transgression of which implies punishment by lashing.
  - (12) Ex. XXVIII, 28.
  - (13) *Ibid.* XXV, 15.
  - (14) *Ibid.* XXVII, 7. (Rashi quotes *Ibid.* XXV, 14). The first passage indicated immovability, the other adjustment, which implies contradiction.
  - (15) The staves at their ends were thicker than the rings, hence could be moved, but not removed entirely.
  - (16) *Ibid.* XXVI, 15.
  - (17) The top on top.
  - (18) [I.e., without the need of nails. V. D.S. a.l.].
  - (19) The hope for restoration is found buttressed by the implication of the text.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 72b

garments for ministering in the holy place.<sup>1</sup> But for the priestly garments, there would not have remained of the haters<sup>2</sup> of Israel one to remain or to escape.<sup>3</sup> R. Samuel b. Nahmani said: In the school of R. Simeon it was taught: [They were] webs which they cut off the looms in the shape required, leaving a small portion of the unwoven thread.<sup>4</sup> What was that? — Resh Lakish said: It was needle-work.<sup>5</sup>

An objection was raised.<sup>6</sup> 'All priestly garments must not be made by needle-work, but by weaving', as it is said: woven work!<sup>7</sup> — Abaye said: This applies only to their sleeves, as it was taught: The sleeves of the priestly garments were woven apparently and then attached to the garment.<sup>8</sup> They reached up to the wrist.

Rehaba said in the name of Rab Judah: Three arks did Bezalel make: the middle one of wood, nine [handbreadths] high; the inner one of gold, eight high, the outer one of gold,<sup>9</sup> a little more than ten high. But it was taught: A little more than eleven [high]?— That is no contradiction: the one opinion agrees with the view that the thickness thereof<sup>10</sup> was one handbreadth, the other was in accord with the view that the thickness thereof was not one handbreadth.<sup>11</sup> And what purpose served the 'little more'?<sup>12</sup> — It is the space of the crown.<sup>13</sup>

R. Johanan said: There were three crowns: that of the altar, that of the ark, and that of the table.

The one of the altar Aaron deserved and he received it. The one of the ark, David deserved and received. The one of the ark is still lying and whosoever wants to take it, may come and take it.<sup>14</sup> Perhaps you might think it is of little account, therefore the text reads: By me kings reign.<sup>15</sup>

R. Johanan pointed out a contradiction. It is written: Zar [alien] and we read it: zir? i.e., [crown] — If he deserves it, it becomes a wreath unto him; if not it remains alien to him.<sup>16</sup> R. Johanan pointed out another contradiction. It is written: Make thee an ark of wood,<sup>17</sup> and it is also written: And they shall make an ark of acacia wood?<sup>18</sup> Hence one learns that the inhabitants of his city are obliged to do the work of the scholar for him.

Within and without shalt thou overlay it.<sup>19</sup> Raba said: Any scholar whose inside is not like his outside, is no scholar.<sup>20</sup> Abaye, or, as some say, Rabbah b. ‘Ulla said: He is called abominable, as it is said: How much less one that is abominable and impure, man who drinketh iniquity like water.<sup>21</sup> R. Samuel b. Nahmani, in the name of R. Jonathan: What is the meaning of the scriptural statement: Wherefore is there a price in the hand of a fool, to buy wisdom, seeing he hath no understanding,<sup>22</sup> i.e., woe unto the enemies of the scholars,<sup>23</sup> who occupy themselves with the Torah, but have no fear of heaven! R. Jannai proclaimed: Woe unto him who has no court, but makes a gateway for his court!<sup>24</sup> Raba said to the Sages: I beseech you, do not inherit a double Gehinnom!<sup>25</sup>

R. Joshua b. Levi said: What is the meaning of the Scriptural verse: And this is the law which Moses set [before the children of Israel]?<sup>26</sup> — If he is meritorious it becomes for him a medicine of life, if not, a deadly poison. That is what Raba [meant when he] said: If he uses it the right way it is a medicine of life unto him; he who does not use it the right way, it is a deadly poison.

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said: R. Jonathan pointed out the following contradiction: it is written: The precepts of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart,<sup>27</sup> but it is also written: The word of the Lord is tried?<sup>28</sup> If he is meritorious, it rejoices him; if not, it tries him.<sup>29</sup> Resh Lakish said: From the body of the same passage this can be derived: If he is meritorious, it tests him unto life; if not, it tests him unto death.<sup>30</sup> The fear of the Lord is pure, enduring forever.<sup>31</sup> R. Hanina said: This refers to one who studies the Torah in purity. What does that mean? — He marries a woman and afterwards studies the Torah.<sup>32</sup>

The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.<sup>33</sup> R. Hiyya b. Abba said: It [the Torah] may be entrusted to testify as to those who study it. ‘The work of the skillful workman<sup>34</sup> . . . the work of the skillful embroiderer.<sup>35</sup> R. Eleazar said: Those embroidered over what they had traced. It was taught in the name of R. Nehemiah: The embroiderer's is needle-work, therefore it has only one [visible] figure. The designer's is weaving work, therefore it has two different figures.<sup>36</sup>

IN THESE WERE THE URIM AND THUMMIM INQUIRED OF. When R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he said: In the garments wherein the high priest officiates, the [priest] Anointed for Battle officiates, as it is said: And the holy garments of Aaron shall be for his sons after him,<sup>37</sup> i.e., for him who comes after him in greatness [of office]. R. Adda b. Ahabah, some say Kadi, raised an objection: One might have assumed that the son of the Anointed for Battle succeeds him in service, even as the son of the high priest succeeds him in service,

---

(1) Ex. XXXV, 19.

(2) Euphemistic for Israel — a calamity is foreshadowed only in indirect fashion.

(3) The root sarad (to plant) also means ‘leaving over’, hence the interpretation: the garments of escape, because they brought atonement for Israel, thereby preventing their extinction.

(4) Here the term is explained as the garments, one part of which was left over unwoven, or unmade.

(5) [This is difficult, nor is the text apparently quite in order. According to Rashi the meaning is, what is done with the unwoven remnant? And the answer is that it is cut off, woven separately and then sewn on to the main garment].

- (6) Zeb. 88a.
- (7) Ex. XXVIII, 32.
- (8) According to Resh Lakish, then, the unwoven remnant would be used in connection with the sleeves.
- (9) Reading with Bah.
- (10) Of the outer ark.
- (11) [In order to understand the distinction thus drawn, it is well to remember that the three arks were open at the top; consequently if the thickness of the outer one was less than one handbreadth, a height of ten handbreadths and a little more would suffice: nine handbreadths corresponding to the height of the middle ark (when measured from without) and a fraction of a handbreadth to allow for the thickness of the outer ark at the bottom, while one extra handbreadth was necessary for the mercy seat which was inserted between the two side boards of the outer ark to rest upon the thickness of the sides of the two smaller arks. If, however, the thickness of the outer ark was one handbreadth, its height, measured from outside would then have to be at least ten handbreadths whilst for the purpose of the mercy seat an extra handbreadth would be necessary, making a total of eleven. As to the need of the 'little more' this will be explained soon. V. Rashi].
- (12) Mentioned in the Baraitha, v. supra n. 1.
- (13) [V. Ex. XXV, 11. The side boards of the outer ark projected beyond the mercy seat that was inserted between them (cf. n. 1), a kind of rim (crown)].
- (14) Aaron, the first high priest, obtained the crown of priesthood, symbolized by the altar; David, the crown of kingdom; but there is no hereditary crown of learning, it must be acquired by each individual. The aspirants, however, are not many, hence it is still lying unclaimed.
- (15) Prov. VIII, 15. Wisdom is identified with Torah, through which it is acquired.
- (16) The Hebrew spelling of wreath may include the letter 'yod', without it the word might be read 'zar', stranger, hence the illustrative suggestion.
- (17) Deut. X, 1.
- (18) Ex. XXV, 10.
- (19) Ibid. II.
- (20) Inside and outside there should be the same golden character.
- (21) Job XV, 16; rendered, one who drinketh the water of the Torah and yet has iniquity in him.
- (22) Prov. XVII, 16. Wisdom is knowledge of the Torah, understanding is moral rightness, based on fear of heaven. Hence this interpretation.
- (23) Euphemism for 'scholars'.
- (24) Fear of the Lord is the court, the goal. Learning should lead to it. Learning (the gateway) without reverence (the goal) is wasteful, sinful.
- (25) The Mishnah, Aboth VI, indicates that acquisition of the Torah depends upon a frugal way of living, a reduction of the margin of joy to a minimum. The reward is to come in after-life. Such reward depends upon reaching the goal of study; fear of heaven. One who now engages in Torah-study without possessing fear of heaven, suffers in this world, wherein he denies himself pleasure for the sake of his study, as well as in the other world, where because he had no fear of heaven, reward will be denied, punishment inflicted.
- (26) Deut. IV, 44.
- (27) Ps. XIX, 9.
- (28) Ibid. XVIII, 31.
- (29) Here the part. passive is interpreted as active, 'tested' becomes 'testing'.
- (30) It tries and refines him, so that he lives a finer life. It tries him by suffering, which ultimately destroys him.
- (31) Ps. XIX, 10.
- (32) So that he is undisturbed by impure thoughts.
- (33) Ibid. 8.
- (34) Ex. XXVI, 31.
- (35) Ibid. v. 1.
- (36) On the two sides of the cloth.
- (37) Ibid. XXIX, 29.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 73a

therefore the text reads: Seven days shall the son that is priest in his stead put them on, even he who cometh into the tent of meeting [etc.],<sup>1</sup> i.e., he who is worthy of entering the tent of meeting. Now if this were the case,<sup>2</sup> then he too would be fit [to enter the tent of meeting]? — R. Nahman b. Isaac said: This is what it means: Whosoever was mainly anointed for the [purpose of] the tent of meeting, that excludes him who was anointed mainly for Battle.

The following objection was raised: The Anointed for Battle officiates neither in four garments, like a common priest, nor in eight like a high priest? — Abaye said: Would you render him then a common man?<sup>3</sup> Rather: Neither like a high priest, for the sake of preventing ill-feeling;<sup>4</sup> nor like a common priest, because one promotes to a higher degree of sanctity, but one must not degrade'. R. Adda b. Ahabah said to Raba: But there is a Tanna who pays no attention to the prevention of ill-feeling, yet according to him, he does not officiate?<sup>5</sup> For it was taught:<sup>6</sup> In the following points a high priest differs from a common priest: the bullock of the priest anointed;<sup>7</sup> and the bullock due in case of [unwitting] transgression of any commandment;<sup>8</sup> the bullock of the Day of Atonement; the tenth of the ephah;<sup>9</sup> he does not unbind his hair, nor rend his clothes.<sup>10</sup> But he [the high priest] tears his garments from below, and the common priest tears his from above; he must not defile himself for his [deceased] relatives;<sup>11</sup> he is under obligation to marry only a virgin;<sup>12</sup> is prohibited from marrying a widow;<sup>13</sup> causes the slayer to return;<sup>14</sup> as onen [mourner]<sup>15</sup> he may offer up a sacrifice but may not eat or take a share thereof; he receives his portion first and takes first part in the offering [of the sacrifice]; he officiates in eight garments; is exempt<sup>16</sup> [from a sacrifice] for [an unwitting transgression of] defilement relating to the Sanctuary and its hallowed thing, and the whole service of the Day of Atonement is legitimate only when performed by him. All these [laws] apply also to priests consecrated by a larger number of official garments, with the exception of the bullock to be offered up for the transgression of any commandment. All these apply to the high priest who has passed from his high priesthood,<sup>17</sup> with the exception of the bullock of the Day of Atonement and the tenth of the ephah. All these things do not apply to the priest Anointed for Battle, with the exception of five matters mentioned in that portion of the section: he does not unbind his hair, nor rend his clothes; nor defile himself with any [deceased] relative; is obliged to marry a virgin; forbidden to marry a widow; and causes the slayer to return-according to R. Judah; whereas, according to the Sages, he does not cause him to return.<sup>18</sup> Whence does he [the Tanna] consider [the question of] enmity [to arise]? Only with regard to one of similar rank.<sup>19</sup> But with one of inferior rank he does consider it.<sup>20</sup>

R. Abbahu was sitting and reporting this teaching in the name of R. Johanan, whereupon R. Ammi and R. Assi averted their faces.<sup>21</sup> (Some say it was R. Hiyya b. Abba who reported this teaching, whereupon R. Ammi and R. Assi averted their faces). To this R. Papa demurred: Granted [that they could not say anything against] R. Abbahu, because of the high regard the Imperial house had for him, but as for R. Hiyya b. Abba, they should have told him explicitly that R. Johanan had not said so!

When Rabin came, he said: This<sup>22</sup> was stated with reference to the time when he is consulted.<sup>23</sup> Thus also was it taught: The garments which the high priest wears when he officiates the Anointed for Battle wears when he is consulted.

Our Rabbis taught: How were [the Urim and Thummim] inquired of? — The inquirer had his face directed to him who was consulted, and the latter directed himself to the Divine Presence. The inquirer said: Shall I pursue after this troop?<sup>24</sup> He who was consulted answered: 'Thus saith the Lord: Go up and succeed'! R. Judah said: He need not say, 'This saith the Lord' but only 'Go up and succeed' — One does not inquire in a loud voice, as it is said: Who shall inquire for him;<sup>25</sup> neither shall one but think thereof in one's heart, as it is said: 'Who shall inquire for him';<sup>25</sup> but rather in the manner in which Hannah spoke in her prayer, as it is said: Now Hannah, she spoke in her heart.<sup>26</sup>

One should not put two questions at the same time; if one has done so, only one [question] is answered; and only the first [question] is answered, as it is said: Will the men of Keilah deliver me up into his hand? Will Saul come down,<sup>27</sup> etc. . . . and the Lord said.' He will come down.<sup>27</sup> But you said: Only the first [question] is answered? — David had asked

- 
- (1) I.e., on the Day of Atonement. Ibid. v. 30.
  - (2) That the Anointed for Battle officiates in eight garments.
  - (3) I.e., a non-priest.
  - (4) It is only Rabbinic enactment that interferes therewith, because of the desire of the Sages to prevent ill-feeling. By the law of the Torah, the Anointed for Battle could officiate.
  - (5) In the eight garments.
  - (6) Mishnah Hor. III, 4,5.
  - (7) Rashi and others omit, as this is the same as the item that follows.
  - (8) V. Lev. IV, 3.
  - (9) Ibid. VI, 13: This is the offering of Aaron and his sons . . . in the day when he is anointed: the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a meal-offering.
  - (10) In the case of mourning.
  - (11) Lev. XXI, 11. These relatives include father, mother, wife, son and daughter, brother or sister.
  - (12) Ibid. v. 13.
  - (13) Ibid. v. 14.
  - (14) When the priest dies, the slayer without intent returns from the city of refuge. Num. XXXV, 10ff.
  - (15) For (Lev. XXI, 12): Neither shall he go out of the Sanctuary. He is called 'onen', whilst his dead lie unburied on the day of death.
  - (16) V. Hor. 12b.
  - (17) Who acted as substitute for the high priest, v. supra 12b.
  - (18) Though this Tanna does not consider here the question of ill-feeling, since he rules that the high priest who passed from his high priesthood continues to officiate with eight garments, and yet the Anointed for Battle he permits the use only of four garments.
  - (19) The substitute enjoyed the same rank as the high priest.
  - (20) The Anointed for Battle is of inferior rank to the high priest, and the donning of eight garments would arouse ill-feeling in the high priest.
  - (21) Refusing to accept the report that R. Johanan had said this.
  - (22) The statement that the Anointed for Battle wears the same eight garments which are the high priest's official garb.
  - (23) By means of the Urim and Thummim.
  - (24) I Sam. XXX, 8.
  - (25) Num. XXVII, 21.
  - (26) I Sam. I, 13.
  - (27) Ibid. XXIII, 11.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 73b**

in wrong order and received his answer in right order.<sup>1</sup> And as soon as he knew that he had asked in wrong order, he asked again in right order, as it is said: Will the men of Keilah deliver up me and my men in to the hand of Saul? And the Lord said.' They will deliver thee up.<sup>2</sup> But if the occasion required both questions, both were answered, as it is said: And David inquired of the Lord, saying: Shall I pursue after this troop? Shall I overtake them? And He answered him: pursue; for thou shalt surely overtake them and shalt without fail recover all.<sup>3</sup> And although the decree of a prophet could be revoked, the decree of the 'Urim and Thummim' could not be revoked, as it is said: By the judgment of the Urim. Why were they called 'Urim and Thummim'? 'Urim' because they made their words enlightening.<sup>4</sup> 'Thummim' because they fulfil their words. And if you should ask: Why did they not fulfil their words in Gibeah Benjamin?<sup>5</sup> It is because they did not inquire<sup>6</sup> [whether the result would be] victory or defeat.<sup>7</sup> But at last, when conquered, they [the Urim and Thummim]

approved their action, as it is said: And Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, stood before it in those days, saying: 'Shall I yet again go out to battle against the children of Benjamin my brother, or shall I cease?' and the Lord said: Go up, for tomorrow I will deliver him into thy hand.<sup>8</sup>

How was it effected? — R. Johanan said: [The letters] stood forth.<sup>9</sup> Resh Lakish said: They joined each other. But the 'Zade' was missing?<sup>10</sup> R. Samuel b. Isaac said: They contained also the names of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. But the 'Teth', too, was missing? — R. Aha b. Jacob said: They contained also the words: The 'tribes'<sup>11</sup> of Jeshurun.

An objection was raised: No priest was inquired of who does not speak by means of the Holy Spirit and upon whom the Divine Presence does not rest, for Zadok inquired and succeeded, whilst Abiathar inquired and failed, as it is said: But Abiathar went up until all the people had done passing out of the city?<sup>12</sup> — He helped along.<sup>13</sup>

AND ONE INQUIRED ONLY FOR A KING. Whence do we know these things? — R. Abbahu said: Scripture said, And he shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall inquire for him by the judgment of the Urim;<sup>14</sup> 'he' i.e., the king, 'and all the children of Israel with him', i.e., the [priest] Anointed for Battle, 'even all the congregation', that is the Sanhedrin.

## CHAPTER VIII

MISHNAH. ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IT IS FORBIDDEN TO EAT, TO DRINK, TO WASH, TO ANOINT ONESELF, TO PUT ON SANDALS,<sup>15</sup> OR TO HAVE MARITAL INTERCOURSE.<sup>16</sup> A KING OR BRIDE<sup>17</sup> MAY WASH THE FACE, AND A WOMAN AFTER CHILDBIRTH<sup>18</sup> MAY PUT ON SANDALS. THIS IS THE VIEW OF R. ELIEZER. THE SAGES, HOWEVER, FORBID IT. IF ONE EATS THE BULK OF A LARGE DATE, THE LIKE THEREOF, WITH ITS STONE INCLUDED, OR IF HE DRANK A MOUTHFUL, HE IS CULPABLE.<sup>19</sup> ANY FOODS COMPLEMENT ONE ANOTHER IN MAKING UP THE BULK OF A DATE, AND ALL THE LIQUIDS COMPLEMENT ONE ANOTHER IN MAKING UP A MOUTHFUL, BUT WHAT A MAN EATS AND DRINKS DOES NOT GO TOGETHER.<sup>20</sup>

GEMARA. [Merely] FORBIDDEN? But surely punished with extirpation?<sup>21</sup> — R. Ela, or as some say, R. Jeremiah, said: This refers only to less than the legal quantity.<sup>22</sup> That will be right according to the view that even less than legal quantity is for — bidden by the law of the Torah, but what can be said according to the view that less than the legal quantity is permitted by the law of the Torah? For it was said: As for less than the legal quantity, R. Johanan holds it forbidden by the law of the Torah, but Resh Lakish considers it permitted by the law of the Torah. Now [the above answer] would be right according to R. Johanan, but what can be said according to Resh Lakish? — Resh Lakish would agree that [less than the legal quantity] is forbidden by [decree of] the Rabbis.<sup>23</sup> If that be the case, one should not be liable on account thereof to offer a sacrifice for an oath,<sup>24</sup> why then did we learn:<sup>25</sup> [If one had sworn] an oath not to eat carrion, trefah things,<sup>26</sup> abominable<sup>27</sup> or creeping things, and then had eaten thereof, he is culpable? R. Simeon holds him not culpable. And we raised the point in connection therewith: Why should he be culpable? Surely he stands committed to the oath<sup>28</sup> from Mount Sinai on! [And] Rab, Samuel and R. Johanan [in reply] said [it is a case] when he includes things permitted in the oath touching foods forbidden,<sup>29</sup> whereas Resh Lakish said: This cannot be explained except where he either expressly refers to less than the legal quantity, and that in accord with the view of the Sages,<sup>30</sup> or that he made a general statement

---

(1) He should have asked first: Will Saul come down? Then, Will they deliver me up?

(2) I Sam. XXIII, 12.

(3) Ibid. XXX, 8.

(4) Ety. 'Urim' - lights. 'Thummim' - tam-to be complete, perfect; here true, fulfilled.

- (5) Judg. XX.
- (6) [The text of cur. edd. is not clear and the rendering follows the reading of MS.M. Rashi, on the basis of the present text, explains: They (the Urim and Thummim) did not state clearly, etc.].
- (7) The single question was who should lead them.
- (8) Judg. XX, 28.
- (9) The names of the twelve sons of Jacob were inscribed on the Urim and Thummim. The answer always came through the letters which stood in relief.
- (10) The names of the twelve sons did not include that letter.
- (11) The Hebrew of which includes a teth.
- (12) II Sam. XV, 24. [This is explained, that he retired from the priesthood because he received no reply from the Urim and Thummim. This in turn would indicate that it is the Holy Spirit resting on the priest that gives that reply and not the letters of the Oracle].
- (13) By the priests' merit the oracle came forth.
- (14) Num. XXVII, 21.
- (15) Or any shoes of leather. Tosef. Yoma IV: 'Even cloth-shoes'.
- (16) The term literally means 'use of the bed'.
- (17) Within the first month after the wedding.
- (18) Lit., 'one reconvalescing', whose health is still delicate and to whom a cold may prove dangerous. Leather shoes will protect her against such contingency.
- (19) V. Lev. XXIII, 29.
- (20) To make up the culpable quantity.
- (21) The term forbidden may mean: either unlawful but, de facto, unpunished; or normally: punished with lashes. But transgression by eating would be punished with extirpation, kareth (v. Glos.).
- (22) Lit., 'half the standard'. The usual legal quantity of forbidden foods is the bulk of an olive; on the Day of Atonement, the bulk of a big date. Any less than that, though the eating thereof does not involve one in the prescribed punishment, nevertheless constitutes a transgression. That is what the Mishnah indicates by the term 'forbidden' i.e., in any quantity.
- (23) Even though less than the legal minimum does not involve punishment according to Biblical law, or indeed, may not be forbidden at all, Rabbinical law, as a fence around the laws of the Torah, may declare less than a minimum forbidden, or punishable, too. The dispute between R. Johanan and Resh Lakish would hinge on the question as to whether forbidden foods are so considered in any quantity, however small, or whether the term 'eating' etc. implies a definite minimum below which no transgression at all can be said to have taken place.
- (24) I.e., if someone has sworn that he would not eat less than the legal quantity of a forbidden food. Since that food is forbidden, he has, as it were, already sworn on Mount Sinai, not to eat it; the present oath, therefore, has no force, for the transgression of which no sin-offering is necessary (v. Shebu. 27a).
- (25) Shebu. 21a.
- (26) The word trefah. lit., 'torn', means any kind of abnormal, irregular, ritually inadmissible food. Nebelah 'carrion' refers to the flesh of animals which had died a natural death, or in connection with the ritual slaughtering of which a basic mistake or irregularity had been committed.
- (27) Lev. XI, 11, 31, 42, 46.
- (28) Israel swore their allegiance to the Torah, and that oath binds every Israelite.
- (29) Had he sworn not to eat forbidden things, such oaths would imply his non-culpability in case of transgression, i.e., as far as the oath is concerned. But, by including things permitted, he swears an oath, the effect of which is to prohibit for him the eating of otherwise permissible foods. Hence the transgression implies the obligation of sacrifice.
- (30) The Sages hold that an oath 'I will not eat a certain thing' implies 'I will not eat as much as the legal minimum', hence he could be guilty in the case of having eaten less than that only if he had expressly stated: I shall not eat anything at all of that food, his special declaration investing his oath with validity in the case of an infinitesimal amount of the food now forbidden to himself.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 74a**

and in accord with R. Akiba, who said that a man may prohibit to himself anything in any quantity,<sup>1</sup>

however small.<sup>2</sup> And if you would say that since it is permitted by the Torah, [the law relating to the] sacrifice for an oath is operative,<sup>3</sup> surely we learned: An 'oath of testimony'<sup>4</sup> applies only to those qualified to bear witness;<sup>5</sup> and we raised the point: what does that mean to exclude, whereupon R. Papa said: This excludes a king, and R. Aha b. Jacob said: This excludes a professional dice-gambler.<sup>6</sup> Now a dice-player, as far as Biblical law is concerned, is qualified to bear witness and only the Rabbis declared him unfit, and yet an oath does not apply to him?<sup>7</sup> There it is different, for Scripture said: If he do not utter it,<sup>8</sup> and this man cannot make a [valid] utterance.<sup>9</sup>

Now would you say that wherever the punishment is extirpation the term 'forbidden' is not used?<sup>10</sup> Surely it was taught: Although the term 'forbidden' was used in connection with all of them,<sup>11</sup> the punishment of extirpation applies only to him who eats or drinks, or engages in labour? — This is what is said: When the term 'forbidden' is used, it is applied but to less than the legal minimum, but where the legal minimum has been transgressed the punishment involved is extirpation; and also extirpation is the penalty, that is the case only with him who eats or drinks or engages in labour. Or, if you like, say: When [the Mishnah] uses the term 'forbidden', it refers to the rest [of the transgressions],<sup>12</sup> for Rabbah and R. Joseph taught in the other books of the School of Rab:<sup>13</sup> Whence do we know that it is forbidden on the Day of Atonement to anoint oneself, to wash, to put on shoes, and to have marital intercourse? Therefore the text reads: [It] is a Sabbath of solemn rest [unto you].<sup>14</sup> [To turn to] the main text: As for the matter of less than the legal minimum, R. Johanan said: It is forbidden by Biblical law, whilst Resh Lakish said: It is permitted by Biblical law. R. Johanan said, It is forbidden by Biblical law; since it could be joined [to form a minimum] it is forbidden food that he is eating. Resh Lakish said: It is permitted by Biblical law, for the Divine Law speaks of eating and this is not [eating].<sup>15</sup> — R. Johanan raised the following objection against Resh Lakish: I know only that whatsoever involves punishment is subject to a prohibition; but in the case of the koy,<sup>16</sup> and what is less than the legal minimum, since they do not involve punishment, I might say that they are not subject to a prohibition either, therefore the text reads: No fat.<sup>17</sup> — This is only Rabbinical and the text [adduced] is but a mere support. And that is also logical. For if one should assume that the prohibition is Biblical, surely [the status of] the koy is doubtful and no Scriptural text is necessary to cover a doubtful<sup>18</sup> case! — Were it only for this there would be no argument, they would hold

---

(1) R. Akiba, on the other hand, holds that a legal minimum exists only in the case of foods etc. forbidden by the Torah, whereas a man who forbids himself by oath any kind of permitted food, implies that he would not partake of any quantity, however small, thereof.

(2) Now, if Resh Lakish held that even less than the legal minimum is forbidden by Rabbinical decree, then how could he endeavour to explain the case of the man taking the oath as applying to one eating less than the legal minimum? For, since he is interdicted to eat by the law of Deut. XVII, 11: According to the law which they shall teach thee ... thou shalt do . . . thou shalt not turn aside... to the right hand or to the left, from eating food Rabbinically forbidden, his oath is inoperative, hence does not oblige him to offer a sacrifice for his transgression thereof.

(3) Shebu. 30a. The answer of Resh Lakish would endeavour to make a distinction between things forbidden by the Torah, the oath re-forbidding the same to oneself would be considered inoperative and would free the swearer, in the case of transgression, from the obligation to offer up a sacrifice — and things permitted by the Torah, to which the oath could apply, so that if one swore not to eat less than the legal minimum which, because below the legal quantity, would be permitted by the law of the Torah and forbidden only by Rabbinic decree, the oath would operate, and in the case of transgression he would have to bring a sacrifice.

(4) Lev. V, 1f.

(5) V. Shebu. 30a.

(6) The king can neither testify, nor be testified against, because of his exalted position; the gambler cannot testify, because his profession renders him, hence his statements or pledges, untrustworthy.

(7) By Biblical law one is considered a robber only if one actually robs from one's hand, as in II Sam. XXIII, 21 where the technical term 'gazal', rob, is used: He (plucked — lit., 'robbed') the spear out of his hand; v. also B.K. 79b. So that, if the oath does not apply to a gambler, although by Biblical law, he is not prevented from testifying, the proposed

distinction is unjustified.

(8) Lev. V, 1.

(9) It means: One whose utterance not merely means speech, but words of meaning, words to be trusted, whereas this gambler's words, since he is untrustworthy, are, legally speaking, no utterance at all.

(10) As insufficient, hence misleading; this being the reason for the first question here in the Gemara.

(11) All the things forbidden, as enumerated in our Mishnah.

(12) Not eating and drinking.

(13) From the School of Rab emanated halachical commentaries not only on Leviticus, but on Numbers and Deuteronomy as well.

(14) Lev. XVI,31 interpreted here as solemn rest not only from work, but from the usual occupations, such as eating, drinking, washing, anointing and having marital intercourse. Just as the term 'solemn day of rest' in connection with the Sabbath is, by the Sages, interpreted as including all manner of work, even not employed in connection with the building of the Sanctuary, so does that term here imply affliction by rest, as above.

(15) Since below the minimum it may be nibbling, but it is eating that is forbidden.

(16) A kind of bearded deer or antelope (Jast.). It is left undecided as to whether it belongs to the genus of cattle, the tallow of which is forbidden, or to beasts of chase, the tallow of which is permitted.

(17) Lev. VII, 23. This proves that less than a legal minimum is prohibited by the Torah.

(18) Since there is no doubt before the Divine Lawgiver, no Scriptural text would be necessary to cover a doubtful situation.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 74b

the koy is a creature by itself. For if you were not to say so, how could R. Idi b. Abin say: 'Also all' includes the koy,<sup>1</sup> since the koy is a doubtful case and surely no Scriptural text is necessary to cover doubtful cases. Hence [what you must say is] a 'creature by itself' is a different case, thus also here [say] 'a creature by itself' is a different case.

Our Rabbis taught: Ye shall afflict your souls.<sup>2</sup> One might assume that one must sit in heat or cold in order to afflict oneself, therefore the text reads: And ye shall do no manner of work;<sup>2</sup> just as the [prohibition of] labour [means]: sit and do nothing, so does [the enjoinder of] affliction [signify]: sit and do nothing.<sup>3</sup> But say perhaps: If one sit in the sun and is warm, one may not say unto him: rise and sit in the shade; or, when he sits in the shade and is cool, one may not tell him: rise and sit in the sun?<sup>4</sup> — It is as with labour: Just as you have made no distinction with regard to labour, so in connection with the [prescribed] affliction<sup>5</sup> is no distinction to be made. Another [Baraita] taught: 'Ye shall afflict your souls'. One might assume that one must sit in heat or cold to afflict oneself, therefore Scripture said: 'And ye shall do no manner of work'. Just as in connection with work [the reference is to] something for which one may become culpable also in another connection,<sup>6</sup> so with affliction it is to something for which one might become culpable in another connection, and what is that? 'An abhorred thing',<sup>7</sup> or that which remaineth.<sup>8</sup> I shall then include only 'the abhorred thing' or that which remaineth, because the penalty there is extirpation but not include *tebel*,<sup>9</sup> since the penalty involved therein is not extirpation, therefore the text reads: 'Ye shall afflict', 'and ye shall afflict your souls',<sup>10</sup> which is inclusive. I might then include *tebel*, the punishment in connection with which is death,<sup>11</sup> but not include carrion, the penalty for eating which is not death, therefore the text reads: 'Ye shall afflict', 'and ye shall afflict your souls', which is inclusive. I might then include the [eating of] carrion, which involves a [transgression of a] prohibition, but not profane food, [the eating of] which is not prohibited at all, therefore Scripture said: 'Ye shall afflict', 'and ye shall afflict your souls', which is inclusive. I might then include profane food, the eating of which is not commanded, but exclude *terumah*,<sup>12</sup> the eating of which is commanded, therefore Scripture said: 'Ye shall afflict', 'and ye shall afflict your souls', which is inclusive. I might then include *terumah*, which is not subject to the law concerning remaining over, but exclude holy sacrifices, in connection with which the law concerning remaining over applies, therefore the text reads: 'Ye shall afflict', 'and ye shall afflict your souls', which is inclusive. And if you should have any remark [in objection

thereto], [I can reply], Behold Scripture said: And I will destroy that soul,<sup>13</sup> i.e., an affliction which causes a destruction of life, and what is that but [the denial of] eating and drinking? What is [meant by]: And if you should have any remark [in objection thereto]? — One might have said Scripture speaks here of marital intercourse,<sup>14</sup> therefore the text reads: ‘And I will destroy that soul’, i.e., an affliction which causes the destruction of life, and that is [the abstention from] eating and drinking. The School of R. Ishmael taught: Here the phrase ‘affliction’ is used, and there<sup>15</sup> the term ‘affliction’ is used; just as there an affliction through hunger is meant, so is here an affliction through hunger meant. But let us infer from: ‘If thou shalt afflict my daughters’?<sup>16</sup> — One should infer concerning the affliction of a community from another affliction of a community, but not for the affliction of a community from the affliction of an individual. But let us infer it from the ‘affliction’ in Egypt, as it is said: And [the Lord] saw our affliction,<sup>17</sup> and in connection with which we said: This is the enforced abstinence from marital intercourse? — Rather [answer thus]: One infers for a heavenly affliction from another heavenly affliction, but one should not infer concerning a heavenly affliction from an affliction through human beings.<sup>18</sup>

Who fed thee in the wilderness with manna . . . that He might afflict thee.<sup>19</sup> R. Ammi and R. Assi [are disputing], one said, You cannot compare one who has bread in his basket with one who has none,<sup>20</sup> the other said: You cannot compare one who sees what he eats with one who does not see what he is eating.<sup>21</sup> R. Joseph said: This is an allusion to [the reason] why blind people eat on without becoming satisfied. Abaye said: Therefore let him who has a meal eat only in daylight. R. Zera said: What Scriptural verse intimates that? Better is the seeing of the eyes than the wandering of the desire.<sup>22</sup> Resh Lakish said: Better is the pleasure of looking at a woman than the act itself as it is said: ‘Better is the seeing of the eyes than the wandering of the desire’.

When it giveth its colour in the cup, when it glideth down smoothly.<sup>23</sup> R. Ammi and R. Assi [dispute concerning it], one said: Whosoever fixes

---

(1) V. Hul. 21a with reference to the blood of the koy.

(2) Lev. XVI, 29.

(3) The affliction enjoined is negative; deny to yourself certain things, abstain from them. It does not demand self-affliction by specific activity, such as sitting in the sun on a hot day.

(4) In this case affliction would take the negative form of abstaining from comfort, in accord with the proposition suggested.

(5) Labour, in any form, is prohibited. Just as one is not obliged to engage in positive work of affliction, the negative form of abstention from getting comfort. Hence, just as one need not go out of comfortable shade into the sun for the purpose of afflicting oneself, so need one not abstain from a change into shade in order to be afflicted in the sun.

(6) Namely on the Sabbath.

(7) A sacrifice rejected in consequence of an improper intention in the mind of the sacrificing priest, v. Lev. VII, 18.

(8) Portions of sacrifices left over beyond the legal time.

(9) Produce forbidden until the priestly gifts have been separated.

(10) Lev. XVI, 31.

(11) At the hands of heaven.

(12) The priest's share of the crop, one fiftieth of the dough, Num. XVIII, 8, 25.

(13) Lev. XXIII, 30.

(14) The term ‘affliction’ is used for the abstention therefrom, as well as for rape, in the Talmud (infra 77a) as well as in the Bible, Deut. XXII, 24 and elsewhere.

(15) Ibid. VIII, 3.

(16) Gen. XXXI, 50.

(17) Deut. XXVI, 7.

(18) It was God who afflicted Israel in the wilderness, Who bids them afflict themselves — thus may be said to afflict them Himself- on the Day of Atonement, whereas in Egypt it was Pharaoh who afflicted them.

(19) Deut. VIII, 16.

(20) V. Supra 18b.

(21) The taste of the manna according to tradition varied according to one's liking (v. infra), so that he who ate it did not see actually the thing which he was tasting].

(22) Eccl. VI, 9.

(23) Prov. XXIII, 31.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 75a

his eye in the cup,<sup>1</sup> all incestual intercourse appears to him like a plain;<sup>2</sup> the other said: One who indulges in his cup, the entire world appears to him like a plain.<sup>3</sup>

Care in the heart, boweth it down.<sup>4</sup> R. Ammi and R. Assi [explained it differently], one said: One should force it down,<sup>5</sup> the other said: One should tell thereof to others.<sup>5</sup>

And dust shall be the serpent's food.<sup>6</sup> R. Ammi and R. Assi [disputed its meaning], one said: Even if the serpent were to eat all the delicacies of the world, he would feel therein but the taste of dust; the other said: Even though he ate all the delicacies of the world, his mind would not be at ease until he had eaten dust.

It was taught: R. Jose said, Come and see how different the action of human beings is from that of the Holy One, blessed be He. If one of flesh and blood is angry with his neighbour he persecutes him as far as depriving him of his livelihood, but it is different with the Holy One, blessed be He. Although He cursed the serpent, yet when he goes up to the roof, there is his food; if he goes down, there is his food. He cursed Canaan:<sup>7</sup> yet he eats what his master eats, drinks what his master drinks. He cursed the woman,<sup>8</sup> all are running after her. He cursed the earth,<sup>9</sup> all are feeding from it.

We remember the fish which we were wont to eat in Egypt for nought.<sup>10</sup> Rab and Samuel [were disputing its meaning], one said: [Fish here means] real fish; the other said: Illicit intercourse.<sup>11</sup> One who said it means real fish [explains it so because of] 'which we were wont to eat'; the other who interprets it as 'illicit intercourse', does so because the term 'for nought' is used.<sup>12</sup> But according to him who said it means 'intercourse', does not Scripture read: 'Which we were wont to eat'? — Scripture uses an euphemism, as it is written: She eateth and wipeth her mouth and saith: I have done no wickedness.<sup>13</sup> What does 'for nought' mean according to him who says they were real fish? — They were brought to them from public property, for a Master taught: When the Israelites were drawing water, the Holy One, blessed be He, prepared for them in the water little fish for their pitchers. According to him who said 'real fish', but with regard to illicit intercourse [he holds] they were not dissolute, it will be quite right that Scripture said: A garden shut up is my sister, etc.<sup>14</sup> but according to the view that fishes mean 'illicit intercourse', what 'fountain sealed' is here? — They were not dissolute with regard to forbidden relations.<sup>15</sup> It will be right according to him who interprets it as 'illicit intercourse', hence Scripture said: And Moses heard the people weeping for their families,<sup>16</sup> i.e., because of the families [relations] with whom they were forbidden to have intercourse; but according to him who interprets it as 'fish', what does 'weeping for their families' mean? — Both<sup>17</sup> are implied.

The cucumbers and the melons.<sup>18</sup> R. Ammi and R. Assi [were disputing its meaning], one said: They found in the manna the taste of every kind of food, but not the taste of these five;<sup>19</sup> the other said: Of all kinds of food they felt both taste and substance, but of these the taste only without the substance.

Now the manna was like gad [coriander] seed.<sup>20</sup> R. Assi said [it was] round like a seed [of coriander] and white like a pearl.

Our Rabbis taught: ‘Gad’ i.e., the manna resembled the seed of flax in its capsules. Others say: ‘Gad’ i.e., it was like a tale, which draws the heart of man, even like water.<sup>21</sup> Another [Baraita] taught: ‘Gad’, because it revealed to Israel whether the child was one of nine months’ pregnancy from the first husband, or of seven months’ [pregnancy] from the second.<sup>22</sup> ‘White’,<sup>23</sup> because it makes white [cleanses] the sins of Israel.

It was taught: R. Jose said: Even as the prophet would tell Israel what is to be found in clefts or holes so would the manna reveal to Israel what is to ‘be found in clefts or holes’. How that? If, e.g., two men came before Moses with a law-suit, one saying: You have stolen my servant, the other saying: You have sold him to me, Moses would say to them: To-morrow judgment will be pronounced. To-morrow, then: If his [the slave's] ‘omer was found in the house of his first master, it was evidence that the other one had stolen him; if it was found in the house of his second master, that was proof that the former had sold him to the latter. Similarly, if a man and a woman came before Moses with a suit, he saying: She acted offensively against me, and she asserting: He acted offensively against me, Moses would say to them: To-morrow judgment will be pronounced. On the morrow: If her ‘omer was found in her husband's house, that was proof that she had acted offensively, but if it was found in her father's house, that was evidence that he had acted offensively towards her.<sup>24</sup>

It is written: And when the dew fell upon the camp in the night, the manna fell upon it,<sup>25</sup> and it is also written: And the people shall go out and gather,<sup>26</sup> and it is written too: The people went about and gathered it.<sup>27</sup> How all that?<sup>28</sup> — Unto the righteous it fell in front of their homes; the average folk went out and gathered, whereas the wicked ones had to go about to gather it. It is written: ‘bread’,<sup>26</sup> and it is written, [dough of] ‘cakes’,<sup>29</sup> and it is written, ‘they ground it’.<sup>29</sup> How that? — The righteous received it as bread, the average Israelites as [dough of] cakes, and the wicked ones had to grind it in the handmill. Or beat it in mortars.<sup>30</sup> Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, or as some say, R. Hama b. Hanina: That teaches that there came down to Israel with the manna the cosmetics for women, i.e., a thing that is ground in a mortar. And seethed it in pots.<sup>30</sup> R. Hama said: This intimates that with the manna there came down to Israel the ingredients for pudding.

And they brought yet unto him freewill-offerings every morning.<sup>31</sup> What does ‘every morning’ mean? — R. Samuel b. Nahmani, in the name of R. Jonathan said: [This:] Of those things which came down every morning intimates that, together with the manna, there came down to Israel precious stones and pearls, as it is said: And hanesi'im brought the onyx stones;<sup>32</sup> [and] it was taught: [nesi'im here means]: clouds literally, as it is said also: As clouds [nesi'im] and winds, without rain.<sup>33</sup> And the taste of it was as the taste of a cake baked with oil.<sup>30</sup> R. Abbuha said: [Do not read le-shad (cake), but shad (breast)]<sup>34</sup> viz: Just as the infant finds very many a flavour in the breast, so also did Israel find many a taste in the manna as long as they were eating it. Some there are who say: [‘Le-shad’ means] a real demon; even as the demon changes into many colours, so did the manna change into many tastes.<sup>35</sup>

And Moses said: This shall be when the Lord shall give you in the evening flesh to eat, and in the morning bread to the full.<sup>36</sup> A Tanna [taught] in the name of R. Joshua b. Karhah: The flesh for which they asked improperly was given to them at an improper time;<sup>37</sup>

---

(1) The Talmud takes the passage in this sense: When he puts his eye i.e., devotes his attention to the cup, when he is drunk.

(2) ‘Mesharim’ (‘smoothly’) is connected with meshor, ‘a plain’.

(3) In his drunken state the man overlooks all handicaps to his desire, be they directed against illicit intercourse or against his neighbour's property.

(4) Prov. XII, 25.

(5) One connects the word yashhenna (boweth it down) with the Hebrew nassah, ‘to remove’; the other with the Hebrew

suh, 'to speak'.

(6) Isa. LXV, 25.

(7) Gen. IX, 26. God did not really curse him, it was Noah who did so. But by decreeing that Canaan be a slave, He seems to confirm Noah's curse.

(8) Here, too, God did not really curse the woman, unless the punishment He meted out to her may imply a curse. All the passages here adduced are connected either by the fact that R. Ammi and R. Assi discussed them or by association of ideas.

(9) Gen. III, 17.

(10) Num. XI, 5.

(11) [I.e., they chafed under the new restrictions in matters of intercourse that had been imposed on them.]

(12) The suggestion is that whereas regular marriage implied widowhood (kethubah), before that mohar (dowry, Ex. XXII, 16), no such financial responsibility is necessary in the case of illicit intercourse.

(13) Prov. XXX, 20, referring to an unchaste woman.

(14) Cant. IV, 12.

(15) [I.e., those that had been already forbidden to the sons of Noah, v. Sanh. 57b].

(16) Num. XI, 10: E.V. 'family by family'; because of its families, family affairs, prohibitions of family life.

(17) The one (fish) is obvious, the other (illicit intercourse) is suggested.

(18) V. p. 361, n. 4.

(19) The Israelites remembered sadly these foods, cucumbers, melons, leeks, onions, garlic. which they had enjoyed in Egypt and which they now missed. Evidently the manna substituted for all other foods, but these five. The latter were 'absent' because these foods do not agree with women in pregnancy.

(20) Num. XI, 7.

(21) Connecting it with rt. negad, draw, pull, attract.

(22) The 'omer per head in each household (v. Ex. XVI, 16) being arranged miraculously in accord with the true state of affairs, would be found in the house of the true father and thus would reveal whose child the infant was. Gad is thus connected with the causative of nagad, meaning to 'reveal', 'tell'.

(23) Being dependent for their daily food on God's bounty, the children of Israel would reflect on their conduct and continually improve it in order to deserve God's food.

(24) In either situation the 'omer would be found in the home of him who deserved it. The master of the slave would have an additional 'omer bestowed upon himself; the husband whom his wife had offended would have the measure in his house, where she belonged; if the husband had ill-treated her, so that her father's house was a legitimate refuge, her 'omer would be found there. Thus would the gad (to which the manna was compared) reveal the true state of affairs. In the case of the slave he would be restored, on the evidence of the 'omer, to his master; in the case of the wife, either the husband would have to pay her her marriage settlement (kethubah) or, if she had been guilty, she would forfeit it.

(25) Num. XI, 9.

(26) Ex. XVI, 4.

(27) Num. XI, 8.

(28) These three statements seem incompatible with one another; according to Num. XI, 9 the manna fell into the camp; according to Ex. XVI, 4 outside thereof, whereas according to Num. XI, 8 it was so far away from the camp that the people had to go far to find it.

(29) עוגות, Num. XI, 8; this denotes cakes while yet unbaked (Rashi).

(30) Num. XI, 8.

(31) Ex. XXXVI, 3.

(32) The word nesi'im, from the root nasa, 'to lift up'; thus things lifted up, elevated, may mean either princes or clouds.

(33) Prov. XXV, 14.

(34) Supplemented from Bah.

(35) The word le-shad may mean cake, as the simple text has it. It may also be connected with shad, 'breast', or with shed, 'demon'. Thus the two following interpretations. The different tastes of the milk depend on the food the mother has eaten.

(36) Ex. XVI, 8.

(37) They had enough cattle to feed their lust for flesh, their importune prayers for flesh, hence, were improper, and they would in punishment receive the flesh at night when, because of the need for preparation, it came too late, 'at an

improper time', because usable only the next day.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 75b

whereas the bread for which they asked properly was given to them in its proper time.<sup>1</sup> Here the Torah intimates a matter of good form; that one should eat meat but at night. But surely Abaye said: One who has a meal should eat it only during the day? — We mean: as in day-light.<sup>2</sup>

R. Aha b. Jacob said: At first Israel were like hens picking in the dunghill, until Moses came and fixed for them a definite meal-time.<sup>3</sup>

While the flesh was yet between their teeth,<sup>4</sup> yet it is also written: But a whole month,<sup>5</sup> how is that? — The average people [died] at once, the wicked ones continued to suffer a whole month. And they spread them all abroad.<sup>6</sup> Resh Lakish said: Do not read 'wayishtehu' [they spread abroad], but 'wa-yishahtu' [they were slaughtered], which [reading] intimates that the enemies of Israel had incurred the punishment of being slaughtered.<sup>7</sup> 'Spread abroad'; it was taught in the name of R. Joshua b. Karhah: Do not read 'shatoah', but 'shahut' [ritually killed], which would intimate that there came down to Israel together with the manna something requiring ritual killing.<sup>8</sup> Rabbi replied: So must you infer it from here. Was it not stated before: He caused flesh also to rain upon them as the dust, and winged fowl as the sand of the sea?<sup>9</sup> And was it not taught: Rabbi said, Then thou shalt kill [of thy herd and of thy flock]. . . as I have commanded thee.<sup>10</sup> This teaches that Moses received commandments concerning the gullet, and the windpipe, and concerning the larger part of one [organ] in the case of a fowl, and the larger part of two in the case of cattle?<sup>11</sup> What then does 'shatoah' [read, shahut] intimate? — That they [the quails] came down so as to form layers.

It is written: 'bread', but it is also written, 'oil' and it is also written, 'honey'?<sup>12</sup> — R. Jose b. Hanina said: Bread for the youths, oil for the aged, honey for the infants. It is written 'shlaw' and we read: slaw?<sup>13</sup> — R. Hanina said: The righteous eat it at ease,<sup>14</sup> whereas when the wicked eat it, it is unto them like thorns.<sup>15</sup> R. Hanan b. Abba said: There are four kinds of slaw [quails]: thrush, partridge, pheasant and quail proper; the best of all is the thrush, the worst of all is the quail proper, which is like a small bird. [One stuffs it],<sup>16</sup> places it in the oven, and it swells up, and becomes so big that it fills the oven. Thereupon one places it on top of twelve loaves of bread, and [even] the lowest one of them cannot be eaten without [some other food] in combination.<sup>17</sup> Rab Judah would find them among his jars; R. Hisda among the twigs. Unto Raba his field labourer used to bring them from the meadow<sup>18</sup> every day. One day he did not bring them. He wondered: Why this? He went up to the roof and heard a child which read: When I heard, my inward parts trembled.<sup>19</sup> Thereupon he said: One knows from this that R. Hisda is dead.<sup>20</sup> It is for this reason that people say: By the merit of his master eats the pupil. It is written: And when the layer of dew was gone up,<sup>21</sup> but it is also written: And when the dew fell?<sup>22</sup> — R. Jose b. Hanina said: There was dew above, and dew below it; it resembled something placed in a box. A fine scale-like thing [mehuspas];<sup>23</sup> Resh Lakish said: It is something that melts on the wrist [palm] of the hand.<sup>23</sup> R. Johanan said: [It means] something which is absorbed by the two hundred and forty-eight parts [of the human body].<sup>24</sup> But [the numerical value] of mehuspas is much more?<sup>25</sup> — R. Nahman b. Isaac said: The word is written defective. Our Rabbis taught: Man did eat the bread of the mighty,<sup>26</sup> i.e., bread which ministering angels eat. This was the interpretation of R. Akiba. When these words were reported to R. Ishmael he said to them: Go forth and tell Akiba: Akiba, thou hast erred. For do, indeed, the ministering angels eat bread? Was it not said long ago: I did neither eat bread, nor drink water?<sup>27</sup> How, then, do I interpret 'the bread abbirum [of the mighty]'? I.e., bread which was absorbed by the two hundred and forty-eight parts [ebarim]. Then how do I apply: And thou shalt have a paddle among thy weapons?<sup>28</sup> That refers to what [foods] the foreign merchants were selling unto them. R. Eleazar b. Perata said: Even of the foodstuff which merchants of other nations sold them, the manna would counteract the effect. What then is the meaning of 'And thou shalt have a paddle among thy weapons'? — That applied to

the time after their offence.<sup>29</sup> The Holy One, blessed be He, said: I thought they shall be like ministering angels, but now I shall burden them with the walk of three parasangs<sup>30</sup> as it is written: And they pitched by the Jordan, from Beth-jeshimoth even unto Abel-shittim.<sup>31</sup> And Rabbah b. Hana had said: I have seen this place, it is three parasangs in extension.<sup>32</sup> And furthermore it was taught when they went to relieve nature they went neither forward, nor sideways, but rearwards.<sup>33</sup>

But now our soul is dried away: there is nothing at all.<sup>34</sup> They said: This manna will swell up their bowels, for is there one born of woman who absorbs food without eliminating it too? But when these words were reported before R. Ishmael he said to them: Do not read *abbirim* [mighty] but *ebarim* [parts of the body], i.e., something which is absorbed by the two hundred and forty-eight parts. But how do I then interpret: 'And thou shalt have a paddle among thy weapons'? — That refers to food that came to them from the distant parts.<sup>35</sup> Another interpretation of: Man did eat the bread of the mighty:

- 
- (1) Nobody can live without bread, hence that prayer was proper.
  - (2) By the light of torch, or candle.
  - (3) Morning and evening, the manna and the quails respectively.
  - (4) Num. XI, 33.
  - (5) Ibid. v. 20.
  - (6) Ibid. v. 32. This suggestion, although aggadic, is not ungrammatical, metathesis being frequent, as in *kesseb*, *kebess* (sheep).
  - (7) Perhaps because of their unrighteous clamour for flesh, when they had cattle of their own. 'Enemies of Israel' is an euphemism for 'Israel'.
  - (8) Hence we infer that quails were of a species that require ritual killing.
  - (9) Ps. LXXVIII, 27. 'Before' means, before this indirect inference there was a clear text to convey this teaching.
  - (10) Deut. XII, 21.
  - (11) The windpipe and the gullet, one in the case of fowl, both in the case of cattle, must be cut according to the ritual. There is no commandment anywhere in the Pentateuch as to the details of ritual slaughtering of animals or birds, called *shechitah*. Hence 'as I have commanded thee' must needs refer to another source of law: the unwritten or oral one.
  - (12) In reference to the manna. Ex. XVI, 29, 31 and Num. XI, 8. Three different tastes are ascribed to this food.
  - (13) The spelling is **מ**, the pronunciation **מ**. The deviation indicates another aspect.
  - (14) The Hebrew word (with **מ**) may be traced to a root meaning 'ease'. Thus the homiletical interpretation.
  - (15) The Aramaic equivalent of the reading means 'thorn', hence the suggestion that *slaw* in addition to the simple text meaning, has also other implications.
  - (16) Supplemented from Bah.
  - (17) It is so greasy that without some other dry food added it would be indigestible.
  - (18) Bah.
  - (19) Hab. III, 16.
  - (20) This story is very satisfactorily explained in Schatzkes' *Mafteah I*, Warsaw, 1866. R. Hisda, in spite of his great riches, was very frugal in his habits and so economical that he would not entrust even the management of wood to any servant, but himself every day handed wood to the cooks (Git. 56a). Although he would find the quails among his twigs, he would prevent anyone from laying his hands upon these delicacies. His son-in-law Raba, therefore, arranged with a tenant-farmer to bring them. His failure to bring them one day Raba rightly attributed to the thought that something had happened which rendered such service unnecessary. To this inference he added, according to widespread custom, the additional reliance on the implications of a text the first child he met would be studying. When that text suggested evil news the 'evidence was complete'.
  - (21) Ex. XVI, 14.
  - (22) Num. XI, 9. The passage in Ex. suggests that the dew covered the manna, whereas the verse in Num. indicates that the dew was below the manna.
  - (23) There is a play on 'mah', 'melt', and 'pas', 'palm'.
  - (24) The numerical value of 'Mehuspas': Mem = 40, heth = 8, samek = 60, pe = 80 and samek = 60, together 248. V. Mak., Sonc. ed., p. 169, n. 5.

(25) The part. pass. is usually spelt with a waw, which makes its numerical value plus 6 =254; whereas the reading is plene, the text is without the waw מַחֲפָפִים, hence 248; and the inference as to the 248 parts of the body is supported.

(26) Ps. LXXVIII, 25.

(27) Deut. IX, 18.

(28) Ibid. XXIII, 14. The paddle is to serve thus: And it shall be, when thou sittest down abroad, thou shalt dig therewith, and shalt turn back, and cover that which cometh from thee. But, if the manna was completely absorbed, there was nothing 'coming from the Israelite', hence no need for the paddle.

(29) In complaining of the manna as Num. XXI, 5; Our soul loatheth this light bread.

(30) To get outside the confines of the camp for the call of nature.

(31) Num. XXXIII, 49.

(32) 'Er. 55b.

(33) None would turn backwards, therefore there was no offence against common decency involved.

(34) Num. XI, 6.

(35) Lit., 'province of the sea'.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 76a

That is Joshua for whom manna [specially] fell down as it did to<sup>1</sup> all Israel, [for] it is written: here, 'man',<sup>2</sup> and also there it is written: Take thee Joshua, the son of Nun, a man in whom is spirit.<sup>3</sup> But perhaps it is Moses, of whom it is said: Now the man Moses was very meek?<sup>4</sup> — One may infer ish from ish, but not ish from we-ha-ish.<sup>5</sup>

R. Simon b. Yohai was asked by his disciples: Why did not the manna come down unto Israel once annually? He replied: I shall give a parable: This thing may be compared to a king of flesh and blood who had one son, whom he provided with maintenance once a year, so that he would visit his father once a year only. Thereupon he provided for his maintenance every day, so that he called on him every day. The same with Israel. One who had four or five children would worry, saying: Perhaps no manna will come down to-morrow, and all will die of hunger. Thus they were found to turn their attention to their Father in Heaven. Another interpretation: They ate it whilst it was yet warm.<sup>6</sup> Another interpretation: Because of the burden of the way.<sup>7</sup>

And it long ago happened that R. Tarfon, R. Ishmael and the Elders were seated and occupied with the portion referring to the manna, and also R. Eleazar of Modiim was seated among them. R. Eleazar of Modim commenced [to expound] and said: The manna which came down unto Israel was sixty cubits high! R. Tarfon said to him: Modite! How long will you rake words together and bring them up against us?<sup>8</sup> — He answered: My master! I am expounding a Scriptural verse.

Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered.<sup>9</sup> Were there indeed fifteen cubits [high] in the valley, [fifteen cubits in the lowlands],<sup>10</sup> fifteen cubits on the mountains?<sup>11</sup> Were the waters standing like a series of walls? And, furthermore, how could the ark come to the top [of the mountains]? Rather, all the fountains of the great deep came up first until the water was even with the mountains, then the water rose fifteen more cubits. Now which measure is larger, that of reward or punishment? You must needs agree that the measure of goodness [reward] is larger. Now with the measure of punishment it is written: The windows of heaven were opened,<sup>12</sup> with the measure of goodness, however, it is said: And he commanded the skies above, and opened the doors of heaven; and caused manna to rain upon them for food, and gave them of the corn of heaven.<sup>13</sup> [And a Tanna taught]:<sup>14</sup> Now how many windows has a door? Four; hence 'doors' [imply] eight.<sup>15</sup> Thus it is found that the manna which fell upon Israel was sixty cubits. It was taught: Issi b. Judah says: The manna which fell down for Israel rose so high that all the kings of the east and the west could see it, as it is said: [Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of my enemies. . .] my cup runneth over.<sup>16</sup> (Abaye said: It is evident from this that the cup of King David in the future world will hold two hundred and twenty-one logs, as it is said: My cup is rewayah [overflowing],

and this is the numerical value of rewayah).<sup>17</sup> But there is no comparison: there it took forty days, here only one hour;<sup>18</sup> or there for all the world, here for Israel alone;<sup>19</sup> and it should have been higher still! — [Rather]: R. Eleazar of Modim infers it from the analogy of ‘opened’, ‘opened’.<sup>20</sup>

[ON YOM KIPPUR] EATING IS FORBIDDEN. To what do the five afflictions correspond? — R. Hisda said: To the five afflictions mentioned in the Torah: And on the tenth day:<sup>21</sup> howbeit on the tenth day;<sup>22</sup> a sabbath of solemn rest;<sup>23</sup> it is a sabbath of solemn rest,<sup>24</sup> and it shall be unto you.<sup>25</sup> But these are only five, whereas [in our Mishnah] we learned of six [afflictions]? — Drinking is included in eating. For Resh Lakish said: When do we know that drinking is included in eating? Because Scripture said: And thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God . . . the tithe of thy corn, of thy [tirosh] wine, and of thine oil;<sup>26</sup> ‘tirosh’ is wine and yet Scripture reads: ‘And thou shalt eat’. Whence this proof? Perhaps it means that he used it as all admixture to elaiogarum?<sup>27</sup> For Rabbah b. Samuel said: Elaiogarum contains the juice of beets; oxygarum the sauce of all kinds of boiled vegetables? — Rather, said R. Aha b. Jacob, is that inferred from here: And thou shalt bestow thy money for whatever thy soul desireth, for oxen, for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink.<sup>28</sup> [To] wine and strong drink [applies the term] drinking and yet the Divine Law reads: ‘And thou shalt eat’. How is that [conclusive]? — Perhaps here, too, the implication is that he uses it as an admixture to elaiogarum?— Scripture says ‘Strong drink’, i.e., something which intoxicates.<sup>29</sup> But perhaps the reference here is to preserved figs from Keilah, for it was taught: If one [a priest] ate preserved figs from Keilah,<sup>30</sup> and drank honey and milk, and thus entered the Sanctuary

---

(1) Corresponding to.

(2) Num. XXVII, 18.

(3) Ex. XXIV, 13. Joshua went up with Moses to Mount Sinai, Moses did not eat, but Joshua did, hence the manna must have come to him there.

(4) Num. XII, 3.

(5) Analogy should be built upon exact similarity, almost identity, not on relative similarity of expression; according to this rigid rule no analogy from ‘ish’ to ‘ha-ish’ or vice versa could be argued.

(6) Its taste or flavour was preserved, but if gathered once for the whole year, it would become stale, cold, tasteless.

(7) It would greatly hamper them on their journeys.

(8) Try to impress us with unsubstantiated statements.

(9) Gen. VII, 20.

(10) [Var. lec. rightly omit as unnecessary repetition].

(11) The phrase fifteen cubits upward surely could not be taken to mean that the fifteen cubits were measured from different levels.

(12) Ibid. v. 11.

(13) Ps. LXXVIII, 23, 24.

(14) Supplied from MS.M. V. also Rashi.

(15) At least two are implied in ‘doors’ hence at least eight windows. But the measure of goodness surpasses the measure of punishment (as e.g., Ex. II, 6, 7). There were at least two ‘windows’ of heaven at the flood, as implied in ‘windows’ which poured forth fifteen cubits of rain; the eight windows (of the two doors of heaven) must have produced at least no less, i.e., sixty cubits of manna, since the measure of goodness is surely no smaller than that of punishment. So that ‘sixty’ here is to be taken as minimum.

(16) Ps. XXIII, 5, 6. This reckoning is stimulated by the preceding one.

(17) The psalm is taken as prophetic of restoration — either in this world (then ‘in the future’ at the time of the Messiah) or in the world to come (usual interpretation).

(18) Between the flood and manna.

(19) Here the argument is in favour of a higher measure for the manna. For since the space wherein it fell was limited, whilst the windows of heaven presumably were capable of pouring out the same quantity, the manna confined to a small area should have risen very much higher than the waters, which covered all the earth.

(20) Gen. VII, 11 and Ps. LXXVIII, 23; he does not employ the argument of a greater measure in store for reward than for punishment; but merely from the fact that in each case two windows produced a height of fifteen cubits — whether

of manna or water.

(21) Num. XXIX, 7.

(22) Lev. XXIII, 27.

(23) Ibid. 32.

(24) Ibid. XVI, 31.

(25) Ibid. v. 29.

(26) Deut. XIV, 23.

(27) Greek; a sauce of oil and garum, to which wine is sometimes added.

(28) Deut. XIV, 26.

(29) And no intoxication results from eating.

(30) A town in the lowlands of Judea, cf. Josh. XV, 44; v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 481, n. 6.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 76b

he is culpable?<sup>1</sup> — Rather, he infers it by analogy of ‘strong drink’ from the Nazirite.<sup>2</sup> Just as there it means wine, so here too is wine involved. But is ‘tirosh’ wine? Was it not taught: One who takes a vow to abstain from ‘tirosh’ is forbidden to use any sweet drink but may use wine? — But is [‘tirosh’] not wine? Surely it is written: And tirosh makes the maids flourish!<sup>3</sup> The thing which is derived from ‘tirosh’ makes maids flourish.<sup>4</sup> But it is written: And thy vats shall overflow with tirosh?<sup>5</sup> — Thy vats shall overflow with what is derived from ‘tirosh’. But it is written: Harlotry, wine and tirosh take away the heart?<sup>6</sup> — Rather, everybody agrees that ‘tirosh’ is wine, but with regard to vows we go after common parlance.<sup>7</sup>

Why is it [wine] called ‘yayin’ and ‘tirosh’? — It is called ‘yayin’ because it brings lamentation into the world, and ‘tirosh’ ‘because he who indulges in it becomes poor.’<sup>8</sup>

R. Kahana pointed out a contradiction: It is written ‘tirash’ and we read ‘tirosh’! — If he is meritorious he becomes a head [rosh] through it; if not, he becomes poor [rash] through it.<sup>9</sup> Raba pointed out this contradiction: The text reads, ‘yeshammah’, whilst we read ‘yesammah’?<sup>10</sup> — If he is meritorious it makes him happy, if not, it makes him desolate. That is why Raba said: Wine and odorous spices made me wise.<sup>11</sup>

Whence do we know that [abstention from] bathing and from anointing oneself is considered an affliction? — Because it is written: I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all.<sup>12</sup> What does ‘I ate no pleasant bread’ mean? — Rab Judah, in the name of R. Samuel b. Shilath said: He ate not even bread made of pure wheat. Whence do we know that [the abstention from anointing] was considered an affliction? Because it is written: Then he said unto me: Fear not, Daniel, for from the first day that thou didst set thy heart to understand, and to afflict<sup>13</sup> thyself before thy God, thy words were heard; and I am come because of thy words.<sup>14</sup> We have found it now with regard to [abstention from] anointing oneself. Whence do we know it about [abstention from] washing? — R. Zutra, son of R. Tobiah said: Scripture reads: And it is come into his inward parts like water, and like oil into his bones.<sup>15</sup> But perhaps that applies to drinking it? — It is compared to oil; just as the oil is applied externally, so also the water [is such as is applied] externally. But a Tanna teaches just the reverse, for we learned: Whence do we know that anointing oneself is like drinking on the Day of Atonement? Although there is no conclusive evidence for this, there is some intimation, for it is said: ‘And it is come into his inward parts like water, and like oil into his bones’?<sup>16</sup> — Rather, said R. Ashi: [That abstention from] washing [is considered an affliction] is evident from the verse itself, for it is written: ‘Neither did I anoint myself at all’.<sup>17</sup> What does: ‘And I am come because of thy words’ mean?<sup>18</sup> — It is written: And there stood before them seventy men of the elders of the House of Israel, and in the midst of them stood Jazaniah, the son of Shapan, every man with his censer in his hand; and a thick cloud of incense went up.<sup>19</sup> [Furthermore]: And the form of a hand was put forth, and I was taken by a lock of my head; and a

spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me into the visions of God to Jerusalem, to the door of the gate of the inner court that looketh toward the north; where

---

(1) Lev. X, 9.

(2) Num. VI, 3.

(3) Zech. IX, 17.

(4) The argument is not too obvious. According to Rashi the point under consideration is whether 'tirosh' is the name for wine (new wine) or for the grapes themselves. If the latter is accepted wine is 'that which is derived from tirosh (berries)'.

(5) Prov. III, 10 and into vats the wine is poured, not the berries!

(6) Hos. IV, II. Surely grapes would not fit into this context.

(7) And in common parlance 'tirosh' and 'yayin' are separated.

(8) The first is a play on 'ya, ya' exclamation of woe, the second on the second syllable of 'tirosh', which is connected with 'rash', to become poor, as if 'tirosh' meant, You will become poor.

(9) The text connected with the root meaning 'poor', the reading with the noun 'rosh', head.

(10) Ps. CIV, 15. Again a difference between text and pronunciation with a significance attached to both; samah means 'rejoicing', 'shammah' is connected with 'shammah', desolation, the 'he' and 'heth' interchanging.

(11) Stimulated my intellect.

(12) Dan. X, 3.

(13) E.V. 'to humble'.

(14) Ibid. V. 12.

(15) Ps. CIX, 18.

(16) Here water in the verse is taken to refer to 'drinking' from which 'anointing' is derived, contrary to the conclusion just arrived at whereby the meaning of 'water' is derived from its juxtaposition to 'oil'.

(17) Lit., '(as to) anointing I did not anoint myself at all'. 'At all' means, not even washing, which may be preparatory.

(18) When was he driven out, so that he had to re-enter? The reference is to 'the man clothed in linen', (v. *ibid.* verse 5) identified *infra* with Gabriel.

(19) Ezek. VIII, 11.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 77a

there was the seat of the image of jealousy, which provoketh to jealousy.<sup>1</sup> [Furthermore]: And he brought me into the inner court of the Lord's house, and, behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about five and twenty men, with their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east; and they worshipped the sun toward the east.<sup>2</sup> Now from the implication of the text: 'And their faces toward the east', do I not know that their backs were toward the temple of the Lord? Why then does the text state: 'With their backs toward the temple of the Lord'? It teaches that they uncovered themselves and committed a nuisance toward that which is below.<sup>3</sup> The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Michael:<sup>4</sup> Michael, your nation has committed sin. Michael answered: Lord of the Universe! Let the good ones among them be considered sufficient! He replied: I shall burn both them and the good ones among them! Immediately then: And he spoke unto the man clothed in linen, and said: Go in between the wheelwork, even under the cherub, and fill both thy hands with coals of fire from between the cherubim, and dash them against the city. And he went in my sight.<sup>5</sup> Thereupon: And the cherub stretched forth his hand between the cherubim unto the fire that was between the cherubim, and took thereof and put it into the hands of him that was clothed in linen, who took it and went out.<sup>6</sup> R. Hana b. Bizna said in the name of R. Simeon the Pious: Were it not for the fact that the coals of the hand of the cherub became cold [in the process of coming] into the hands of Gabriel,<sup>7</sup> there would not have been left over from the 'enemies of Israel'<sup>8</sup> one to remain or one to escape, for it is written: And behold the man clothed in linen, who had the inkhorn on his side, reported, saying: 'I have done according to all that Thou hast commanded me'.<sup>9</sup> R. Johanan<sup>10</sup> said: In that hour Gabriel was led out behind the curtain and received forty fiery strokes, he being told: If you had not executed the command at all, well, you simply would not have executed it.<sup>11</sup> But since you did execute it, why did you not do as you were commanded?<sup>12</sup> Furthermore: Don't you know that:<sup>13</sup> 'One brings no report about mischief'?<sup>14</sup> Thereupon Dubiel,<sup>15</sup> the guardian angel of the Persians, was brought in and placed in his stead, and he officiated for twenty-one days. This is what is written: But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days; but lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me; and I was left over there beside the kings of Persia.<sup>16</sup> Twenty-one provinces and the port of Mashmahig<sup>17</sup> were given to him. Thereupon he said: Put down for me Israel for the polltax! They did so. Put down the Sages for the poll-tax! They did so. When they were about to sign, Gabriel came forth from behind the curtain and said: It is vain for you that ye rise early, and sit up late, ye that eat the bread of toil; so He giveth unto His beloved in sleep.<sup>18</sup> (What does 'So He giveth unto His beloved in sleep' signify? R. Isaac said: This refers to the wives of the scholars who deny themselves sleep in this world, and acquire the world to come).<sup>19</sup> No attention was paid to him. He said before Him: Lord of the Universe, if all the wise men of other nations were in one scale of the balance, and Daniel, the man of pleasant parts, in the other, would he not be found to outweigh them all? — The Holy One, blessed be He, said: Who is it that pleads the merit of my children? They replied: Lord of the Universe, it is Gabriel. He said: Let him come in, as it is written: 'And I am come [in] because of thy words'. Having commanded that they bring him in, they brought him in. He noticed that Dubiel held the document in his hand, and he wanted to take it from him, but the former swallowed it. Some say: [The document] was written out, but not signed. Others say: It was also signed, but as he swallowed it, the signature was blotted out. Hence there are some people in the kingdom of Persia who are obliged to pay poll-tax, while others are free from it. And when I go forth, lo, the prince of Greece shall come.<sup>20</sup> He cried and cried and none minded him.

Or, if you like, that [abstention from] washing is considered an affliction is deducible from here. For it is written: And unto Abiathar the priest said the king: 'Get thee to Anathoth, unto thine own fields; for thou art deserving of death; but I will not at this time put thee to death, because thou didst bear the ark of the Lord God before David my father, and because thou wast afflicted in all wherein my father was afflicted'.<sup>21</sup> And concerning David it is written: For they said: 'The people is hungry, and faint and thirsty in the wilderness'.<sup>22</sup> 'Hungry' because of no bread; 'thirsty' because of no

water; 'faint' because of what? Would you not say: Because of no washing?<sup>23</sup> — But perhaps 'faint' [means] because of no sandals? — Rather said R. Isaac, [it is to be deducted] from this: As cold water to a faint soul.<sup>24</sup> But perhaps it means: [Faint] from [lack of] drink? — Does Scripture read: 'Into a faint soul'? Upon a faint soul is written! And whence is to be inferred that [abstention from wearing] sandals [is considered an affliction]? Because it is written: And David went up by the ascent of the Mount of Olives and wept as he went up; and he had his head covered, and went bare.<sup>25</sup> 'Bare' of what? Obviously 'of shoes'. Perhaps it means bare because without horse and whip?— Rather, said R. Nahman b. Isaac, the inference comes from: Go and loose the sack-cloth from off thy loins, and put thy shoe from off thy foot,<sup>26</sup> and it is written: And he did so, walking naked and bare.<sup>26</sup> 'Bare' of what? Obviously bare of sandals. But perhaps [it means he went] in patched shoes. For, if you were not to interpret thus, 'naked' would also have to be explained as stark naked? Rather, must you here too explain: [naked] i.e. in shabby garments, thus also 'bare' in patched sandals! — Rather, said R. Nahman b. Isaac: [It is derived] from here: Withhold thy foot from being unshod, and thy throat from thirst,<sup>27</sup> i.e., withhold thyself from sin lest thy foot become unshod; withhold thy tongue from idle speech, lest thy throat become dry [faint with thirst].

Whence do we know that [abstention from] marital intercourse is considered an affliction? — Because it is written: If thou shalt afflict my daughters, and if thou shalt take wives beside my daughters,<sup>28</sup> [i.e..]

---

(1) Ibid. v. 3.

(2) Ibid. v. 16.

(3) A euphemism for heaven.

(4) Who is the guardian angel of Israel.

(5) Ezek. X, 2.

(6) Ibid. 7.

(7) Alluded to in 'the man clothed in linen'.

(8) Euphemistic for Israel.

(9) Ibid. IX, 11.

(10) Var. lec. remove the whole account that follows from here.

(11) He may have assumed that God's mercy would postpone or suspend punishment.

(12) You were commanded to fetch the coals yourself, you sinned in appointing someone else to do so.

(13) Meg. 15a. For the same reason one need not report to children the death even of their parents.

(14) With reference to his reporting back, 'I have done according to all that Thou hast commanded me'.

(15) Lit., 'bear-god'. In Daniel VII, 5 Persia appears as 'a bear', hence their angel is bear-god. V. Kid. 72a. A.Z. 2a.

(16) Dan. X, 13. This verse is ingeniously used to build up the present Aggadah.

(17) A place on an island of the Persian Gulf, famous for pearl fisheries. V. R. H., Sonc. ed., p. 99, n. 5. V. D. S. as to the MSS. which omit this whole passage.

(18) Ps. CXXXVII, 2.

(19) The nations of the world should not be able to subdue or tax these, for they are the beloved of the Lord, and their own wives, in denying sleep to themselves in this world (taking 'yedid' ad hoc as if derived from 'nadad', flee, avoid i.e., sleep) earn eternal salvation. God thus protects them. When this argument proved unavailing, they made another attempt by comparing Daniel with all non-Jewish scholars, and this was accepted by the Lord.

(20) Dan. X, 20. Gabriel's protest was of no avail against the time when Greece was given rule over Israel.

(21) I Kings II, 26.

(22) II Sam. XVII, 29.

(23) Thus would abstention from bathing be proved to be considered an affliction.

(24) Prov. XXV, 25.

(25) II Sam. XV, 30.

(26) Isa. XX, 2.

(27) Jer. II, 25.

(28) Gen. XXXI, 50.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 77b

'if thou shalt afflict' by denying conjugal duty, 'if thou shalt take' refers to rivals. But say [perhaps]: Both [afflictions due] to rival women? — Does Scripture say: 'If thou shalt take',<sup>1</sup> it reads: 'And if thou shalt take'. But perhaps both refer to affliction through rivals; one through rivalries among them, the other through rivalries of new wives, so that ['if thou shalt afflict'] would be the same as 'if thou shalt take'.<sup>2</sup> Does Scripture say: 'If thou wilt take and afflict'? It reads: If thou shalt afflict and thou shalt take.<sup>3</sup> R. Papa said to Abaye: But intercourse in itself is described as affliction, for it is written: And he lay with her and afflicted her?<sup>4</sup> He answered: He afflicted her through other [forms of] intercourse.

Our Rabbis taught: It is forbidden to wash part of the body [on the Day of Atonement], as [it is forbidden to wash] the whole body. But if one was soiled with mud or excrement, he may wash in his usual way without any fear.<sup>5</sup> It is forbidden to anoint part of the body [as it is forbidden to anoint] the whole body. If, however, one was sick or had scabs on his head, he may anoint himself in his usual way without any fear. The School of R. Menasseh taught: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: A woman may wash one of her hands in water to give bread to an infant without any fear. It was reported about the older Shammai<sup>6</sup> that he would not [hand food] to be eaten even with one hand, whereupon the Rabbis decreed that he must do so with both hands.<sup>7</sup> Why that? Abaye said: Because of Shibta.<sup>8</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: One who goes to visit his father or his teacher, or his superior,<sup>9</sup> may walk through water up to his neck without any fear. They asked: How about a master who visits his disciple? — Come and hear: For R. Isaac b. Bar Hana said: I saw Ze'iri who went to R. Ashi, his disciple. R. Ashi said: That was R. Hiyya b. Ashi, who went to Ze'iri, his master. Raba permitted the people of 'Ibar Jemina<sup>10</sup> to walk through water for the purpose of guarding [fruits] the crop.<sup>11</sup> Abaye said to Raba: I know a teaching that supports you [your decision]: Those who guard the crop may walk up to the neck through water without any fear. R. Joseph permitted the people of Be Tarbu<sup>12</sup> to walk through the water in order to go to the lecture [of the Day of Atonement] but he did not permit them to return [in the same fashion]. Abaye said to him: If so, you will put a stumbling-block in their way for the future.<sup>13</sup> Some say: He permitted them to go and to return [through water], whereupon Abaye said: Quite right [to permit them] to do so on the way to the lecture, but why the permission on their return? — Lest you put a stumbling-block in their way for the future.

Rab Judah and R. Samuel son of R. Judah were standing at the bank of Nehar Papa,<sup>14</sup> at the ford of Hazdad, and Rami b. Papa was standing on the other bank. He shouted across: How about going over to you to inquire about a decision of the Law? Rab Judah answered; Rab and Samuel both agree: One may come over, provided one take not one's hand out of the bosom of his shirt.<sup>15</sup> Some say: It was R. Samuel, son of Rab Judah who said: We were taught, He may come over, provided he take not his hand out of the bosom of his shirt.

R. Joseph demurred: But, even on a weekday is such action permitted?<sup>16</sup> Does not Scripture say: He measured a thousand cubits and he caused me to pass through the waters, waters that were to the ankles;<sup>17</sup> hence we infer that it is permitted to pass through water up to the ankles. Again he measured a thousand, and caused me to pass through the waters, waters that were up to the knees;<sup>18</sup> hence we learn that it is permitted to pass through waters up to the knees. Again he measured a thousand, and caused me to pass through waters that were to the loins;<sup>18</sup> hence we know that it is permissible to pass through water up to the loins. Henceforth: Afterward he measured a thousand, and it was a river that I would not pass through.<sup>19</sup> Abaye said: It is different with a river whose waters run rapidly.<sup>20</sup> One might have assumed that it is permissible to swim across such a river, therefore the text reads: For the waters were risen, waters to swim in.<sup>19</sup> What does 'sahu' mean? —

‘Swim’, for a swimmer is called ‘sayaha’. One might have assumed that it is permissible to pass through such [river] in a small Liburnian boat, therefore the text reads: Wherein, shall go no galley with oars.<sup>21</sup> One might have assumed that one may cross it in a big Liburnian ship, therefore Scripture says: Neither shall gallant ship pass thereby.<sup>20</sup> How does that follow from the text? — As R. Joseph interprets it: No fisher's boat goes thereon, no big boat traverses it.<sup>22</sup> R. Judah b. Pazzi said: Even the Angel of Death has no permission to cross it, for here it is said: ‘Wherein shall go no galley with oars [shayit].’<sup>23</sup> and there it reads: From going [shut] to and fro in the earth.<sup>23</sup> R. Phinehas in the name of R. Huna of Sepphoris said: The spring that issues from the Holy of Holies in its beginning resembles the antennae of locusts; as it reaches the entrance to the Sanctuary it becomes as the thread of the warp; as it reaches the Ulam,<sup>24</sup> it becomes as the thread of the woof; as it reaches the entrance to the [Temple] court, it becomes as large as the mouth of a small flask, that is meant by what we learned: R. Eliezer b. Jacob said: [Hence] go forth the waters

(1) So that the second part of the verse would state explicitly what the first implies.

(2) Thus the question as to the meaning of ‘and’ would be disposed of.

(3) The lesser evil would be mentioned first, whereas the marrying of Jacob of other additional women would constitute the larger wrong.

(4) Gen. XXXIV, 2.

(5) Of transgressing the prohibition of washing on the Day of Atonement.

(6) The colleague of Hillel in the Sanhedrin under King Herod.

(7) Shammai did not wish to allow himself the concession made by the Rabbis, since he always took the severer view for himself, when two interpretations of ritual obligations were involved. But the Rabbis decided that their permission to wash one's hand was a matter of safeguarding the child's health, and Shammai's unwillingness to accept their rule was unjustified. To emphasize that they imposed upon him the obligation to wash both his hands before handing food to his infant.

(8) An evil spirit, or odour, that endangers the health of those that eat food touched with unwashed hands.

(9) On the day of Atonement and in order to reach him must wade through a river. ‘His superior’ is one to whom one owes obeisance either by Biblical or Rabbinic law or by the exigencies of political situation.

(10) [Lit., ‘the right (= south) side’, the district south of Mahoza on the Tigris, where lay the orchards of Mahoza and which could not be reached except across some canal, v. Obermeyer p. 181.]

(11) [Apparently the people of Ibar Jemina came up to Mahoza for the service of the Day of Atonement and Raba permitted them to return home by wading through water in order to guard their produce, v. loc. cit.].

(12) [Near Pumbeditha, v. Obermeyer. p. 230].

(13) They will abstain from attending the lecture on future occasions because of the discomfort involved in having to wait until the end of the Day of Atonement for their return home.

(14) [A canal that passed through Pumbeditha, v. Obermeyer. p. 227].

(15) I.e., to throw his cloak over his shoulder, it would look as if he were carrying it, rather than wearing it.

(16) To walk through water up to one's neck.

(17) Ezek. XLVII, 3.

(18) Ibid. 4.

(19) Ibid. v. 5.

(20) As with the river, coming from the Holy of Holies; but this is no precedent.

(21) Isa. XXXIII, 21.

(22) V. Targum on Prophets a.l.

(23) Job I, 7. The argument is based on the analogy of expression. The conditions attaching to the ‘shayit’ in Isaiah inferred from Ezekiel apply also to shut in Job. Hence, just as there it is forbidden, by inference, to cross the river, so may the Angel of Death, as another shayit not do so either.

(24) The Main Hall leading into the interior of the Sanctuary.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 78a

which will bubble forth from under the threshold of the Sanctuary.<sup>1</sup> From there onwards it becomes

bigger, rising higher and higher, until it reaches the entrance to the House of David.<sup>2</sup> As soon as it reaches the entrance to the house of David, it becomes even as a swiftly running brook, in which men and women afflicted with gonorrhoea, menstruating women, and women after childbirth bathe, as it is said: In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for purification and for sprinkling.<sup>3</sup> Said R. Joseph: Hence there is an intimation that a menstruating woman [at her purification] must sit in water [that reaches in height] up to the neck. But the law is not in accord with him.

(That will be right on the Day of Atonement, on which no sandal is worn). But what about the Sabbath on which sandals are worn?<sup>4</sup> — R. Nehemiah, the son-in-law of the Prince,<sup>5</sup> said: I saw R. Ammi and R. Assi who reached a pool of water and crossed it dressed.<sup>6</sup> That is all right in shoes, but what can be said in the case of sandals?<sup>7</sup> R. Rihumi said: I saw Rabina, who crossed it in sandals. R. Ashi said: One must not do so at the outset in sandals. The Exilarch once came to Hagronia to the house of R. Nathan. Rafram and all the Rabbis attended his lecture, Rabina did not. Next day Rafram wanted to remove Rabina from the mind of the Exilarch,<sup>8</sup> so he said to him: 'Why did you not come to the lecture, Sir?' He answered: 'My foot hurt me'. 'You should have put shoes on!' 'It was the back of the foot'. 'You should have put sandals on'. He answered: 'A pool of water was in the way'. 'You should have crossed it in them,'. He replied: 'Don't you hold, Sir, the view of R. Ashi, that one must not at the outset do so in sandals'!

Judah b. Gerogeroth taught: It is forbidden to sit on moist muddy ground on the Day of Atonement. R. Joshua b. Levi said: This refers to mud which makes wet [those sitting on it]. Abaye said: If it is moist enough to moisten other subjects.

Rab Judah said: It is permitted to cool off [by sitting] on fruit on the Day of Atonement. Rab Judah would cool off through squash, Raba through fresh twigs, Rabbah through a silver cup. R. Papa said:<sup>9</sup> On a silver vessel one may not cool oneself if it is full; it is permissible only when it is not full. On an earthen vessel it is forbidden in either case, because [the unglazed vessel] lets the moisture ooze through. R. Papa<sup>10</sup> said: A silver vessel, if not full, is also forbidden for use as a cooler-off, because it may be upset.<sup>11</sup> Ze'iri b. Hama was the host of R. Ammi and R. Assi, and R. Joshua b. Levi, and of all the Rabbis of Caesarea. He said to R. Joseph the son of R. Joshua b. Levi: O, son of a great man,<sup>12</sup> come and let me tell you a fine custom that your father had. He had a towel from the eve of the Day of Atonement, which he soaked in water, made it into a kind of dry vessel, and on the morrow would wipe his face, hands and feet with it. On the eve of the ninth of Ab he would soak it in water and on the morrow he would stroke his eyes with it. Similarly<sup>13</sup> when Rabbah b. Mari came he reported: On the eve of the ninth of Ab a towel was brought to him, he soaked it in water, and put it under his head. On the morrow he would therewith wipe his face, hands and feet. On the eve of the Day of Atonement one brought him a towel, which he soaked in water and made it into a kind of dry vessel, and on the morrow he stroked his eyes with it. Said R. Jacob to R. Jeremiah b. Tahlifa: You had told us the matter in just the opposite fashion and we refuted you by reference to prohibition of wringing out.<sup>14</sup>

R. Menashiah b. Tahlifa, in the name of R. Amram, on the authority of Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said: The following question was propounded to R. Eleazar: Must a scholar, who is a member of an Academy, obtain special permission to declare a firstborn animal allowed,<sup>15</sup> or does he not need that special permission? What was it that appeared doubtful to them? — This is what they wanted to know: In accord with the statement of R. Iddi b. Abin that 'this matter was left in the hands of the Prince as a special distinction for himself', the question is: Must [the elder] receive permission, or, since he is an elder and a member of an Academy, he need not? R. Zadok b. Haloka thereupon stood up and said: I saw R. Jose b. Zimra who was both an elder and a member of an Academy, and indeed was superior to the grandfather of this our Prince,<sup>16</sup> yet obtained permission to declare firstborn animals for profane use! — R. Abba replied to him: It was not like this, but rather, this was the fact:

R. Jose b. Zimra was a priest, and this was his problem: Is the halachah in accord with R. Meir, who said: One who is suspected concerning a matter<sup>17</sup> may neither judge nor offer testimony in connection therewith; or is the halachah in accord with R. Simeon b. Gamaliel who said: Such a one would be trustworthy in a case concerning his neighbour, but not in a case concerning himself? The answer given was: The halachah is in accord with the view of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel. Furthermore did they ask [R. Eleazar]: How about

---

(1) Mid. III, 6. A play on pakh (pitcher) as if derived from pakhakh (to bubble forth).

(2) I.e., Zion, outside Jerusalem, the fortress in the wall of the Holy City.

(3) All of which need a ritual immersion to regain their purity. Zech. XIII, 1.

(4) Some commentators, among them Rashi, omit the bracketed portion. The question taken up again is: Whether, as apart from the prohibition to wear shoes, which applies on the Day of Atonement as a form of affliction, on a Sabbath such crossing would be permissible, since the possibility of their falling off, and being carried, should involve a preventive prohibition of such crossing. They might slide off easily, and thus lead the wearer to carrying them.

(5) Perhaps R. Judah II.

(6) I.e., with their feet dressed in shoes.

(7) The difference between the two lies in this: that shoes, as a rule, are laced or worn tight, whence the danger of their falling off is minimized. Therefore the Rabbis above were seen wearing shoes. But sandals which are but lightly attached, might slide off.

(8) I.e., to find out from Rabina the reason for his absence and thereby remove the suspicion of deliberate negligence in his friend's part from the mind of the Exilarch.

(9) Asheri: Rab.

(10) Alfasi and Asheri: R. Ashi.

(11) The silver vessel, being smooth, may be upset and the liquid spilt, thus offering unlawful flow.

(12) Lit., 'son of a lion'.

(13) [Wilna Gaon Glosses deletes 'Similarly'].

(14) Wringing out is forbidden on the Day of Atonement; the towel had therefore to be dried on the eve of the Day of Atonement. Abba Mari was wrong and rejected this important detail, hence the version reported by R. Jeremiah b. Tahlifa.

(15) According to Sanh. 5a no Sage was permitted to declare a firstborn animal free, i.e., defective and hence permitted for profane use, unless he had received special authorization from the Prince in Palestine. The question here posed is whether a member of an Academy may be considered a privileged person in this respect or not. This problem is not germane to the present discussion and is introduced only because it leads to another (the next) question, touching the Day of Atonement, which was submitted at the same time.

(16) [R. Judah II, whose grandfather was R. Judah I, the Prince].

(17) Since the destruction of the Temple a firstborn animal must be left to pasture under priestly control until it acquired a blemish. To avoid such inconvenience many a priest felt tempted to discover a blemish before its actual appearance, hence the priests were suspected of undue laxity in this matter. V. Bek. 35a.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 78b**

going forth [on the Day of Atonement] in sandals of bamboo? — Thereupon R. Isaac b. Nahmani stood up and said: I saw myself R. Joshua b. Levi going forth in sandals of bamboo on the Day of Atonement. I asked him: How about [on public rain] fast?<sup>1</sup> He answered: There is no difference. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said: I saw R. Eleazar of Niniveh<sup>2</sup> who was going forth in sandals of bamboo on a public [rain] fast, and I asked him: How about the Day of Atonement? He answered: There is no difference. Rab Judah went forth in [sandals made of] reeds; Abaye in [such made] of palm-branches; Raba in [such made of] twisted reeds; Rabbah b. Bar Hanah tied a piece of cloth around his legs and went thus forth.

Rami b. Hama raised an objection: 'A cripple may go forth with his artificial foot', according to R. Meir, whilst R. Jose forbids it. Both agree, however, that he must not go forth with it on the Day of

Atonement.<sup>3</sup> Said Abaye: There, the reference is where it [the wooden leg] has pads, and [the prohibition to go out with them on the Day of Atonement is] due to the comfort [they bring]. Said Raba to him: But if it be no object of wear [without them], would the pads make it one? And, furthermore, is any comfort not coming from shoes forbidden on the Day of Atonement? Did not Rabbah b. Bar Hanah tie a cloth around his legs and thus go forth? Furthermore, since the conclusion [of that teaching] reads: 'If it [the artificial leg] has a receptacle made of pads, it is capable of acquiring ritual uncleanness',<sup>4</sup> it follows that the first portion deals with a wooden leg without such pads? — Rather, said Raba: In truth, all agree that an artificial leg is not considered a shoe, but in the case of the Sabbath they differ on the following point: One Master holds, We decree [the prohibition for fear] it may fall off and cause him to carry it four cubits in a public thoroughfare;<sup>5</sup> whereas the other Master holds, We do not decree [any prohibition because of such fear].

Our Rabbis taught: Children are permitted all these [matters],<sup>6</sup> with the exception of the putting on of shoes. Wherein is the putting on of shoes different? [Presumably] because people might say: Adults made them [wear them]. In all other cases, too, they might say: Adults made them for them? Bathing and anointing can be performed on the preceding day. But sandals, too, may be assumed to have been put on yesterday? It is impossible for sandals to have been put on yesterday, for Samuel said: Let one who would experience a taste of death put on shoes and sleep in them! But it is stated that [the other matters] are permitted [implying] for them at the very outset? — Rather, those things which have nothing to do with their natural growth,<sup>7</sup> the Rabbis have interdicted, these however, which are needed for their health,<sup>8</sup> the Rabbis have not forbidden. For Abaye said: Mother<sup>9</sup> told me the proper treatment for a child consists in [bathing in] warm water and [rubbing with] oil. If he has grown a bit, in egg with kutah;<sup>10</sup> if he grows up still more, the breaking of clay vessels.<sup>11</sup> Thus did Rabbah buy clay vessels in damaged condition for his children who would break them.<sup>12</sup>

THE KING AND THE BRIDE MAY WASH THEIR FACES. According to whom is our Mishnah? According to R. Hananiah b. Tradion. For it was taught: [Even] the king and the bride may not wash their faces. R. Hananiah b. Tradion said in the name of R. Eliezer: The king and the bride may wash their faces. The woman after childbirth may not put on a sandal. R. Hananiah b. Tradion said in the name of R. Eliezer: A woman after childbirth may put on a sandal. Why [may] a king [wash his face]?-Because Scripture said: Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty.<sup>13</sup> Why [may] a bride [wash her face]? — Lest she become unattractive to her husband. Rab said to R. Hiyya: How long [does] a bride [enjoy this privilege]? He replied: As it was taught: One must not withhold her adornment from the bride during the full thirty days [after the wedding].<sup>14</sup> The woman after childbirth may put on shoes to avoid a cold. Samuel said: If there is danger of a scorpion it is permitted [for all to wear shoes].

ONE WHO EATS AS MUCH AS THE BULK OF A BIG DATE. R. Papa asked:

---

(1) V. Ta'an. 12b.

(2) [Probably Nawa in the Golan Province (Transjordan). V. Klein JQR (NS) II, 550ff]

(3) Shab. 65b. It is assumed at present that although the artificial leg is not considered a shoe, it is yet forbidden to walk out with it on the Day of Atonement. Hence sandals of bamboo should also be forbidden on that day.

(4) V. loc. cit.

(5) The minimum constituting a transgression of the prohibition to carry anything in a public thoroughfare. No minimum is necessary for transferring an object from a private to public thoroughfare and vice versa.

(6) Prohibited in our Mishnah on the Day of Atonement.

(7) As wearing shoes.

(8) As washing and anointing.

(9) V. Kid. 31b.

(10) A preserve consisting of sour milk, bread-crusts and salt.

(11) The breaking of the glass is not a concession to their youthful fury, but an excellent outlet for emotional surplus

energies, cheaper than anything else on which they might wreak themselves.

(12) V. Kid. 31b.

(13) Isa. XXXIII, 17.

(14) The bride or young matron retains her privilege for thirty days, even if she becomes a mourner after father or mother, her ornaments would be left to her (v. Keth. 4a). Similar consideration is lawful for the weak mother after childbirth, and for any person in danger of contracting a disease. Hence the 'menace of a scorpion' applies to all, even healthy persons.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 79a

Does the [size of] the date spoken of include the kernel or does it not?<sup>1</sup> R. Ashi asked: Does 'a bone as big as a barley-corn' include the husk or does it not?<sup>2</sup> [Is the reference to] a moist one or to a dry one? — R. Ashi did not ask the question posed by R. Papa: For 'a big date' was said, which means a date in its complete size.<sup>3</sup> R. Papa did not ask the question propounded by R. Ashi, because a moist one would be called 'shibolet' and one without its husk 'ushla'.<sup>4</sup>

Rabbah said in the name of Rab Judah: The big date spoken of is bigger than an egg, and our Rabbis had established the fact that with such a quantity [a hungry person] becomes satisfied,<sup>5</sup> but with less than that he does not become satisfied.

An objection was raised: Once they brought to R. Johanan b. Zakkai a dish to taste and to Rabban Gamaliel two dates and a bucket of water, whereupon they said: Take them up to the Sukkah.<sup>6</sup> (In connection therewith it was taught:)<sup>7</sup> [They ordered so], not because that was the legal decision, but because they desired to take a severer view for themselves. And<sup>8</sup> when someone gave R. Zadok a piece of food smaller than an egg, he would take it with a towel, eat it outside the Sukkah, and pronounce no blessing after it.<sup>9</sup>

---

(1) The Mishnaic text 'kamoha u-kegarinatha' may mean either, date and its kernel; or, date or its kernel (Rashi). Cf. Ex. XXI, 6 where the word 'o' also means 'either' and/or 'or'. V. Mecklenburg, *ha-kethab we-hakabbalah* a.l. [The question is nevertheless not clear. Var. lec., however, read: Does the size of the date (spoken of) with its kernel (refer to) a dry or moist one, v. D. S. a. l. Cf. the next question].

(2) Ber. 41a. The reference is to a bone as small as a barley-corn, of a corpse which renders him who touches it ritually unclean.

(3) I.e., including the kernel.

(4) And not 'se'orah'.

(5) Comes to himself.

(6) This happened on a Sukkoth day, when meals are to be taken in the booth (sukkah).

(7) The bracketed portion is omitted in some texts.

(8) Hul. 107a.

(9) R. Zadok showed a less severe attitude in three things: (a) He did not wash his hands but would take the food with a towel — only because of his fastidiousness. (b) He ate it outside the Sukkah. (c) He did not pronounce the customary blessing after it (Rashi).

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 79b

This [implies that] if it were as big as an egg it would require [to be eaten] in the Sukkah, and if the thought should occur to you that the big date referred to is larger in size than an egg — now if two dates<sup>1</sup> without kernels are not even as large as one egg, how could a large date with its kernel be bigger in size than an egg? — R. Jeremiah said: Yes, two dates without their kernel are not as large as an egg, but a large date with its kernel is bigger than an egg. R. Papa said: Therefore do people say: Two kabs of dates contain as much as one kab of kernels, with a bit left over.<sup>2</sup> Raba said: The reason there was that they were fruits, and fruits do not require [to be eaten in] a Sukkah.<sup>3</sup> An

objection was raised: Rabbi said, ‘When we were studying the Torah with R. Eleazar b. Shammua,’ figs and wine-berries were brought before us and we ate them outside the Sukkah as an incidental meal’. That means only as an incidental meal [is it permitted to eat fruit] outside the Sukkah, but as a proper meal not?<sup>4</sup> — Say: ‘We ate them as [if we had partaken of] an incidental meal outside the Sukkah’.<sup>5</sup> Or, if you like say: ‘We ate them for a regular meal and we ate bread with them outside the Sukkah [in a quantity small enough to be considered only for] an incidental meal’. Shall we say that the following supports his view: ‘Therefore if he made up the number [of meals] by means of delicacies, he has done his duty’.<sup>6</sup> Now if you should think that fruits must be eaten in the Sukkah, he should have stated ‘fruits’ [instead of ‘delicacies’]? What does he mean by ‘delicacies’? ‘Fruits’. Or, if you like, say: [The reference is to] a place wherein fruits are not to be found.

R. Zebid said: The big date whereof they spoke is smaller in size than an egg, for we learned: Beth Shammai say: ‘Of leaven as much as an olive, or leavened bread as much as a date’.<sup>7</sup> And thereon we were debating; what is the reason of Beth Shammai? [And were given this]: Let the Divine Law write about hamez [leavened bread] alone, without needing a reference to leaven, and I would say: If the eating of an olive-size of hamez the leaven whereof is not so intensive is forbidden, how much more is such size forbidden in the case of leaven which is so much more leaven! But since the Divine Law nevertheless mentioned them separately, it teaches you that the minimum size of the one is not the same as of the other, viz., in the case of leaven it is that of an olive, in the case of hamez that of a date. Now if you should think that the big date mentioned is bigger than an egg, since Beth Shammai are looking for a quantity bigger than an olive, let them teach that of an egg; and even if the two be of the same size let them teach ‘that of an egg’. Hence one must infer therefrom that the date spoken of is smaller than an egg! How does that follow? In truth I may say to you, perhaps, that the big date referred to is bigger than an egg, but the normal one is as big as an egg, and (even though they be of the same size)<sup>8</sup> Beth Shammai just mentions one of the two! Rather, may one infer it<sup>9</sup> from here: ‘How much must one have eaten to be obliged to make an appointment for common [saying of] grace [after meals]? The size of an olive, according to R. Meir. According to R. Judah: The size of an egg’.<sup>10</sup> [And in connection therewith it was said:] Wherein are they differing? R. Meir holds: And thou shalt eat,<sup>11</sup> refers to eating. ‘And be satisfied’,<sup>11</sup> refers to drinking. And the minimum of ‘eating’ is the size of an olive whereas R. Judah holds: ‘And thou shalt eat and be satisfied’, i.e., an eating which brings satisfaction, and that is [at least as much] as an egg. And if you should think that the big date referred to is bigger than an egg — how if the quantity of an egg even satisfied one, would it not help one to come to? Thence the inference is proper that the big date referred to is smaller than an egg: the quantity of an egg will satisfy one, the size of a big date will help one to come to. It was taught: Rabbi says,

---

(1) Which R. Gamaliel had eaten in the Sukkah and in connection with which it was stated ‘not that the law required it’, which means they were less than the legal minimum — one egg.

(2) Because the kernels are larger in bulk than the dates.

(3) The argument from the Sukkah is misleading, because fruits, no matter what their quantity, are not required to be eaten in the Sukkah.

(4) Which would signify, as against R. Papa, that fruits in proper quantity would have to be eaten in the Sukkah.

(5) Because they were fruits, no matter how many of them, they would be considered a mere incidental meal, permissible to be had outside the Sukkah.

(6) V. Suk. 28a. R. Eliezer holds fourteen to be the required minimum number of meals that must be taken in the Sukkah during the feast of Tabernacles. If someone now made up the number of prescribed meals by means of delicacies etc.

(7) The minimum, the possession of which during Passover causes one to transgress the prohibition. Ex. XII, 19: Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses, and XIII, 7: And there shall be no leavened bread seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee, in all thy borders. V. Bez. 2a.

(8) [The bracketed words are best left out with var. lec.].

(9) That the big date spoken of is less than an egg.

(10) Ber. 45a.

(11) Deut. VIII, 10.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 80a

All the legal standards [for foods] are the size of an olive, with the exception of that of the ritual defilement of foods, because there Scripture has used a different expression and the Sages accordingly have altered the standard. The proof for this view is furnished by the Day of Atonement.<sup>1</sup> What is the change in the usual expression in connection therewith? — [It follows] from: [For whatsoever soul it be that] shall not be afflicted.<sup>2</sup> And what is the change in the usual quantity the Sages have decreed here? — ‘As much as a date’. And what constitutes the proof from the Day of Atonement?<sup>3</sup> One could have replied: Here it is the usual Scriptural expression.<sup>4</sup>

Whence do we know that the minimum for the ritual uncleanness of foods is the size of an egg? — Said R. Abbahu in the name of R. Eleazar: Scripture says, All food therein which may be eaten,<sup>5</sup> i.e., food<sup>6</sup> derived from food, and that is an egg of a hen. But say it is a kid? That still requires slaughtering.<sup>7</sup> But say it is an animal taken alive out of the slaughtered mother's womb?<sup>8</sup> — That still requires cutting open.<sup>9</sup> Then say: the egg of bar-yokani?<sup>10</sup> — If you take hold of too large a thing, you may lose your hold, but if you take hold of the lesser thing, you will retain your hold.<sup>11</sup> But say: the egg of a little bird, that is very small? — R. Abbahu said in his own name: ‘All food there in which may be eaten’, i.e., food which you may eat in one swallowing; and the Sages measured that the esophagus cannot hold more than the size of a hen's egg.

R. Eleazar said: If one has eaten tallow in these times,<sup>12</sup> he must put down [make a note of] the quantity, because another Rabbinical Court may come and increase the measures.<sup>13</sup> What does increase the measures mean? Would say you that they would declare one obliged to bring a sin-offering for having eaten the size of a small olive, but it was taught: When a ruler sinneth, and doeth through error any one of all the things [which the Lord his God hath commanded] not to be done, and is guilty.<sup>14</sup> i.e., only he who repents when he finds out his transgression must bring a sacrifice, because of his error, but he who does not repent when he finds out his transgression, does not bring a sacrifice for his error.<sup>15</sup> Rather, therefore, must [‘increase the measures’] signify that they would declare a sacrifice obligatory only when he had eaten a quantity as large as a large olive. But according to the first view, viz., that they could impose a sacrifice even for the quantity of a small olive, what does ‘increase the measure’ mean? — It might mean increase the number of sacrifices’ required because of the reduced minimum of the quantities. R. Johanan said: Standard measures and penalties are fixed by laws [communicated] to Moses on Sinai. But the penalties are written out in Scripture? — Rather: The minimum required for penalties is fixed by laws [communicated] to Moses on Sinai. It was also taught thus: The minima required for penalties are fixed by laws [communicated] to Moses on Sinai. Others say: The Court of Jabetz<sup>16</sup> fixed them. But Scripture said: These are the commandments,<sup>17</sup> which means that no prophet is permitted to introduce any new law from then on? — Rather: They were forgotten and then they established them anew.

OR IF HE DRANK A MOUTHFUL. Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel: Not really a mouthful, but so much that if he moves it to one side it looks like a mouthful. But we learned: A MOUTHFUL. — Say: ‘As much as A MOUTHFUL’!

An objection was raised: ‘How much must one have drunk to become culpable? Beth Shammai say: One fourth [of a log], Beth Hillel say: One mouthful. R. Judah in the name of R. Eliezer says: As much as a mouthful. R. Judah b. Bathyra says: As much as can be swallowed at a time! Is this one better than our Mishnah which we explained as meaning: ‘That it look like a mouthful’, and this, too, we can explain: That it look like a mouthful. But if so, it is the same opinion as that of R. Eliezer? — There is a difference in the case of an exact mouthful.<sup>18</sup>

R. Hoshaiah demurred to this: If so, there would be a [another] case in which Beth Shammai took the more lenient view, and Beth Hillel the severer one?<sup>19</sup> — He replied to him:

- (1) Where a change in expression on the part of the Bible involved a change in the fixed minimum standard.
- (2) Lev. XXIII, 29. The usual expression would be: Whosoever eateth on the day. The Rabbis, then, would have applied the normal measure, the olive, the legal minimum with every forbidden food.
- (3) There seems to be no difference between the law touching ritual impurity of foods and that covering the prohibition of food on the Day of Atonement. In both cases change in expression is responsible for change in measure. Wherein, then, lies the reason for the Day of Atonement text being chosen as a proof?
- (4) In the text relating to the uncleanness of foods the expression 'All foods therein which may be eaten' (which is the change in the usual expression alluded to, v. infra) would not appear an unusual expression. But 'that shall not be afflicted' for 'that shall eat' is indeed, unusual and thus accounts best for the change in measure determined by the Rabbis.
- (5) Lev. XI, 34.
- (6) Interpreted: that (coming) from food, which is also eatable.
- (7) Before it can be designated food.
- (8) Lit., 'the young one of an animal which is ripped open'. Such a young animal, where the mother in whose womb it still was, was slaughtered in accord with the rite, is considered ready food, since it does not require ritual slaughtering.
- (9) It is not considered ready food since it requires not, indeed, the ritual slaughter, but cutting open and removal of the blood.
- (10) A bird of fabulous size, the eggs of which are very large, v. Bek. 57b.
- (11) A proverb: v. R.H. 4b. In the case of two possible interpretations, always choose the smaller as the more likely one.
- (12) I.e., when the Temple is no longer in existence.
- (13) R. Eleazar suggested that if the Sanctuary be rebuilt in his days and a new Rabbinical Court were in session, they might render such decision. Hence one who is conscious of having eaten tallow may well take the precaution of putting down the exact quantity so as to be sure that his transgression does, or does not, involve the obligation of a sin-offering, in accord with the new enactment of the revived court.
- (14) Lev. IV, 22.
- (15) As he became conscious of his transgression, the new enactment was still unknown, the quantity of a small olive to him, hence, was below the minimum required for a transgression to be constituted, hence he has not 'found out his transgression', and is not required to offer up a sacrifice in atonement of his sin.
- (16) Identified with Othniel, the son of Kenaz; after the death of Moses he revived the forgotten portions of the law, v. Tem. 16a.
- (17) Lev. XXVII, 34: These are the laws, i.e., no others may ever be offered.
- (18) According to the Hillelites who insist: a mouthful, it is enough if it looks like a generous mouthful when moved to one cheek; according to R. Eliezer the appearance of an exact mouthful is required.
- (19) In the fourth chapter of 'Ed. all cases are enumerated in which, as against the usual norm, Beth Shammai take the more lenient, and Beth Hillel the more severe, view. If our text were right it should have been enumerated as an additional exception, because here too the usual attitudes of these two conflicting schools of learning are reversed, since Beth Hillel make him liable for what appears like a mouthful, which is less than the minimum required by Beth Shammai.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 80b**

When this came up for discussion, it came up in connection with 'Og, king of Bashan',<sup>1</sup> so that Beth Shammai will be found to take the severer view. — R. Zera asked a strong question: To what difference is it due that, with regard to eating, the minimum of a date was fixed for every one, whereas in the case of drinking each has [his minimum] in accord with his own [mouthful]? — Abaye replied to him: Regarding<sup>2</sup> food the Rabbis established that with [the quantity of] a date a person may come to, but with a smaller quantity he will not come to; but with regard to drinking [they have found] that a man will come to with the quantity of his own [mouthful], but not with less

than that. — R. Zera then asked another strong question: ‘All the world’ with a date and Og, the king of Bashan, also with a date? — Abaye replied: The Rabbis have ascertained that [touching food] the quantity [of a date] helps one to come to, but with a smaller quantity he will not come to; but, whereas all the world [can come to] more so, Og, king of Bashan, [only] somewhat so. R. Zera again asked another strong question: Fat meat in the quantity of one date and wine-branches also in the quantity of one date? — Abaye replied: The Rabbis have ascertained that one comes to with so much, but not with less; with [this quantity of] fat meat one becomes, however, more satisfied, whilst with the same quantity of wine-branches one becomes less so. Raba asked a strong question: The quantity of an olive, during the time one could eat a peras,<sup>3</sup> — and the quantity of a date during the time required for eating a peras!<sup>4</sup> — Abaye replied: The Rabbis have ascertained that if it [the eating of the quantity of a date] takes so long [as one could eat a peras] a person will come to, but if longer he will not come to. Raba asked another strong question: The quantity of a date, during the time required for the eating of a peras, and half a peras during the time required for the eating of a peras?<sup>5</sup> — R. Papa answered: Leave alone the uncleanness of the body, which is not determined by Biblical law.<sup>6</sup> But could R. Papa have answered thus? Is it not written: Neither shall ye make yourselves unclean with them, that ye should be defiled thereby.<sup>7</sup> and R. Papa said that from here is derived the Biblical origin of the [laws concerning] the body's becoming defiled [through unclean foods]? — It is really Rabbinical, and Scripture is quoted only as mere [mnemotechnical] aid.<sup>8</sup>

ALL FOODS COMPLEMENT ONE ANOTHER IN MAKING UP THE BULK OF A DATE. R. Papa said: If one ate a piece of raw meat with salt, they are joined;<sup>9</sup> and although [salt] in itself is no food, since people eat [the two] together, they are joined. Resh Lakish said: The juice on the green [vegetables] joins so as to make up [with the vegetable] the [quantity of a] date in connection with the Day of Atonement. But that is self-evident? You might have said: It is drink,<sup>10</sup> therefore he informs us that whatever is used for seasoning food is considered as food. Resh Lakish said: If one eats an excessive meal on the Day of Atonement, he is free from punishment. Why? Scripture said: That shall not be afflicted,<sup>11</sup> and that excludes whatever causes harm.<sup>12</sup> R. Jeremiah said in the name of Resh Lakish: If a non-priest eats excessively of terumah,<sup>13</sup> he need pay but the principal, but not the [fine of the] additional fifth, for Scripture says: And if a man eat,<sup>14</sup> which excluded one causing harm.<sup>15</sup> R. Jeremiah said in the name of R. Johanan: A non-priest

---

(1) I.e., this teaching refers to the case of men as gigantic as Og, king of Bashan (Ber. 54b); in such cases Beth Shammai will be found to have taken, as usual, the severer view. For according to that school the minimum incurring penalty for any man is a fourth of a log, whereas according to the Hillelites it is for each according to his mouthful. According to Beth Shammai, therefore, an ‘Og, king of Bashan’ would become culpable on drinking, what to him would be less than a drop, whereas according to Beth Hillel he would incur penalty only when drinking the generous measure of his own mouthful.

(2) Corrected according to Bah.

(3) Peras, lit., ‘a piece (of bread)’ is in the Tosef. Neg. VII, 10 defined as half a loaf, three of which make a kab. The time it takes to eat such a quantity is the maximum within which morsels of food smaller than the minimum measure are considered to join in order to make up the minimum incurring penalty.

(4) Ought not a longer period to be allowed for the quantity of a date?

(5) If one has eaten half a peras of ritually unclean food during the time it takes to eat a peras of food, one is considered unclean and may not partake of sacred foods. Half a peras is (‘Er. 83a) as two ‘friendly’ (generous sized) eggs, equal in size to three ordinary eggs.

(6) And consequently is not governed by such strict standards.

(7) Lev. XI, 43.

(8) As far as Biblical law is concerned, a person could become defiled by food only by swallowing the meat of a ritually clean fowl that has died a natural death. The reference to this verse is used by R. Papa only to lend support to the more severe rabbinic law.

(9) To make up together the legally required minimum of the big date.

(10) And, according to the Mishnah, foods and drinks do not combine to make up the required minimum.

(11) Lev. XXIII, 29.

(12) The man causes harm to himself by excessive eating and thus is also afflicting himself, or at least not enjoying himself. Rashi suggests that since Jews eat lavishly on the eve of the Day of Atonement, a meal taken immediately thereupon, i.e. after the incidence of the fast, would constitute excessive eating.

(13) V. Glos.

(14) Lev, XXII, 14.

(15) The offence here was committed in error, whence the capital and the fifth as fine is to be repaid by the offender. Such fine would be dispensed with in case this food was taken as an excessive meal, where the eating is but sheer waste of the terumah.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 81a

who chews<sup>1</sup> barley-corns of terumah must pay the principal, but not the additional fifth, for Scripture said: 'If a man eat', that excludes one causing harm. R. Shezbi said in the name of R. Johanan: If a non-priest swallowed jujubes of terumah, and spat them out, and another one ate them, then the first pays the principal, and the fifth, whereas the second does not pay more than their wood [fuel] value.<sup>2</sup>

BUT WHAT A MAN EATS AND DRINKS DOES NOT GO TOGETHER. Who is the Tanna [of this part of the Mishnah]? — R. Hisda said: This has been taught under a controversy of opinion, and it is in accord with R. Joshua, for we learned: R. Joshua pronounced with principle: All foods are equal regarding the [duration of] their uncleanness and the quantity of them [required to convey uncleanness] combine; if they be equal only concerning the [duration of] their uncleanness, but not concerning the quantity of them [required to convey uncleanness]; or only regarding quantity, but not in the duration of uncleanness; or if they be equal neither in respect of [duration of] uncleanness nor quantity, they do not combine [to make up the minimum quantity which constitutes the transgression].<sup>3</sup> R. Nahman said: You may even say that [this part of our Mishnah is] in accord with the Rabbis. For the Rabbis [opposing R. Joshua] hold their view only touching uncleanness, because all are designated as 'uncleanness', but here the point involved is 'coming to', and this<sup>4</sup> does not enable one to come to. Thus also did Resh Lakish say: This has been taught under the controversy of an opinion and our Mishnah is in accord with R. Joshua, for we were taught: R. Joshua pronounced a principle etc. but R. Johanan said: You may even say that our Mishnah is in accord with the Rabbis: There the Rabbis present their view only in connection with uncleanness, but here 'coming to' is the point, and this<sup>4</sup> does not enable one to come to.

MISHNAH. IF A MAN ATE AND DRANK IN ONE STATE OF UNAWARENESS, HE IS NOT OBLIGED TO BRING MORE THAN ONE<sup>5</sup> SIN-OFFERING, BUT IF HE ATE AND PERFORMED LABOUR WHILE IN ONE STATE OF UNAWARENESS HE<sup>6</sup> MUST OFFER UP TWO SIN-OFFERINGS. IF HE ATE FOODS UNFIT FOR FOOD, OR DRANK LIQUIDS UNFIT FOR DRINKING, OR DRANK BRINE OR FISH-BRINE, HE IS NOT CULPABLE.

GEMARA. Resh Lakish said: Why is no explicit warning<sup>7</sup> mentioned in connection with the commandment to afflict oneself? — Because it is impossible. For how shall the Divine Law word it? Were the Divine Law to write: 'He shall not eat'? But 'eating' implies [the minimum size of] an olive.<sup>8</sup> Shall the Divine Law write: 'He shall not afflict himself'?<sup>9</sup> That would mean: Go and eat! — R. Hoshaiah asked a strong question: Let the Divine Law write: 'Take heed, lest thou dost not afflict thyself'! — That would mean several prohibitions.<sup>10</sup> To this R. Bibi b. Abaye demurred: Let the Divine Law write: Take heed concerning the commandment of affliction! 'Take heed' implies a command, if attached to a command, and a prohibition, if attached to a prohibition.<sup>11</sup> R. Ashi asked a strong question: Let the Divine Law write: Do not depart from affliction! — This is a difficulty.

The following Tanna derives it [the prohibition relating to affliction] from here: And ye shall afflict your souls: ye shall do no manner of work.<sup>12</sup> One might have assumed that the punishment<sup>13</sup>

[of extirpation] is involved for one who disregarded the addition<sup>14</sup> by doing a labour, therefore Scripture said: For whatsoever soul it be that doeth any manner of work in that same day he shall be cut off,<sup>15</sup> i.e., only for the [disregard of] that day itself is one punished with extirpation, but for labour performed during the additional time one is not punished with extirpation. One might have assumed that one does not incur punishment of extirpation by doing labour during the additional time, but that one does incur punishment of extirpation for failure to afflict oneself during the additional time, therefore the text reads: For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day he shall be cut off;<sup>16</sup> that means for [failure of] afflicting [oneself on] the day itself does the penalty of extirpation come, but the penalty of extirpation does not result from failure to afflict oneself during the additional time. One might have assumed that one is not included in the penalty, but that one is under a warning against performing work during the additional time, therefore the text reads: And ye shall do no manner of work in that same day,<sup>17</sup> i.e., one is warned concerning the day itself but not concerning [work done] during the additional time. One might have assumed that one is not under a warning concerning labour performed during the additional time, but one is under a warning concerning [failure of] affliction during the additional time; but a logical inference cancels that. For if in the case of labour, the prohibition of which applies on Sabbath and festival days, one is not under a warning [concerning additional time] then with regard to [the commandment of] affliction, which does not apply on Sabbath and festival days, how much more should one not be under a warning against it [during the additional time]! But we have not learnt [so far] of any explicit warning with regard to the [obligation to] affliction on the day itself, whence then do we derive [that required 'warning']? [From the following]: There was no necessity for stating the penalty resulting from the performance of labour, for that is inferable from the [commandment of] affliction. If [for failure of] affliction, which is not commanded on the Sabbath and festival days, one is punished with extirpation, then for the performance of labour [the prohibition of] which does apply on Sabbath and festival days, how much more shall [one be punished with extirpation]! Why then was [the penalty] stated? It is free<sup>18</sup> for interpretation, hence it serves for comparison, to derive thence an inference from analogy of expression: the penalty is stated in connection with [the commandment of] affliction, and the penalty is stated in connection with the [prohibition of] labour, hence just as the performance of labour was punished only after warning,<sup>19</sup> so also is [failure of] affliction punished only after warning. But against this it may be objected:<sup>20</sup> The specific condition with affliction [which attaches a penalty to it] lies in the fact that no exception against the general rule was made here; but would you apply [the same] to the performance of labour seeing that in its case exceptions from the general rule were made?<sup>21</sup> Rather [argue thus]: Let Scripture not mention any penalty in connection with [failure of] affliction, inferring it from the [prohibition of] labour. If [the performance of] labour, from the general prohibition of which some exceptions were made, involves the penalty of extirpation, how much more must [failure of] affliction, from the general prohibition of which no exception was made, involve such penalty? Then why does Scripture mention it? It is free for interpretation, hence it serves for comparison, to derive thence an inference from analogy of expression: the penalty is mentioned in connection with [failure of] affliction, and the same penalty is mentioned in connection with [the performance of] labour, hence just as [performance of] labour is punished only after warning, so is [the failure of] affliction punished only after warning. Against this may be objected: There is a specific condition in connection with labour [to which a penalty is attached] in that it is forbidden on Sabbath and festival days, but would you apply the same to [the commandment of] affliction seeing that does not apply on Sabbath and festival days? Rabina said: This Tanna infers it from the word 'self-same'.<sup>22</sup> Now it must be free,<sup>23</sup> for if it were not free, the objection as above could be raised against it. Hence it indeed must be free.

[Consider] there are<sup>24</sup> five Scriptural verses written in connection with labour:<sup>25</sup> one indicating the prohibition for the day, one the prohibition for the night, one the warning for the day, one the warning for the night, one remains free for inference from [the prohibition of] labour for [the commandment of] affliction, touching both day and night.

The School of R. Ishmael taught: Here the word 'affliction' is used and there the word 'affliction'<sup>26</sup> is used; hence just as there the penalty is incurred only after warning, so here too the penalty is incurred only after warning. R. Aha b. Jacob said: One can infer that from the phrase 'Shabbath Shabbathon' ['solemn day of rest']<sup>27</sup> which occurs in connection with the ordinary Sabbath,<sup>28</sup> and just as there penalty is incurred only after warning, so here too, penalty is incurred only after warning. R. Papa said:

- (1) 'Chewing' which is the term. techn. for irregular eating.
- (2) The first, having eaten them, must pay both principal and fine, a complete offence having been committed by him; but not the second, who ate something which could have been used only as fuel.
- (3) Two half olives from two corpses, or two pieces of the size each of one half of a lentil, coming from a dead creeping thing, share the duration of uncleanness and the minimum quantity; a creeping thing and the carcase of an animal that died a natural death, are alike with regard to duration of the uncleanness they cause (in each case up to the evening of the day), but differ as to the minimum quantity which causes defilement; the former has the standard of an olive, the latter that of a lentil. A human corpse and the carcase of an animal again are alike in the minimum required for defiling a person, viz., an olive, but are different with regard to the duration of the uncleanness caused: the former causing one lasting seven days, the latter one lasting up to the evening only; v. Me'il. 17a.
- (4) The quantity of a big date, composed of food and drink does not enable one to come to, whereas food alone of that quantity would. The only matter in connection with the minimum required on the Day of Atonement is that it enables one to come to, hence the Rabbis could agree here, whilst disputing R. Joshua in the matter of the combination of various unclean foods.
- (5) He did not know all the time that it was the Day of Atonement. Because whereas two offences took place, both belong to one head: eating includes drinking.
- (6) But eating and working are two different forms of activities prohibited on the Day of Atonement, derived from two Scriptural verses, Num. XXIX, 7 and Lev. XXIII, 29.
- (7) The usual form of which is: 'Thou shalt not'.
- (8) The usual minimum (to render one culpable of having eaten forbidden food) is the quantity of an olive. Had the Torah therefore used the phrase 'He shall not eat', the inference would have been that one who ate the quantity of an olive had thereby transgressed the law; whereas the quantity on the Day of Atonement is dependent on one's coming to, which is the result of having eaten as much as the size of a big date.
- (9) The form would be negative, but the meaning just the opposite of what is required!
- (10) 'Take heed' and 'lest' are phrases each implying a separate negative command, v. 'Er. 96a.
- (11) Deut. XXIV, 8: 'Take heed in the plague of leprosy' implies the prohibition of cutting off the bright spot (Lev. XIII, 2) whereas 'Take heed that you do a certain thing', i.e., not neglect it, has affirmative exhortatory meaning. The phrase here would therefore imply a positive command.
- (12) Num. XXIX, 7.
- (13) Reading with Bah.
- (14) The prohibitions and positive commandments in connection with the Day of Atonement become valid some time before the actual commencement of the day — before the night of the tenth of Tishri, and extend for some minutes after the end of the Day of Atonement — the night of the eleventh day. The validity for this additional time of the laws governing the Day of Atonement is Biblical, v. infra 81b.
- (15) Lev. XXIII, 30.
- (16) Lev. XXIII, 29.
- (17) Ibid. v. 28.
- (18) Lit., 'being free', or 'vacated', here unnecessary for the context, hence available for hermeneutical purposes.
- (19) Lev. XXIII, 28.
- (20) The comparison is superficial, because in spite of similarity of expression, basic difference of prevailing conditions render the comparison unjustified, and but for an explicit statement of penalty in the case of 'labour' one would not be able to derive it from 'affliction'.
- (21) None is exempted from the affliction, whereas as regards labour the priests in the Sanctuary were permitted to perform all work in connection with the ceremonial of the Day of Atonement.
- (22) This word occurs both with the prohibition of labour in Lev. XXIII, 30 and with the commandment of affliction in

v. 29 *ibid.*, hence appears available for inference from analogy of expression.

(23) V. p. 397. n. 3.

(24) So Bah.

(25) Lev. XVI, 29; XXIII, 28, 29, 30 and Num. XXIX, 7.

(26) In connection with the rape of a betrothed maiden, Deut. XXII, 24.

(27) Lev. XXIII, 32.

(28) Lit., 'with the Sabbath of creation', i.e., the Sabbath, the observance of which is due to the first Sabbath, a tech. term. for any ordinary seventh day Sabbath, as against other days of rest, viz., the Holy Days.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 81b**

This day itself is also called Sabbath, for Scripture said: [In the ninth day of the month, from even to even], shall ye keep your Sabbath. R. Papa did not [well] interpret as R. Aha b. Jacob, because it is preferable to use a Scriptural text mentioned in connection with the subject itself. But why did not R. Aha b. Jacob expound as R. Papa did? — That<sup>1</sup> is necessary for the following teaching: And ye shall afflict your souls, in the ninth day of the month. One might have assumed that such affliction commences on the ninth of the month already. Therefore the text reads: 'At even'. If from 'at even', one might have inferred that one must afflict oneself only after it gets dark, therefore the text reads: 'In the ninth'. How is [this to be explained]? He should commence to afflict himself whilst it is yet day. From here we learn that we add from the profane time to the sacred one. Thus I know it only at its beginning. Whence do I know it at its end? Therefore Scripture said: 'From even unto even'. Thus I know it only for the Days of Atonement, whence do I learn the same for the Sabbath days? Therefore the text reads: 'Your Sabbath'. How is that? Wherever the word 'shebuth' [rest] is mentioned, we add from the profane time to the sacred one.

How does the Tanna who infers from the word-analogy of 'self-same',<sup>2</sup> 'self-same' interpret the words: 'In the ninth of the month'? — He uses it in accord with what Hiyya, the son of Rab, of Difti taught, for Hiyya, the son of Rab, of Difti learned: 'And you shall afflict your souls in the ninth [day of the month]'. But is one fasting on the ninth? Do we not fast on the tenth? Rather, it comes to indicate that, if one eats and drinks on the ninth, Scripture accounts it to him as if he had fasted on the ninth and the tenth.<sup>3</sup>

IF HE ATE FOODS UNFIT FOR FOOD. Raba said: If one chewed pepper on the Day of Atonement, he is not culpable. If one chewed ginger on the Day of Atonement, he is not culpable. An objection was raised: R. Meir used to say: By mere implication from the text: Then you shall count the fruit thereof as forbidden.<sup>4</sup> I could understand that fruit trees are meant. Why then does Scripture say: 'trees for food'? It means a tree the taste of whose wood and fruit are alike. Say: This is pepper. That teaches you that the plant of pepper is subject to the law of 'orlah',<sup>5</sup> and that the land of Israel lacks nothing, as it is said: Thou shalt not lack anything in it.<sup>6</sup> — That is no difficulty; The one case deals with green pepper, the other with dry pepper.<sup>6</sup> Rabina said to Meremar: But R. Nahman has said that preserved ginger coming from India is permitted,<sup>7</sup> and the blessing . . . Who createst the fruit of the ground' is obligatory [before eating it].<sup>7</sup> — This is no difficulty: The one case deals with fresh one, the other with dry one.

Our Rabbis have taught: If one ate the leaves of calamus, he is culpable. If he ate the leaves of vine, he is culpable. What vines are meant here? — R. Isaac of Magdala said: Such as sprouted forth between New Year and the Day of Atonement.<sup>8</sup> R. Kahana said: During the first thirty days,<sup>9</sup> it was taught in accord with R. Isaac of Magdala: If one ate the leaves of calamus, he is not culpable. If he ate the leaves of vines, he is culpable. The vines meant here are those that sprouted forth between New Year and the Day of Atonement.

IF HE DRANK BRINE OR FISH-BRINE HE IS NOT CULPABLE. But [if he drank] vinegar, he

is culpable — according to whom is our Mishnah? — According to Rabbi. For it was taught: Rabbi said, Vinegar restores the soul.<sup>10</sup> R. Giddal b. Menasseh of Bari of Naresh<sup>11</sup> reported that the halachah is not in accord with Rabbi, whereupon in the following year all went forth to drink [on the Day of Atonement] vinegar [mixed with water]. When R. Giddal heard that he became angry and said: I spoke only of a de facto case, did I say at all that one may do so at the outset? I referred only to a small quantity, did I speak at all of a large one? I spoke only of raw vinegar, did I refer at all to [vinegar] mixed [with water]? [

---

(1) The Scriptural text adduced by R. Papa.

(2) Who infers the additional time from the words of the text, which are free for interpretation (v. supra). To him the words 'And ye shall afflict yourself on the ninth', which to us suggest the additional time, must convey a different meaning.

(3) The feasting on the ninth of Tishri helps to emphasize the solemnity and the self-affliction due on the morrow, indeed, starting at the eve of the same day. The more feasting on the eve of the Day of Atonement, the more pronounced the affliction on the day itself.

(4) Lev. XIX, 23.

(5) Which forbids for the first three years the fruit of trees, v. *ibid*.

(6) Deut. VIII, 9. Hence pepper is considered fruit, and as such should involve the eater thereof on the Day of Atonement in the penalty of extirpation, whereas Raba had taught that one who ate thereof is not culpable. R. Meir speaks of green pepper which can be eaten, hence subject to the law of 'orlah, whereas Raba speaks of dry pepper, which cannot be considered a food, hence one who has eaten thereof, in the best case has not partaken of eatables, in the worst case has harmed himself, in either case is not culpable.

(7) Preserved ginger therefore is considered a food. The blessing due emphasizes that it is considered such.

(8) But if they sprouted forth before the New Year, they are considered stale and 'even as wood', i.e., no food.

(9) The same principle, though in different terms.

(10) I.e., has the effect of satisfying one, of helping one to come to, on the Day of Atonement.

(11) I.e., Bari, which was near Naresh, north of Sura. V. Obermeyer, p.308.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 82a**

**MISHNAH. ONE SHOULD NOT AFFLICT<sup>1</sup> CHILDREN AT ALL ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT. BUT ONE TRAINS THEM A YEAR OR TWO BEFORE<sup>2</sup> IN ORDER THAT THEY BECOME USED TO RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES.**

**GEMARA.** Since [the Mishnah has taught already that] two years before [their attaining majority] they must be trained, is it necessary to state that one must do so a year before that time? R. Hisda said: This is no difficulty: the one refers to a healthy<sup>3</sup> child, the other to a sickly one. R. Huna said: At the age of eight and nine years one trains them by hours,<sup>4</sup> at the age of ten and eleven they must fast to the end of the day, by Rabbinic ordinance. At the age of twelve they must fast to the end of the day by Biblical law, [all this] referring to girls. R. Nahman said: At the age of nine and ten one trains them by hours, at the age of eleven and twelve they must fast to the end of the day by Rabbinic ordinance, at the age of thirteen they must fast to the end of the day by Biblical law, [all this] referring to boys. R. Johanan said: There is no Rabbinic ordinance about the obligation of children to fast to the end of the day. But, at the age of ten and eleven one trains them by hours, at the age of twelve they must fast to the end of the day by Biblical law.

We learned: ONE SHOULD NOT AFFLICT THE CHILDREN AT ALL ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT, BUT ONE TRAINS THEM A YEAR OR TWO BEFORE. That will be right according to R. Huna and R. Nahman: A YEAR OR TWO BEFORE [means] a year before, according to Rabbinic law, or two years before, according to Biblical law.<sup>5</sup> But according to R. Johanan, there is a difficulty!<sup>6</sup> R. Johanan will tell you: 'One or two years before means: before their reaching maturity.'<sup>7</sup>

Come and hear: For Rabbah b. Samuel taught: One does not afflict children on the Day of Atonement, but one trains them a year, or two, before their attaining maturity. That will be right according to R. Johanan, but according to R. Huna and R. Nahman this presents a difficulty. — [These] Rabbis will tell you: ‘Training’ here means ‘fasting to the end of the day’. But has ‘training’ the meaning of ‘fasting to the end of the day’? Was it not taught: What is training? If he was accustomed to eat at the second hour [eight o'clock],<sup>8</sup> one feeds him now at the third hour [nine o'clock]; if he was accustomed to eat at the third hour, one feeds him now at the fourth.<sup>9</sup> Raba b. ‘Ulla said, There are two kinds of training.<sup>10</sup>

**MISHNAH. IF A WOMAN WITH CHILD SMELT,<sup>11</sup> SHE MUST BE GIVEN TO EAT UNTIL SHE FEELS RESTORED. A SICK PERSON IS FED AT THE WORD OF EXPERTS.<sup>12</sup> AND IF NO EXPERTS ARE THERE, ONE FEEDS HIM AT HIS OWN WISH UNTIL HE SAYS: ENOUGH.**

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis taught: If a woman with child smelt the flesh of holy flesh, or of pork, we put for her a reed into the juice and place it upon her mouth. If thereupon she feels that her craving has been satisfied, it is well. If not, one feeds her with the juice itself. If thereupon her craving is satisfied it is well; if not one feeds her with the fat meat itself, for there is nothing that can stand before [the duty of] saving life, with the exception of idolatry, incest<sup>13</sup> and bloodshed [which are prohibited in all situations]. Whence do we know that about idolatry? For it was taught: R. Eliezer said: Since it is said, With all thy soul,<sup>14</sup> why is it said: With all thy might?<sup>14</sup> And since it is said: ‘With all thy might’, why is it said: ‘With all thy soul’? [It but comes to tell you that]<sup>15</sup> if there be a man whose life is more cherished by him than his money, for him it is said: ‘With all thy soul’; and if there be a person to whom his money is dearer than his life, for him it is said: ‘With all thy might’.<sup>16</sup> Whence do we know it about incest and bloodshed? — Because it was taught: Rabbi said, For as when a man rises against his neighbor, and slayeth him, even so is this matter.<sup>17</sup> What matter do we infer for [the rape of] a betrothed maiden from a murderer? — Rather: What was meant to teach, learns itself.<sup>18</sup> Just as in the case of a betrothed maiden it is lawful to save her at the expense of his [the would-be raper's] life, thus also in the case of a murderer. And just as in the case of [an order to] shed blood one should rather be killed oneself than transgress [the prohibition of murder], thus also in the case of a [command to rape a] betrothed maiden, one should rather be killed than transgress [the prohibition of violating her].

---

(1) To make them fast, to deny them food. Concerning other afflictions, v. supra 78b.

(2) The connotation of this is discussed in the Gemara.

(3) With a healthy child the training may be started at an earlier year than with a sick or sickly one.

(4) Extending the hours of fasting from one hour to another.

(5) So Rashi, v. Bah; v. next note. Cur. edd. according to rabbinic law. On interpretation of this reading v. Wilna Gaon, Glosses.

(6) Whereas R. Huna and R. Nahman could explain ‘BEFORE’ as meaning ‘before they are obliged by Rabbinic law’ to fast to the end of the day. R. Johanan holds there is no Rabbinic ordinance compelling children to fast to the end of the day, and would be unable to account for this text.

(7) His answer is simple; ‘before’ means ‘before maturity’, when yet the obligation to fast to the end of the day does not apply.

(8) According to the Jewish calculation for ritual purposes, every day, summer and winter, has twelve hours, every night twelve hours. The hours, however, vary in duration. In December an hour may consist of forty minutes, in June of ninety minutes. In Tishri (usually September) an hour would have about sixty minutes. The first hour of the day would be from six to seven, the second from seven to eight. ‘At the second hour’ would thus correspond to ‘about eight o'clock’.

(9) This indicates, at any rate, that ‘training’ means ‘training by the extension of hours’, not ‘fasting to the end of the day’.

(10) Raba replies that the term ‘training’ is being used in both senses.

(11) Smelt a dish on the Day of Atonement and has a morbid desire for it.

(12) Physicians.

(13) Including adultery.

(14) Deut. VI, 5. The word 'meod', usually translated as 'might', is here interpreted as 'economic might', money.

(15) Life is more important than 'money' or 'might'. Why then the mention of both? If one is commanded to love the Lord even with all one's soul, viz., so that one would surrender life in the service of Him, it is self-evident and therefore superfluous to mention the obligation to love Him with all one's money, viz., to be willing to surrender one's possessions to Him.

(16) Scripture takes account of people's idiosyncrasies, the Lord, Who gave the Torah to Moses, knoweth the heart of man.

(17) Deut. XXII, 26 referring to the rape of a betrothed maiden.

(18) Lit., 'Behold this one comes to teach and turns out a learner'. This passage is intended to throw light on another one, whereas it receives light therefrom.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 82b**

Rut whence do we know that this principle applies in the case of a murder? — This is reasonable. For there was a man who came before Raba and said to him: The lord of my village told me: Kill so-and-so, and if you will not, I shall kill you! — He [Raba] answered: Let him kill you, but do not kill! What makes you see that your blood is redder than his? Perhaps the blood of that man is redder than yours?<sup>1</sup>

There was a woman with child who had smelt [a dish]. People came before Rabbi [questioning him what should be done]. He said to them: Go and whisper to her that it is the Day of Atonement. They whispered to her and she accepted the whispered suggestion, whereupon he [Rabbi] cited about her the verse: Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee.<sup>2</sup> From her came forth R. Johanan. [Again] there was a woman with child who smelt [a dish]. The people came to R. Hanina, who said to them: Whisper to her [that it is the Day of Atonement]. She did not accept the whispered suggestion. He cited with regard to her:

---

(1) The Lord wants you to save your own life, because the life of any one of His children is clear to Him. But your neighbour's life is as clear to Him as your own; and no blood is 'redder than the other'. Hence you must not kill someone else, in order to save life. But if someone comes to murder you, self-defence is not only permissible, but mandatory.

(2) Jer. I, 5.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 83a**

The wicked are estranged from the womb.<sup>1</sup> From her came forth Shabbatai, the hoarder of provisions<sup>2</sup> [for speculation].

A SICK PERSON IS FED AT THE WORD OF EXPERTS. R. Jannai said: If the patient says, I need [food], whilst the physician says: He does not need it, we hearken to the patient. What is the reason? The heart knoweth its own bitterness.<sup>3</sup> But that is self-evident? You might have said: The physician's knowledge is more established; therefore the information [that we prefer the patient's opinion]. If the physician says: He needs it, whilst the patient says that he does not need it, we listen to the physician. Why? Stupor seized him.<sup>4</sup>

We learned: A SICK PERSON IS FED AT THE WORD OF EXPERTS. [That implies]: Only upon the order of experts, but not upon his own order? [Further it implies]: Only upon the order of 'experts,' but not upon the order of a single expert?<sup>5</sup> — This refers to the case that he says: I do not need it. But one should feed him upon the order of one expert? — This refers to the case when someone else is present who agrees that he does not need it. [If so, wherefore state that he] is FED

AT THE WORD OF EXPERTS. Surely that is self-evident, for it is a possibility of danger to human life and ‘in the case of the possibility of danger to human life we take a more lenient view’!<sup>6</sup> — It refers to a case in which two more people are present who say that he does not need it.<sup>7</sup> And although R. Safra said that ‘Two are as a hundred and a hundred are as two’<sup>8</sup> applies only to witnesses, but with regard to opinion we go according to the number of opinions, all that applies only to opinions concerning money matters, but here it is a case where there is a possibility of danger to human life. But since in the second part [of the Mishnah] it states: AND IF NO EXPERTS ARE THERE, ONE FEEDS HIM AT HIS OWN WISH, it is to be inferred that in the first part we deal with the case that he said he needed it? There is something missing [in the Mishnah] and this is how it reads: These things are said only for the case that he says: I do not need it; but if he says: I need it, then if two experts are not there, but one who says: He does not need it, then ONE FEEDS HIM AT HIS OWN WISH.

Mar son of R. Ashi said: Whenever he says. ‘I need [food]’, even if there be a hundred who say, ‘He does not need it’, we accept his statement, as it is said: ‘The heart knoweth its own bitterness’. We learned in the Mishnah: If no experts are there one feeds him at his own wish. That means only if no experts are there, but not if such experts were there? — This is what is meant: These things are said only for the case that he says, ‘I do not need it’, but if he says, ‘I need it’, then there are no experts<sup>9</sup> there at all, [and] one feeds him at his own wish, as it is said: ‘The heart knoweth its own bitterness’.

MISHNAH. IF ONE IS SEIZED BY A RAVENOUS HUNGER,<sup>10</sup> HE MAY BE GIVEN TO EAT EVEN UNCLEAN THINGS UNTIL HIS EYES ARE ENLIGHTENED.<sup>11</sup> IF ONE WAS BIT BY A MAD DOG, HE MAY NOT GIVE HIM TO EAT THE LOBE OF ITS LIVER, BUT R. MATTHIA B. HERESH PERMITS IT.<sup>12</sup> FURTHERMORE DID R. MATTHIA B. HERESH SAY: IF ONE HAS PAIN IN HIS THROAT, HE MAY POUR MEDICINE INTO HIS MOUTH ON THE SABBATH,<sup>13</sup> BECAUSE IT IS A POSSIBILITY OF DANGER TO HUMAN LIFE AND EVERY DANGER TO HUMAN LIFE SUSPENDS THE [LAWS OF THE] SABBATH. IF DEBRIS FALL ON SOMEONE, AND IT IS DOUBTFUL WHETHER OR NOT HE IS THERE, OR WHETHER HE IS ALIVE OR DEAD, OR WHETHER HE BE AN ISRAELITE OR A HEATHEN, ONE SHOULD OPEN [EVEN ON SABBATH] THE HEAP OF DEBRIS FOR HIS SAKE. IF ONE FINDS HIM ALIVE ONE SHOULD REMOVE THE DEBRIS, AND IF HE BE DEAD ONE SHOULD LEAVE HIM THERE [UNTIL THE SABBATH DAY IS OVER].

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: How did they know that his eyes are enlightened again? When he distinguishes between good and bad [food]. — Abaye said: In the taste thereof. Our Rabbis taught: If one was seized by a ravenous hunger, one feeds him with the less forbidden things first; as between *tebel* [untithed food] and carrion,<sup>14</sup> one should feed him carrion first; between *tebel* and fruit of the seventh year, one should give him the fruit of the seventh year first.<sup>15</sup> As between *terumah*<sup>16</sup> and *tebel*, Tannaim are of divided opinion. For it was taught: One should feed him *tebel*, but not *terumah*. Ben Tema holds: *Terumah*, but not *tebel*. Rabbah said: If it is possible [to feed him] with common food,<sup>17</sup> there is general agreement that one should prepare it<sup>18</sup> for him and feed him with it; the dispute concerns the case when it is not possible [to feed him] with common food; one holds that [the prohibition of] *tebel* is more severe, the other assuming that the prohibition<sup>19</sup> of *terumah* is the more severe. The one holds that [the prohibition of] eating *tebel* is more severe because *terumah* is permissible to priests. the other holding [the prohibition of] *terumah* more severe, whereas *tebel* may be rendered right [by tithing].

---

(1) Ps. LVIII, 4.

(2) The suggestion throughout the page of a woman with child who smells a dish and develops a morbid longing for it, is that it is the embryo, and not the mother, who has the desire. If the mother accepted the whispered suggestion, it was due to the noble piety of the unborn child, hence, R. Johanan as the child of the first woman. None is more contemptible than

the speculator in foodstuffs who corners the markets for his sordid gain and who causes great affliction among the poor. Such a person, even in the embryonic stage, would not be influenced by the information that it is the Day of Atonement. He would crave his food, unresponsive to any law or sentiment.

(3) Prov. XIV, 10.

(4) So that he does not feel the lack of food.

(5) Which refutes R. Jannai.

(6) V. Shab. 129a.

(7) Two witnesses are considered sufficient evidence (Deut. XIX, 15) and no increase of their number either strengthens, or if they were counter-witnesses, by reason of superior numbers, weakens their original testimony.

(8) And yet on the strength of the two experts who say 'he needs it', he is fed.

(9) Such experts, opposing the patient's own view, would be ignored: 'They are not present at all'.

(10) \*\*, bulimy, ox-hunger.

(11) Cf. I Sam. XIV, 27. Such ravenous hunger renders the eyes dull.

(12) That was considered a cure: a fore-runner of modern homeopathics. The Tanna who forbids it denies its curative value, hence its use is forbidden. Matthia b. Heresh believed in this cure, hence permitted it.

(13) The dispute here concerns not the principle, but the efficacy, of the proposed medicines.

(14) Whenever the permitted and forbidden food alone are insufficient to restore the patient, one should proceed by eliminating as far as possible the more forbidden foods. Untithed food involves punishment of death by divine hand, whereas the eating of carrion involves only the castigation by stripes.

(15) Similarly is the fruit of the seventh year less 'forbidden', its eating implies much less penalty than the eating of untithed food, because there only the transgression of a positive commandment is involved.

(16) V. Glos.

(17) [Probably it means that the hungry person can wait for the priestly dues to be duly set aside, v. D.S. a.l. p. 50].

(18) By setting aside the prescribed dues.

(19) In each case that food which is considered less forbidden, or involving less of a penalty, would be given first.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 83b**

'If it be possible with common food [etc.]'. Surely it is self-evident?—This refers to the case [that it would have to be done] on the Sabbath.<sup>1</sup> But on the Sabbath, too, It is self-evident, because moving is forbidden only by Rabbinic decree?<sup>2</sup> — We deal here with a pot without a hole, the obligation<sup>3</sup> on which, too' is only Rabbinic.<sup>4</sup> ('One holds [the prohibition of] tebel is more severe, the other holding [the prohibition of] terumah more severe).<sup>5</sup> Shall we say that Tannaim have been disputing this matter already?<sup>6</sup> For it was taught: If one was bitten by a snake, one may call for him a physician from one place into another,<sup>7</sup> or tear open a hen for him, or cut leak from the ground for him, give it to him to eat, without having separated the tithe thereof; this is the view of Rabbi. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon said: He must not eat until tithe has been separated. Shall we say that it is in accord with R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon, and not with Rabbi?<sup>8</sup> — You may even say that it is in accord with Rabbi's view. Rabbi [one may say] makes his statement only here because the tithe of vegetables is in question and that is due but Rabbinically, but in the case of the tithe of corn, which is obligatory by Biblical law, even, Rabbi would agree that if you permit him to eat without [due tithing] in the case of a pot without a hole, he would come to eat likewise even in the case of a pot with a hole.<sup>9</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: If one was seized with a ravenous hunger, he is given to eat honey and all kinds of sweet things, for honey and very sweet food enlighten the eyes of man. And although there is no proof for the matter, there is an intimation in this respect: See, I pray you how mine eyes are brightened. because I tasted a little of this honey.<sup>10</sup> What does 'although there is no proof for the matter' mean? Because there no ravenous hunger has seized him. Abaye said: This applies only after a meal, but before the meal, it even increases one's appetite, as it is written: And they found an Egyptian in the field, and brought him, to David, and gave him, bread, and he did eat,' and they gave him water to drink,' and they gave him a piece of cake of figs, and two clusters of raisins,' and when he had eaten, his spirit came back to him,' for he had eaten no bread, nor drunk any water, three days

and three nights.<sup>11</sup>

R. Nahman said in the name of Samuel: If one was seized by a ravenous hunger, one should give him to eat a tail with honey. R. Huna, the son of R. Joshua said: Also pure flour with honey. R. Papa said: Even barley-flour with honey [is effective]. R. Johanan said: Once I was seized by a ravenous hunger, whereupon I ran to the eastern side of a fig-tree, thus making true in my own case: Wisdom preserveth the life of him who hath it,<sup>12</sup> for R. Joseph learned: One who would taste the [full] taste of a fig, turns to its eastern side, as it is said: And for the precious things of the fruits of the sun.<sup>13</sup>

R. Judah and R. Jose were walking together when a ravenous hunger seized R. Judah. He seized a shepherd and devoured his bread. R. Jose said to him: You have robbed the shepherd! As they entered the city, a ravenous hunger seized R. Jose. They brought him all sorts of foods and dishes. Whereupon R. Judah said to him: I may have deprived the shepherd, but you have deprived a whole town. Also, R. Meir and R. Judah and R. Jose were on a journey together. (R. Meir always paid close attention to people's names, whereas R. Judah and R. Jose paid no such attention to them). Once as they came to a certain place. they looked for a lodging, and as they were given it, they said to him [the innkeeper]: What is your name? — He replied: Kidor. Then he [R. Meir] said: Therefrom it is evident that he is a wicked man, for it is said: For a generation [ki-dor] very forward are they.<sup>14</sup> R. Judah and R. Jose entrusted their purses to him;<sup>15</sup> R. Meir did not entrust his purse to him, but went and placed it on the grave of that man's father. Thereupon the man had a vision in his dream [saying]: Go, take the purse lying at the head of this man! In the morning he [the innkeeper] told them [the Rabbis] about it, saying: This is what appeared to me in my dream. They replied to him: There is no substance in the dream of the Sabbath night<sup>16</sup>. R. Meir went, waited there all day, and then took the purse with him. In the morning they [the Rabbis] said to him,: 'Give us our purses'. He said: There never was such a thing!<sup>17</sup> R. Meir then said to them: Why don't you pay attention to people's names? They said: Why have you not told this [before]. Sir? He answered: consider this<sup>18</sup> but a suspicion. I would not consider that a definite presumption! Thereupon they took him [the host] into a shop [and gave him wine to drink].<sup>19</sup> Then they saw lentils on his moustache. They went to his wife and gave her that as a sign, and thus<sup>20</sup> obtained their purses and took them back. Whereupon he went and killed his wife. It is with regard to this that it was taught:<sup>21</sup> [Failure to observe the custom of] the first water<sup>22</sup> caused one to eat the meat of pig, [failure to use] the second water slew a person. At the end they, too, paid close attention to people's names. And when they called to a house whose [owner's] name was Balah, they would not enter, saying: He seems to be a wicked man, as it is written: Then said I of her that was [balah] worn out by adulteries.<sup>23</sup>

**IF SOMEONE WAS BITTEN BY A MAD DOG.** Our Rabbis taught: Five things were mentioned in connection with a mad dog. Its mouth is open, its saliva dripping, its ears flap, its tail is hanging between its thighs, it walks on the edge of the road. Some say, Also it barks without its voice being heard. Where does it<sup>24</sup> come from? — Rab said: Witches are having their fun with it. Samuel said: An evil spirit rests upon it. What is the practical difference between these two views? — This is the difference

---

(1) On the Sabbath it is not usually permitted to separate the terumah.

(2) [The prohibition to set aside on Sabbath any of the priestly dues is of Rabbinical origin, in the same category as moving about on the Sabbath articles that are unfit for use (cf. Bez. 36b)].

(3) To tithe the fruit grown therein.

(4) [I.e., the tebel under consideration grew in a pot without a hole, and consequently not subject biblically to priestly dues. Nevertheless where it can be rendered right by setting aside the dues, we are told one should rather override the shebuth (v. Glos.) involved than feed him with what is regarded as tebel only Rabbinically (Rashi)].

(5) [On the interpretation of Rashi which is followed in these notes, the bracketed passage is best omitted, as it is in various MSS. V. D.S.]

(6) [I.e., Rabbah's principle that we override the shebuth rather than to feed him, with produce which is tebel only

Rabbinically, v. p. 408, n. 10].

(7) On the Sabbath, as a rule, that would not be permitted, but in the case of a possible danger to human life, that restriction would be inoperative.

(8) [I.e., Rabbah's principle is in agreement with R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, who likewise holds that the vegetables must be first tithed even on Sabbath, although they are subject to tithes only Rabbinically].

(9) In which case the obligation is Biblical, which involves the penalty of death by divine decree. [MS.M. has an entirely different reading of the whole passage. v. D.S. a. l.]

(10) I Sam. XIV, 29.

(11) I Sam. XXX, 11, 12.

(12) Eccl. VII, 12.

(13) Deut. XXXIII, 14.

(14) Ibid. XXXII, 20. The name 'kidor' suggested to R. Meir one who does not deserve confidence. That, as he later explained, was an idiosyncrasy of his own, amounting at best to an intuitive caution.

(15) It was on the eve of the Sabbath,

(16) The Sabbath rest gives rise to idle thoughts which are then reflected in dreams.

(17) Lit., 'these things never happened'.

(18) The suggestion conveyed by the sound of a man's name.

(19) Supplemented from Bah.

(20) Telling him the husband had sent them for the purses and giving her as a proof the fact that lentils had been the last meal in her house.

(21) Corrected in accord with marginal gloss.

(22) The washing of hands before meals implies 'the first water', as against the latter water-washing of the hands after meals, to remove any fat, grease, crumbs, from the meal. The one precedes the blessing before the meal, the other the grace after meals. Failure to wash his hands before meals caused one to eat pork. A certain innkeeper, who served both Jews and heathens, guided himself by the attitude of the guests as to 'first waters'. Once a non-conforming Jew entered, asked for a meal, without washing his hands; the innkeeper taking him for a heathen, placed pork before him (Rashi). In our case, had Kidor washed his hands after meals, and as is usual in such a case, wiped his upper lip, the traces of his repast would not have been visible, the Rabbis would have had no clue as to how to restore their purses to themselves, and the enraged thief would not have killed his wife.

(23) Ezek. XXIII, 43. A play on 'balah', viz., one worn out by wrong living.

(24) The madness of the dog.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 84a**

as to killing it by throwing<sup>1</sup> something at it. It was taught in accordance with Samuel: When one kills it, one does so only with something thrown against it. One against whom it rubs itself is endangered; one whom it bites, dies. 'One against whom it rubs itself is endangered'. What is the remedy?—Let him cast off his clothing, and run. As happened with R. Huna, the son of R. Joshua, against whom one mad dog rubbed itself in the market-place: he stripped off his garments and ran, saying: I fulfilled in myself. 'Wisdom preserveth the life of him who hath it'.<sup>2</sup>

'One whom it bites, dies'. What is the remedy? — Abaye said: Let him take the skin of a male hyena.<sup>3</sup> and write upon it: I, So-and-so, the son of that-and-that woman, write upon the skin of a male Hyena: Hami, kanti, kloros. God, God, Lord of Hosts, Amen, Amen, Selah,<sup>4</sup> Then let him strip off his clothes, and bury then, in a grave [at cross-roads],<sup>5</sup> for twelve months of a year. Then he should take them out and burn them in an oven, and scatter the ashes. During these twelve months, if he drinks water, he shall not drink it but out of a copper tube, lest he see the shadow<sup>6</sup> of the demon and be endangered. Thus the mother of Abba b. Martha, who is Abba b. Minyumi, made for him a tube of gold [for drinking purposes].

FURTHERMORE DID R. MATTHIA SAY. R. Johanan suffered from scurvy. He went to a matron, who prepared something for him on Thursday and Friday. He said to her: How shall I do it

on the Sabbath? She answered him,: Then you will not need it [any more]. He said: But if I should need it, what then,? She replied: ‘Swear unto me by the God of Israel<sup>7</sup> that you will not reveal it’ [to others]; whereupon he swore: ‘To the God of Israel I shall not reveal it’. She revealed it to him, and he went forth and expounded it in his lecture. But he had sworn to her? — [He swore]: ‘To the God of Israel I shall not reveal it’ [which implies] but to His people I shall reveal it! But this is a profanation of the Name?<sup>8</sup> — It was so that he had explained it [the meaning of his oath] to her from the very beginning. What did she give to him? R. Aha, the son of R. Ammi said: The water of leaven, olive oil and salt. R. Yemar said: Leaven itself, olive oil and salt. R. Ashi said: The fat of a goose-wing. Abaye said: I tried everything without achieving a cure for myself, until an Arab recommended: ‘Take the stones of olives which have not become ripe one third, burn them in fire upon a new rake, and stick them into the inside of the gums’.<sup>9</sup> I did so and was cured. Whence does [scurvy] come? — From [eating] very hot wheat [-en bread], and from the [overnight] remnants of a pie of fish-hash and flour. What is its symptom? — If he puts anything between his teeth, his gums will bleed.

When R. Johanan suffered from scurvy, he applied this [remedy] on the Sabbath and was healed. How could R. Johanan do that?<sup>10</sup> — R. Nahman b. Isaac said: It is different with scurvy, because whereas it starts in the mouth, it ends in the intestines. R. Hiyya b. Abba said to R. Johanan: According to whom is it? According to R. Matthia b. Heresh who said that if one has pains in his throat one may pour medicine into his mouth on the Sabbath?<sup>11</sup> — I say: In this case, but in no other.<sup>12</sup> Shall we say that the following [teaching] supports his view? If one is attacked by jaundice one may give him to eat the flesh of a donkey; if one was bitten by a mad dog, one may give him to eat the lobe of its liver; and to one who has pains in his mouth may be given medicine on the Sabbath — this is the view of R. Matthia b. Heresh; but the Sages say: These are not considered cures — Now what does ‘these’ mean to exclude? Won't you say it is meant to exclude medicine?<sup>13</sup> No, it is meant to exclude blood-letting in case of asphyxia.<sup>14</sup> Thus also does it seem logical. For it was taught: R. Ishmael son of R. Jose reported three things in the name of R. Matthia b. Heresh: One may let blood in the case of asphyxia on the Sabbath, and one whom a mad dog has bitten may be given to eat the lobe of its liver, and one who has pains in his mouth may be given medicine on the Sabbath, whereas the Sages hold: These are not considered cures. Now what does ‘these’ exclude? Would you not say ‘these’ excludes the two latter one, and not the first one?<sup>15</sup> — No, it means to exclude the first two ones, and not the last one.

---

(1) If it were killed by something held in one's hand the contact with the dog's body might cause the evil spirit to attack the dog's assailant. If madness is the result of witches' fun, no such danger would seem to inhere.

(2) Eccl. VII, 12.

(3) Or, leopard.

(4) V. Blau, *Altjud. Zauberwesen*, p. 80f

(5) Supplemented from Bah.

(6) Which might have jumped over from the dog, and would endanger him.

(7) The Hebrew proposition ‘l’ may be interpreted as ‘by’ (the God of Israel), as the matron meant it; or, ‘to’ the God of Israel, as the Rabbi took it: I swear that ‘to the God of Israel I shall not reveal it’.

(8) If a scholar deceives a non-Jew he profanes the Name of the Lord, Who is associated with the Torah and Israel, much more than when an ordinary Jew does so although it is a grave offence in any case.

(9) Lit., ‘inside the row of teeth’.

(10) Since that does not seem to be a dangerous disease, justifying the application of medicine on the Sabbath day. By Rabbinic ordinance that is forbidden, as a fence around the law (Aboth I, 1) to prevent its leading to the grinding of spices for medicinal purposes, grinding being one of the thirty-nine kinds of labour prohibited by Biblical law on the Sabbath.

(11) But the Sages oppose R. Matthia, hence he remains in the minority and his permission is invalid.

(12) Here the Sages will agree with him, because of the ultimately dangerous character of the disease.

(13) As being permissible owing to their curative properties.

(14) Which is permitted.

(15) Which the Rabbis consider a cure. Which proves that the Sages, while they regard bloodletting as a cure for asphyxia and permissible on Sabbath, do not extend this sanction to medicine in general.

### **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 84b**

Come and hear: For Rabbah b. Samuel learned: If a woman with child has smelt [food], one feeds her until she is restored; and one who was bitten by a mad dog is given to eat from the lobe of its liver, and one who has pains in his mouth may be given medicine on the Sabbath — these are the words of R. Eleazar b. Jose in the name of R. Matthia b. Heresh. But the Sages say: In this case, but not in another. Now what does ‘in this case refer to? Would you say to the woman with child? That is self-evident; for is there anyone to say that in the case of a woman with child it would not be permitted? — Hence it must refer to the medicine.<sup>1</sup> This is conclusive.<sup>2</sup>

R. Ashi said: Our Mishnah too justifies this inference. R. MATTHIA B. HERESH SAID FURTHERMORE: IF ONE HAS PAINS IN HIS MOUTH ONE MAY GIVE HIM MEDICINE ON THE SABBATH.<sup>3</sup> And herein the Rabbis<sup>4</sup> do not dispute him. For if it were that the Rabbis dispute him, he should teach these together,<sup>5</sup> and afterwards mention that the Rabbis dispute it . This is conclusive evidence.

BECAUSE IT IS A POSSIBILITY OF DANGER TO HUMAN LIFE. Why was it necessary to add ‘AND WHEREVER THERE IS DANGER TO HUMAN LIFE, THE LAWS OF THE SABBATH ARE SUSPENDED?—Rab Judah in the name of Rab said: Not only in the case of a danger [to human life] on this Sabbath, but even in the case of a danger on the following Sabbath.<sup>6</sup> How that? If e.g. the [diagnosis] estimates an eight-day [crisis] the first day of which falls on the Sabbath. You might have said, let them wait until the evening, so that the Sabbaths may not be profaned because of him, therefore he informs us [that we do not consider that]. Thus also was it taught: One may warm water for a sick person on the Sabbath, both for the purpose of giving him a drink or of refreshing him, and not only for [this] one Sabbath did they rule thus, but also for the following one. Nor do we say: Let us wait, because perchance he will get well, but we warm the water for him immediately, because the possibility of danger to human life renders inoperative the laws of the Sabbath, not only in case of such possibility on this one Sabbath, but also in case of such possibility on another Sabbath. Nor are these things to be done by Gentiles or minors,<sup>7</sup> but by Jewish adults.<sup>7</sup> Nor do we say in this connection: We do not rely in such matters on the opinions of women, or of Samaritans, but we join their opinion to that of others.<sup>8</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: One must remove debris to save a life on the Sabbath, and the more eager one is, the more praiseworthy is one; and one need not obtain permission from the Beth din. How so? If one saw a child falling into the sea, he spreads a net and brings it up — the faster the better, and he need not obtain permission from the Beth din though he thereby catches fish [in his net]. If he saw a child fall into a pit, he breaks loose one segment [of the entrenchment] and pulls it up — the faster the better; and he need not obtain permission of the Beth din, even though he is thereby making a step [stairs]. If he saw a door closing upon an infant,<sup>9</sup> he may break it, so as to get the child out — the faster the better; and he need not obtain permission from the Beth din, though he thereby consciously makes chips of wood. One may extinguish and isolate [the fire] in the case of a conflagration — the sooner the better, and he need not obtain permission from the Beth din, even though he subdues the flames.<sup>10</sup> Now all these cases must be mentioned separately. For if only the case of the [infant falling into] the sea had been mentioned [one would have said, it is permitted there] because meantime<sup>11</sup> the child might be swept away by the water, but that does not apply in the case [of its falling into] the pit, because since it remains [stays] therein, one might have thought, one may not [save it before obtaining permission], therefore it is necessary to refer to that. And if the teaching had confined itself to the case of the pit, [one would have thought, there no permission is

required] because the child is terrified but in the case of a door closing upon it, one might sit outside and [amuse the child] by making a noise with nuts, therefore it was necessary [to include that too].

For what purposes is the 'extinguishing' and 'isolating' necessary? — Even for the benefit of another [neighbouring] court.

R. Joseph said on the authority of Rab Judah, in the name of Samuel: In the case of danger to human life one pays no attention to majority. How is that? Would you say [in the case of] nine Israelites and one heathen among them? But then the majority consists of Israelites! Or, even if there were half and half, in the case of danger to human life, we take the more lenient view? Again, if you say that it is a case of nine heathens and one Israelite, that too is self-evident, because it is stationary and whatever is stationary is considered<sup>12</sup> half and half? — No, it refers to a case in which [one has]<sup>13</sup> gone off into another court.<sup>14</sup> You might have said: Whosoever has gone off, has gone off from the majority which consisted of heathens, therefore the information that in case of danger to human life, we are not concerned with question of majorities which consisted of heathens. But that is not so, for R. Assi said in the name of R. Johanan: In the case of nine heathens and one Israelite, [if a building collapsed upon them while they were all] in that court, one must remove debris, but not if [a building collapsed] in another court?<sup>15</sup> — This is no contradiction: In the one case all had gone off, in the other only a few had gone off.<sup>16</sup> But could Samuel have said that? Have we not learnt: If one finds therein<sup>17</sup> a child abandoned, if the majority of the inhabitants are heathens, it is to be considered a heathen; if the majority are Israelites, it is to be considered an Israelite; in the case of half and half it is to be also considered an Israelite.<sup>18</sup> And in connection therewith Rab said: This was taught only in relation to sustaining it,<sup>19</sup> but not for the purpose of legitimizing<sup>20</sup> it;

---

(1) V. p. 414, n. 3.

(2) That the Rabbis agree that this may be given on Sabbath.

(3) [The text here differs from the one given in the Mishnah, but agrees with the reading in the Mishnah of MS.M].

(4) The authorities of the first view given anonymously in the Mishnah.

(5) With the other case, wherein the Sages oppose his view.

(6) As is soon explained.

(7) So MS.M.; cur. edd. Cutheans (Samaritans). If the original 'Cutheans is preferred, then 'gedole Yisrael' (rendered here 'adult Jews') means 'even prominent Jews' — shall profane the Sabbath to save life.

(8) If e.g., two say it is necessary, three say it was not, and a woman or a non-Jew assert it is necessary, the opinion of the latter is joined to that of the others, who are in the affirmative, thus presenting a divided opinion, in which case, since danger to human life is involved, the more lenient view is adopted.

(9) The infant may be frightened, or within the room, endangered.

(10) And produces a coal-fire, which may be utilised. For other readings v. D.S. a.I.

(11) Until such permission is obtained.

(12) Kabua'. For a full explanation of this principle v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 531, n. 4.

(13) [So Asheri].

(14) And in that court he became buried in the debris.

(15) Where to one of the group had repaired.

(16) [In the former case, since they all had left the former court, the principle of kabua' no longer operates, and consequently the majority decides, but in the latter case, since there still remains a number of them in the former court, we apply the principle of kabua' and the debris have to be removed. So Asheri; Rashi explains differently].

(17) In a town wherein Israelites and Gentiles live.

(18) V. Keth. 15a.

(19) Jews are in duty bound to support their own poor.

(20) If the child found exposed were a girl, she could not marry a priest, who is obliged to marry a native-born Israelite, not a proselyte.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 85a

whereas Samuel said: [It was taught] with reference to removing the debris for its sake?<sup>1</sup> — The words of Samuel refer to the first clause, 'If the majority are heathens, it is considered a heathen'. It is in connection therewith that Samuel said that it did not apply to the saving of life.<sup>2</sup>

'If the majority are heathens, it is considered a heathen'. For what practical law [is this taught]? — Said R. Papa: To give it to eat carrion.<sup>3</sup> 'If the majority are Israelites, it is considered an Israelite' — For what practical purpose [is this taught]? To restore to it lost property.<sup>4</sup> 'In the case of half and half, it is considered an Israelite'. For what practical purpose [is this taught]? Resh Lakish said: With regard to damages<sup>5</sup> How that? Shall we say that one ox of ours gored one of his?<sup>6</sup> Let him bring proof and collect!<sup>7</sup> — No, It is necessary for the case that an ox of his had gored one of ours; then he must pay one half, and concerning the other he can say: Prove that I am not an Israelite and collect!<sup>8</sup>

IF DEBRIS HAD FALLEN UPON SOMEONE [etc.]. What does he teach herewith?<sup>9</sup> — It states a case of 'not only'.<sup>10</sup> Not only must one remove the debris in the case of doubt as to whether he is there or not, as long as one knows that he is alive if he is there; but, even though it be doubtful whether he is alive or not he must be freed from the debris. Also, not only if it is doubtful whether he be alive or dead, as long as it is definite that he is an Israelite; but even if it is doubtful whether he is an Israelite or a heathen, one must, for his sake, remove the debris.

IF ONE FINDS HIM ALIVE, ONES SHOULD REMOVE THE DEBRIS. But that is self-evident if one finds him alive? — No, the statement is necessary for the case that he has only a short while to live.

AND IF HE BE DEAD, ONE SHOULD LEAVE HIM THERE. But that, too, is self-evident? — It is necessary because of the teaching of R. Judah b. Lakish. for it was taught: One may not save a dead person out of a fire.<sup>11</sup> R. Judah b. Lakish said: I heard that one may save a dead person out of a fire. Now even R. Judah b. Lakish says that only because<sup>12</sup> 'a person is upset about a dead relative' and if you will not permit him [to save his dead] he will ultimately come to extinguish the fire, but here, if you do not permit it, what can he do?<sup>13</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: How far does one search?<sup>14</sup> Until [one reaches] his nose. Some say: Up to his heart. If one searches and finds those above to be dead, one must not assume those below are surely dead. Once it happened that those above were dead and those below were found to be alive. Are we to say that these Tannaim dispute the same as the following Tannaim? For it was taught: From where does the formation of the embryo commence? From its head, as it is said: Thou art he that took me [gozi] out of my mother's womb,<sup>15</sup> and it is also said: Cut off [gozi] thy hair and cast it away.<sup>16</sup>

Abba Saul said: From the navel which sends its roots into every direction!<sup>17</sup> You may even say that [the first view is in agreement with] Abba Saul, inasmuch as Abba Saul holds his view only touching the first formation, because 'everything develops from its core [middle]', but regarding the saving of life he would agree that life manifests itself through the nose especially, as it is written: In whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life.<sup>18</sup>

R. Papa said: The dispute arises only as to from below upwards,<sup>19</sup> but if from above downwards, one had searched up to the nose, one need not search any further, as it is said: 'In whose nostrils was the breath of life'.

R. Ishmael, R. Akiba and R. Eleazar b. Azariah were once on a journey, with Levi ha-Saddar<sup>20</sup> and R. Ishmael son of R. Eleazar b. Azariah following them. Then this question was asked of them: Whence do we know that in the case of danger to human life the laws of the Sabbath are suspended? — R. Ishmael answered and said: If a thief be found breaking in.<sup>21</sup> Now if in the case of this one it is

doubtful whether he has come to take money or life; and although the shedding of blood pollutes the land, so that the Shechinah departs from Israel, yet it is lawful to save oneself at the cost of his life — how much more may one suspend the laws of the Sabbath to save human life! R. Akiba answered and said: If a man come presumptuously upon his neighbour etc. thou shalt take him from My altar, that he may die.<sup>22</sup> I.e., only off the altar, but not down from the altar.<sup>23</sup> And in connection therewith Rabbah b. Bar Hana said in the name of R. Johanan: That was taught only when one's life is to be forfeited,

- 
- (1) Which seems to indicate that even in the case of saving human life it is the majority which decides the legal attitude.
  - (2) Samuel holds that even in that case life must be saved, majority or minority not influencing such a duty.
  - (3) I.e., the flesh of an animal that either died a natural death, or in the course of the ritual slaughter in which some irregularity occurred. An Israelite bound by the ritual could not partake thereof, whereas a non-Israelite could eat it.
  - (4) V. B.M., Sonc. ed., p. 149, n. 6.
  - (5) V. B.K., Sonc. ed., p. 211, n. 6. The Jewish owner of an ox which has gored an ox owned by a heathen, is not obliged to pay damages, whereas the heathen would have to pay full damage, whether the owner had been forewarned or not. The Jewish owner of an ox who has gored an ox owned by a fellow-Jew, if not forewarned must pay half of the damage; if forewarned, full damage.
  - (6) I.e., the abandoned child. The suggestion is that we would make him pay damage.
  - (7) The damages due to you.
  - (8) He pays one half, as any Jew not forewarned would if his ox gored the ox of a fellow-Jew. The owner in this case would wait to collect full damages, claiming the owner of the goring ox to be a heathen, hence obliged to repay full damages, even if not forewarned. The latter would say: One half I have paid because I am a Jew. If you wish to collect the other half, it is upon you to adduce evidence that I am not a Jew. Only thus could you collect.
  - (9) What is the value of all these hypothetical cases, doubtful savings of life, that he adduces.
  - (10) Lit., 'it is not required'.
  - (11) On the Sabbath, which may be profaned to save life, but not to save a dead person from being burnt.
  - (12) Shab. 43b.
  - (13) There is no Biblical law he can transgress; he will but wait for the end of the Sabbath day to do this work.
  - (14) If the person buried under the debris gives no sign of life at the point at which debris have been removed from him.
  - (15) Ps. LXXI, 6.
  - (16) Jer. VII, 29.
  - (17) Hence the dispute of these Tannaim looks exactly the same as those mentioned above.
  - (18) Gen. VII, 22.
  - (19) If the person under the debris has his feet up and his head down. According to one view, one must examine the core, i.e., the heart; according to the other, even though the heart seems to have suspended action, the definitive diagnosis depends on the action or failure of the function of the nose.
  - (20) Perhaps the systematizer: one who arranged traditions systematically, as opposed to one who excels in dialectics. [Aruch:ha-Sarad: the netmaker].
  - (21) Ex. XXII, 1, in which case, in spite of all the other considerations, it is lawful to kill him.
  - (22) Ex. XXI, 14.
  - (23) If he came as priest to do his service, one may take him off the altar, but if he had commenced on it, one may not take him down.

## **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 85b**

but to save life<sup>1</sup> one may take one down even from the altar. Now if in the case of this one, where it is doubtful whether there is any substance in his words or not, yet [he interrupts] the service in the Temple [which is important enough to] suspend the Sabbath, how much more should the saving of human life suspend the Sabbath laws! R. Eleazar answered and said: If circumcision, which attaches to one only of the two hundred and forty-eight members of the human body, suspends the Sabbath,<sup>2</sup> how much more shall [the saving of] the whole body suspend the Sabbath! R. Jose son of R. Judah said: Only ye shall keep My Sabbaths,<sup>3</sup> one might assume under all circumstances, therefore the

text reads: 'Only' viz, allowing for exceptions.<sup>4</sup> R. Jonathan b. Joseph said: For it is holy unto you;<sup>5</sup> I.e., it [the Sabbath] is committed to your hands, not you to its hands.

R. Simeon b. Menassia said: And the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath.<sup>6</sup> The Torah said: Profane for his sake one Sabbath, so that he may keep many Sabbaths. Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel: If I had been there, I should have told them something better than what they said: He shall live by them,<sup>7</sup> but he shall not die because of them. Raba said: [The exposition] of all of them could be refuted, except that of Samuel, which cannot be refuted. That of R. Ishmael — perhaps that is to be taken as Raba did, for Raba said : What is the reason for the [permission to kill the] burglar? No man controls himself when his money is at stake, and since [the burglar] knows that he [the owner] will oppose him, he thinks: If he resists me I shall kill him, therefore the Torah says: If a man has come to kill you. anticipate him by killing him! Hence we know it [only] of a certain case; [but] whence would we know it of a doubtful one? That of R. Akiba's, there too [there may be a refutation]. Perhaps we should do as Abaye suggests, for Abaye said: We give him<sup>8</sup> a couple of scholars, so as to find out whether there is any substance in his words. Again we know that only in the case of certain death, [but] whence would we know it of a doubtful case? [And similarly with the exposition of] all of them we know it only of a certain case; whence do we know of a doubtful case? But of Samuel, as to that there is no refutation. Rabina, or R. Nahman b. Isaac said: 'Better is one corn of pepper than a whole basket full of pumpkins.'<sup>9</sup>

**MISHNAH. THE SIN-OFFERING AND THE GUILT-OFFERING [FOR THE] UNDOUBTED COMMISSION OF CERTAIN OFFENCES<sup>10</sup> PROCURE ATONEMENT, DEATH AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT PROCURE ATONEMENT TOGETHER WITH PENITENCE.<sup>11</sup> PENITENCE PROCURES ATONEMENT FOR LIGHTER TRANSGRESSIONS: [THE TRANSGRESSION OF] POSITIVE COMMANDMENTS AND PROHIBITIONS. IN THE CASE OF SEVERER TRANSGRESSIONS IT [PENITENCE] SUSPENDS [THE DIVINE PUNISHMENT], UNTIL THE DAY OF ATONEMENT COMES TO PROCURE ATONEMENT. IF ONE SAYS: I SHALL SIN AND REPENT, SIN AND REPENT, NO OPPORTUNITY WILL BE GIVEN TO HIM TO REPENT.<sup>12</sup> [IF ONE SAYS]: I SHALL SIN AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT WILL PROCURE ATONEMENT FOR ME, THE DAY OF ATONEMENT PROCURES FOR HIM NO ATONEMENT. FOR TRANSGRESSIONS AS BETWEEN MAN AND THE OMNIPRESENT THE DAY OF ATONEMENT PROCURES ATONEMENT, BUT FOR TRANSGRESSIONS AS BETWEEN MAN AND HIS FELLOW THE DAY OF ATONEMENT DOES NOT PROCURE ANY ATONEMENT, UNTIL HE HAS PACIFIED HIS FELLOW. THIS WAS EXPOUNDED BY R. ELEAZAR B. ALARIAH: FROM ALL YOUR SINS BEFORE THE LORD SHALL YE BE CLEAN,<sup>13</sup> I.E., FOR TRANSGRESSIONS AS BETWEEN MAN AND THE OMNIPRESENT THE DAY OF ATONEMENT PROCURES ATONEMENT, BUT FOR TRANSGRESSIONS AS BETWEEN MAN AND HIS FELLOW THE DAY OF ATONEMENT DOES NOT PROCURE ATONEMENT UNTIL HE HAS PACIFIED HIS FELLOW.<sup>14</sup> R. AKIBA SAID: HAPPY ARE YOU, ISRAEL! WHO IS IT BEFORE WHOM YOU BECOME CLEAN? AND WHO IS IT THAT MAKES YOU CLEAN? YOUR FATHER WHICH IS IN HEAVEN, AS IT IS SAID: AND I WILL SPRINKLE CLEAN WATER UPON YOU AND YE SHALL BE CLEAN.<sup>15</sup> AND IT FURTHER SAYS: THOU HOPE OF ISRAEL, THE LORD!<sup>16</sup> JUST AS THE FOUNTAIN RENDERS CLEAN THE UNCLEAR, SO DOES THE HOLY ONE, BLESSED BE HE, RENDER CLEAN ISRAEL.**

**GEMARA.** Only the undoubted guilt-offering [atones], but not the suspensive one? But is not the word 'forgiveness' written with regard to it too?<sup>17</sup> — These [others] procure complete atonement, the suspensive guilt-offering does not procure complete atonement. Or else, As for these [others]<sup>18</sup> another can effect their atonement, whereas in the case of the suspensive guilt-offering nothing else can effect their atonement. For it was taught: If those who were liable to sin-offerings, or guilt-offerings [for the] undoubted [commission of offences] permitted the Day of Atonement to

pass, they are still obliged to offer them, up; but in the case of those who were liable to suspensive guilt-offerings, they are exempt.<sup>19</sup>

DEATH AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT PROCURE ATONEMENT TOGETHER WITH PENITENCE. Only TOGETHER WITH PENITENCE, but not in themselves! — Shall we say that this teaching is not in accord with, Rabbi? For it was taught: Rabbi said, For all transgressions [of commands of] the Torah, whether one had repented or not, does the Day of Atonement procure atonement, except in the case of one who throws off the yoke<sup>20</sup> [of the Torah ], interprets the Torah unlawfully.<sup>21</sup> or breaks the covenant of Abraham our father.<sup>22</sup> In these cases, if he repented, the Day of Atonement procures atonement, if not, not! — You might even say that this is in accord with Rabbi: Repentance needs the Day of Atonement, but the Day of Atonement does not need repentance.

PENITENCE PROCURES ATONEMENT FOR LIGHTER TRANSGRESSIONS: [THE TRANSGRESSION OF] POSITIVE COMMANDMENTS AND PROHIBITIONS. If it procures atonement for the transgression of negative commandments, is it necessary [to state that it procures it for the transgression of] positive ones?<sup>23</sup> — Rab Judah said: This is what he means, [It procures atonement] for [the transgression of] a positive commandment , of a negative commandment that is to be remedied into a positive one.<sup>24</sup> But not [for the transgression] of an actual negative commandment? Against this the following contradiction is to be raised: These are light transgressions [for which penitence procures atonement: transgression of] positive commandments and negative commandments

---

(1) If one had been sentenced to death, there is ample provision for a revision, if even at the last moment someone claims to have found evidence of the accused's innocence. If a priest has such evidence, or is only believed to have it, he would be taken down from the altar even after he had commenced, and before having completed, his service.

(2) The circumcision must take place on the eighth day, even if that day falls on the Sabbath, suspending the law of the Sabbath, which prohibits operation, as well as preparations leading to it.

(3) Ex. XXXI, 13.

(4) Lit., 'divides', 'makes a distinction'. The word 'rak' here translated 'only' (E.V. 'verily') is interpreted as 'only under certain, I.e., not all conditions',

(5) Ibid. 14.

(6) Ibid., 16.

(7) Lev. XVIII, 5.

(8) To the priest who thinks he has relevant testimony in favour of the accused, because of which he may be taken down from the altar in the midst of the service.

(9) A commentary on Samuel's irrefutable simple interpretation, as against the more involved and less perfect interpretations of the other Rabbis.

(10) Cf. Lev. V, 15 and VI, 6, as opposed to the suspensive guilt-offering, due in the case of doubtful commission of sin, which postpones punishment until that doubt is removed, when a sin-offering is due to procure atonement. Among the guilt-offerings due for undoubted commission of certain offences are: one for illegal appropriation of private property, after reparation has been made; one for misappropriation of sacred property; one for carnal connection with a bondwoman betrothed to another man; the offering of a nazirite who had interrupted the days of his avowed naziriteship by levitical impurity.

(11) Penitence is essential; it consists of genuine regret, and determination to improve one's conduct. In the case of any offering (sin or guilt) such penitence is taken for granted, for without it no sacrifice has any meaning or value.

(12) Because this statement indicates that he never experienced genuine regret.

(13) Lev. XVI, 30.

(14) The verse is thus taken to mean 'From all your sins before the Lord', (i.e. , as between man and his Creator) will the Day the Atonement procure you forgiveness; but not for those which are committed not 'before the Lord', and 'before man', viz., sins committed against our fellow-man.

(15) Ezek. XXXVI, 25.

- (16) Jer. XVII, 13. The word 'mikweh' is a homonym meaning both 'fountain' thus ritual bath, and 'hope'.
- (17) V. Lev. V, 18 with reference to a suspensive guilt-offering; v. also supra p. 422, n. 4.
- (18) The sin-offering and certain guilt-offerings.
- (19) Ker. 25a.
- (20) I.e., denies the existence of God.
- (21) Lit., 'reveals an aspect of the Torah (not in accordance with the correct interpretation)'; or, 'acts in a bare-faced manner against the Torah'. For a full discussion of the phrase v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 99.
- (22) Circumcision; v. loc. cit.
- (23) A sin of omission is not as serious as one of commission.
- (24) A prohibitive law, the transgression of which must be repaired by a positive act, as e.g., Lev. XIX, 13: Thou shalt not rob, and V, 23: He shall make restitution.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 86a

with the exceptions of: Thou shalt not take [in vain]<sup>1</sup> — 'Thou shalt not take' and others of the same kind.<sup>2</sup>

Come and hear: R. Judah said: For everything from 'Thou shalt not take' and down repentance procures atonement, for everything from 'Thou shalt take' and up.<sup>3</sup> penitence procures suspension [of punishment] and the Day of Atonement procures atonement? — 'Thou shalt not take' and others of the same kind.

Come and hear: Since in connection with Horeb<sup>4</sup> penitence and forgiveness are stated,<sup>5</sup> one might assume, that includes the [transgression of] 'Thou shalt not take', therefore it says: He will not clear the guilty.<sup>6</sup> Then I might have assumed that with all others guilty of having transgressed negative commandments the same is the case, therefore the text reads: '[ Will not clear the guilt of him who taketh] His name [in vain].<sup>7</sup> i.e., He does not clear the guilt in [the taking in vain of] His name, but He clears the guilt in the transgression of other negative commandments?<sup>8</sup> -This is indeed a point of dispute between Tannam; for it was taught: For what transgression does penitence procure atonement? For that of a positive commandment. And in what case does repentance suspend punishment and the Day of Atonement procure atonement? In such as involve extirpation, death-penalty through the Beth din and in actual negative commandments.

The Master said: In connection with Horeb [penitence and]<sup>9</sup> forgiveness is stated. Whence do we know that? Because it was taught : R. Eleazar said: It is impossible to say. 'He will not clear the guilt '<sup>10</sup> Since it says: 'He will clear the guilt'; nor is it possible to say: 'He will not clear the guilt' since it is said: 'He will clear the guilt'; how is that to be explained? 'He clears the guilt' of those who repent, and does not 'clear the guilt' of those who do not repent.

R. Matthia b. Heresh asked R. Eleazar b. Azariah in Rome: have you heard about the four kinds of sins, concerning which R. Ishmael has lectured? He answered: They are three, and with each is repentance connected — If one transgressed a positive commandment , and repented , then he is forgiven, before he has moved from his place; as it is said: Return, O backsliding children.<sup>11</sup> If he has transgressed a prohibition and repented, then repentance suspends [the punishment] and the Day of Atonement procures atonement, as it is said : For on this day shall atonement be made for you ... from all your sins.<sup>12</sup> If he has committed [a sin to be punished with] extirpation or death through the Beth din, and repented, then repentance and the Day of Atonement suspend [the punishment thereon], and suffering finishes the atonement,<sup>13</sup> as it is said: Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with strokes.<sup>14</sup> But if he has been guilty of the profanation of the Name, then penitence has no power to suspend punishment, nor the Day of Atonement to procure atonement, nor suffering to finish it, but all of them together suspend the punishment and only death finishes it , as it is said : And the Lord of hosts revealed Himself in my ears; surely this iniquity shall

not be expiated by you till ye die.<sup>15</sup> What constitutes profanation of the Name? — Rab said: If, e.g., I take meat for the butcher and do not pay him at once.<sup>16</sup> Abaye said: That we have learnt [to regard as profanation] only in a place wherein one does not go out to collect payment, but in a place where one does not go out to collect, there is no harm in it [not paying at once]. Rabina said: And Matha Mehasia<sup>17</sup> is a place where one goes out collecting payments due. Whenever Abaye bought meat from two partners, he paid money to each of them, afterwards bringing them, together and squaring accounts with both. R. Johanan said: In my case [it is a profanation if] I walk four cubits without [uttering words of] Torah or [wearing] tefillin.<sup>18</sup>

Isaac, of the School of R. Jannai. said: If one's colleagues are ashamed of his reputation, that constitutes a profanation of the Name. R. Nahman b. Isaac commented: E.g., if people say, May the Lord forgive So-and-so. Abaye explained: As it was taught: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God,<sup>19</sup> i.e., that the Name of Heaven be beloved because of you. if someone studies Scripture and Mishnah, and attends on the disciples of the wise, is honest in business,<sup>20</sup> and speaks pleasantly to persons, what do people then say concerning him? 'Happy the father who taught him Torah, happy the teacher who taught him Torah; woe unto people who have not studied the Torah; for this man has studied the Torah look how fine his ways are, how righteous his deeds! . Of him does Scripture say: And He said unto me: Thou art My servant, Israel, in, whom I will be glorified.<sup>21</sup> But if someone studies Scripture and Mishnah, attends on the disciples of the wise, but is dishonest in business, and discourteous in his relations with people, what do people say about him? ' Woe unto him who studied the Torah, woe unto his father who taught him Torah; woe unto his teacher who taught him Torah!' This man studied the Torah: Look, how corrupt are his deeds, how ugly his ways; of him Scripture says: In that men said of them,: These are the people of the Lord, and are gone forth out of His land.<sup>22</sup>

R. Hama b. Hanina said: Great is penitence, for it brings healing to the world, as it is said: I will heal their backsliding, I will love them, freely.<sup>23</sup> R. Hama b. Hanina pointed out a contradiction: It is written : Return, ye backsliding children,<sup>24</sup> I.e., you who were formerly backsliding; and it is written: I will heal your backsliding?<sup>25</sup> This is no difficulty: in the one case the reference is where they return out of love, in the other, out of fear.<sup>26</sup>

Rab Judah pointed out this contradiction: It is written: 'Return ye backsliding children, I will heal your backsliding', but it is also written: For I am a lord unto you. and I will take you one of a city. and two of a family?<sup>27</sup> This is no contradiction: The one verse speaks [of a return] out of love or fear; the other, when it comes as a result of suffering.

R. Levi said: Great is repentance, for it reaches up to the Throne of Glory, as it is said: Return, O Israel, unto the Lord thy God.<sup>28</sup>

---

(1) Ex. XX, 7; viz., the Name of God. [This proves that other negative commands are included in the lighter transgression for which penitence procures atonement].

(2) I.e., all actual negative commandments.

(3) 'Up and down', i.e., before and after.

(4) After the sin of the golden calf as Moses besought the Lord's forgiveness.

(5) As explained infra.

(6) Ex. XX, 7.

(7) Interpreting the phrase as if it were divided into two parts.

(8) [This proves that for the transgression of other negative commandments penitence effects atonement].

(9) Supplemented from Bah.

(10) Ex. XXXIV, 7.

(11) Jer. III, 14.

(12) Lev. XVI, 30.

- (13) Lit., 'cleanses (from sin)'.  
 (14) Ps. LXXXIX, 33.  
 (15) Isa. XXII, 14.  
 (16) He would learn from my bad example to treat debts dishonestly by delaying and ultimately ignoring the payment.  
 (17) A suburb of Sura, the place of Rabina.  
 (18) People would not know that I am weak, they would profit by my 'example' to neglect the study of the Torah, v. D.S. a.I.  
 (19) Deut. VI, 5.  
 (20) Supplemented from Bah.  
 (21) Isa. XLIX, 3.  
 (22) Ezek. XXXVI, 20.  
 (23) Hos. XIV, 5.  
 (24) Jer. III, 22.  
 (25) [The contradiction is not clear. Apparently the first part of the verse implies that having repented they are perfect as children, whereas the second part, which speaks of 'healing', implies that they still retain a taint of their former backsliding, v. Rashi].  
 (26) [Where the penitence is motivated by love, the return is complete leaving no trace of any taint, which is not the case where it is motivated by fear].  
 (27) Jer. III, 14.  
 (28) Hos. XIV, 2.

### **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 86b**

R. Johanan said: Great is repentance. for it overrides a prohibition of the Torah, as it is said: . . . saying: If a man put away his wife, and she go from him, and become another man's, may he return unto her again? Will not that land be greatly polluted? But thou hast played the harlot with many lovers; and wouldest thou yet return to Me? Saith the Lord.<sup>1</sup> R. Jonathan said: Great is repentance, because it brings about redemption, as it is said And a redeemer will come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob,<sup>2</sup> i.e., why will a redeemer come to Zion? Because of those that turn from transgression in Jacob. Resh Lakish said: Great is repentance, for because of it premeditated sins are accounted as errors, as it is said: Return, O Israel, unto the Lord, thy God,' for thou hast stumbled in thy iniquity.<sup>3</sup> 'Iniquity' is premeditated, and yet he calls it 'stumbling' But that is not so! For Resh Lakish said that repentance is so great that premeditated sins are accounted as though they were merits, as it is said: And when the wicked turneth from his wickedness, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall live thereby!<sup>4</sup> That is no contradiction: One refers to a case [of repentance] derived from love, the other to one due to fear. R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Jonathan: Great is repentance, because it prolongs the [days and]<sup>5</sup> years of man, as it is said: 'And when the wicked turneth from his wickedness . . . he shall live thereby'. R. Isaac said: In the West [Palestine] they said in the name of Rabbah b. Mari: Come and see how different from the character of one of flesh and blood is the action of the Holy One, blessed be He. As to the character of one of flesh and blood, if one angers his fellow,<sup>6</sup> it is doubtful whether he [the latter] will be pacified or not by him. And even if you would say, he can be pacified, it is doubtful whether he will be pacified by mere words. But with the Holy One, blessed be He, if a man commits a sin in secret, He is pacified by mere words, as it is said: Take with you words, and return unto the Lord.<sup>7</sup> Still more: He even accounts it to him as a good deed, as it is said: And accept that which is good.<sup>7</sup> Still more: Scripture accounts it to him as if he had offered up bullocks, as it is said : So will we render for bullocks the offerings of our lips.<sup>7</sup> Perhaps you will say [the reference is to] obligatory bullocks. Therefore it is said: I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely.<sup>8</sup>

It was taught: R Meir used to say, Great is repentance. for on account of an individual who repents, the sins of all the world are forgiven, as it is said: I will heal their backsliding. I will love them freely, for mine anger is turned away from him.<sup>8</sup> 'From them' it is not said, but 'from him,'.

How is one proved a repentant sinner? — Rab Judah said: If the object which caused his original transgression comes before him on two occasions, and he keeps away from it. Rab Judah indicated: With the same woman, at the same time, in the same place. Rab Judah said: Rab pointed out the following contradictions. It is written: Happy is he whose transgression is covered,<sup>9</sup> whose sin is pardoned;<sup>10</sup> and it is also written: He that covereth his 'transgression shall not prosper?'<sup>11</sup> This is no difficulty, one speaks of sins that have become known [to the public], the other of such as did not become known.<sup>12</sup> R. Zutra b. Tobiah in the name of R. Nahman said: Here we speak of sins committed by a man against his fellow, there of sins committed by man against the Omnipresent.<sup>13</sup> It was taught: R. Jose b. Judah said: If a man commits a transgression, the first, second and third time he is forgiven, the fourth time he is not forgiven, as it is said: Thus saith the Lord.' For three transgressions of Israel, Yea for four, I will not reverse it;<sup>14</sup> and furthermore it says: Lo, all these things does God work, twice, yea, thrice, with a man.<sup>15</sup> What does 'furthermore' serve for? — One might have assumed that applies only to a community, but not to an individual, therefore: Come and hear [the additional verse]: 'Lo, all these things does God work, twice, yea, thrice with a man'.

Our Rabbis taught: As for the sins which one has confessed on one Day of Atonement, he should not confess them on another Day of Atonement; but if he repeated them, then he should confess them, on another Day of Atonement — And if he had not committed them again, yet confessed them again, then it is with regard to him that Scripture says: As a dog that returneth to his vomit, so is a fool that repeateth his folly.<sup>16</sup> R. Eleazar b. Jacob said: He is the more praiseworthy, as it is said: For I know my transgressions, and my sin is even before me.<sup>17</sup> How then do I [explain]. 'As a dog that returneth to his vomit, etc.'? In accord with R. Huna; for R. Huna said: Once a man has committed a sin once and twice, it is permitted to him. 'Permitted'? How could that occur to you? — Rather, it appears to him as if it were permitted.<sup>18</sup>

It is obligatory to confess the sin in detail [explicitly], as it is said: This people have sinned a great sin, and have made them a god of gold.<sup>19</sup> These are the words of R. Judah b. Baba. R. Akiba said: [This is not necessary],<sup>20</sup> as it is said: 'Happy is he whose transgression is covered, whose sin is pardoned.'<sup>21</sup> Then why did Moses say: 'And have made them a god of gold'? That is [to be explained] in accord with R. Jannai, for R. Jannai said:<sup>22</sup> Moses said before the Holy One, blessed be He: The silver and gold which Thou hast increased unto Israel until they said 'enough !'<sup>23</sup> has caused them to make golden gods.

Two good administrators arose unto Israel, Moses and David. Moses begged: let my sin be written down, as it is said: Because ye believed not in me to sanctify me.<sup>24</sup> David begged that his sin be not written down, as it is said; 'Happy is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is pardoned'. This case of Moses and Aaron may be compared to the case of two women who received in court the punishment of stripes; one had committed an indecent act, the other had eaten the unripe figs of the seventh year.<sup>25</sup> Whereupon the woman who had eaten unripe figs of the seventh year said: I beg of you, make known for what offence I<sup>26</sup> have been punished with stripes, lest people say: The one woman was punished for the same sin that the other was punished for. They brought unripe fruits of the seventh year, and hanged them on her neck, and they were calling out before her: This woman was punished with stripes because she ate the unripe figs of the seventh year.

One should expose hypocrites to prevent<sup>27</sup> the profanation of the Name,<sup>28</sup> as it is said: Again, when a righteous man doth turn from righteousness. and commit iniquity, I will lay a stumbling-block before him.<sup>29</sup> The repentance of the confirmed sinner delays punishment, even though the decree of punishment for him had been signed already. The careless ease of the wicked ends in calamity. Power buries those who wield it. Naked did man come into the world, naked he leaves it. Would that his coming forth be like his coming in.<sup>30</sup> Whenever Rab went to the court, he used to say thus: Out of his own will he goes<sup>31</sup> towards death, the wishes of his household he is unable to fulfil, for he returns empty to his home. Would that the coming forth be like the going in.<sup>32</sup>

(Whenever Raba went to the court he used to say thus:

- 
- (1) Jer. III, 1.
  - (2) Isa. LIX, 20.
  - (3) Hos. XIV, 2.
  - (4) Ezek. XXXIII, 19.
  - (5) Supplemented from Bah.
  - (6) So MS.M.; cur. edd. add 'with words'.
  - (7) Hos. XIV, 3.
  - (8) Ibid. 5.
  - (9) E.V. 'forgiven'.
  - (10) Ps. XXXII, 1.
  - (11) Prov. XXVIII, 13. The phrase 'covering of sin' is understood in the sense of hiding it, not making it public by confession.
  - (12) Certain sins, such as have become notorious, one ought to confess publicly; secret sins one need confess to none but God.
  - (13) Social sins one ought to make known to others so that they might intercede on his behalf unto the person he offended; ritual transgressions one need reveal but to God.
  - (14) Amos II, 6.
  - (15) Job XXXIII, 29.
  - (16) Prov. XXVI, 11.
  - (17) Ps. LI, 5.
  - (18) In that respect he becomes like a dog, returning to his vomit.
  - (19) Ex. XXXII, 31.
  - (20) Supplemented from Bah.
  - (21) V. supra p. 430, n. 3.
  - (22) V. Ber. 32a.
  - (23) A play on the name of a place 'Di zahab' (Deut. I, 1) which is read 'Dai zahab' viz., 'enough of gold'.
  - (24) Num. XX, 12.
  - (25) Unripe figs of the Sabbatical year, which must not be eaten, as Sabbatical produce must not be wasted.
  - (26) Lit., 'she'.
  - (27) Lit., 'on account of'.
  - (28) People should not imitate their conduct.
  - (29) Ezek. III, 20.
  - (30) That he leave life as innocent as he entered it.
  - (31) Referring to himself.
  - (32) The responsibility involved in rendering decision appeared to him as momentous as if the ethical dangers involved were physical ones. The stipend was insufficient to meet the needs of his household, the only fruit was the fear that he may leave the court less righteous than he entered it. There were no salaries for the judges in antiquity. Like the office of the Rabbi, it was a post of honour. But every scholar who spent his time exclusively in the study of the Torah was freed from taxes and received public and private privileges.

### **Talmud - Mas. Yoma 87a**

Out of his own will he goes towards death, the wishes of his household he is unable to fulfil, for he returned empty to his house. Would that the coming forth be like the going in).<sup>1</sup> And when he [Rab]<sup>2</sup> saw a crowd escorting him, he would say: Though his excellency mount up to heaven, and his head reach unto the clouds, yet shall he perish forever like his own dung, they that have seen him shall say: 'Where is he?'<sup>3</sup> When R. Zutra was carried shoulder-high<sup>4</sup> on the Sabbath before the Pilgrimage festivals,<sup>5</sup> he would say: For riches are not forever; and doth the crown endure unto all generations?<sup>6</sup>

It is not good to respect the person of the wicked.<sup>7</sup> It is not good for the wicked that they are being

favoured [by the Holy One, blessed be He] in this world. It was not good for Ahab that he was favoured in this world, as it is said: Because he humbled himself before Me, I will not bring the evil in his days.<sup>8</sup> So as to turn aside the righteous in judgment<sup>9</sup> — it is good for the righteous that they are not favoured in this world. It was good for Moses that he was not favoured in this world, as it is said: Because ye believed not in Me, to sanctify Me [etc.]. But had you believed in Me your time to depart this world would not yet have come. Happy are the righteous! Not only do they acquire merit, but they bestow merit upon their children and children's children to the end of all generations, for Aaron had several sons who deserved to be burnt like Nadab and Abihu, as it is said: 'That were left';<sup>10</sup> but the merit of their father helped them. Woe unto the wicked! Not alone that they render themselves guilty, but they bestow guilt upon their children and children's children unto the end of all generations. Many sons did Canaan have, who were worthy to be ordained<sup>11</sup> like Tabi, the slave of R. Gamaliel, but the guilt of their ancestor caused them [to lose their chance].

Whosoever causes a community to do good, no sin will come through him, and whosoever causes the community to sin, no opportunity will be granted him to become repentant. Whosoever causes a community to do good, no sin will come through him'. Why? Lest he be in Gehinnom, and his disciples in Gan Eden [Paradise], as it is said: For Thou wilt not abandon my soul to the nether world, neither wilt Thou suffer thy godly one to see the pit.<sup>12</sup>

'And whosoever causes the community to sin, no opportunity will be granted him for repentance', lest he be in Gan Eden and his disciples in Gehinnom, as it is said: A man, that is laden with the blood of any person shall hasten his steps unto the pit; none will help him.<sup>13</sup>

IF ONE SAYS: I SHALL SIN, AND REPENT, SIN AND REPENT. Why is it necessary to state I SHALL SIN AND I SHALL REPENT twice? — That is in accord with what R. Huna said in the name of Rab; for R. Huna said in the name of Rab: Once a man has committed a transgression once or twice, it becomes permitted to him. 'Permitted'? How could that come into your mind — Rather, it appears to him like something permitted.

I SHALL SIN AND THE DAY OF ATONEMENT SHALL PROCURE ATONEMENT; THEN THE DAY OF ATONEMENT DOES NOT PROCURE ATONEMENT. Shall we say that our Mishnah is not in accord with Rabbi, for Rabbi said: It was taught, For all transgressions of Biblical commandments, whether he repented or not, whether positive or negative, does the Day of Atonement procure atonement? — You may even say it will be in agreement with Rabbi. It is different when he relies on it.<sup>14</sup>

FOR TRANSGRESSIONS COMMITTED BY MAN AGAINST THE OMNIPRESENT. R. Joseph b. Helbe pointed out to R. Abbahu the following contradiction: [We learned]:<sup>15</sup> FOR TRANSGRESSIONS COMMITTED BY MAN AGAINST HIS FELLOWMAN THE DAY OF ATONEMENT PROCURES NO ATONEMENT, but it is written: If one man sin against his fellow-man, God [Elohim] will pacify him?<sup>16</sup> 'Elohim' here means 'the Judge'. But how then is the second half of the clause to be understood, 'But if a man sin against the Lord, who shall entreat for him'? — This is what he means to say: 'If a man sins against his fellow-man, the judge will judge him, he [his fellow] will forgive him';<sup>17</sup> 'but if a man sins against the Lord God, who shall entreat for him'? Only repentance and good deeds.

R. Isaac said: Whosoever offends his neighbour, and he does it only through words, must pacify him, as it is written: My son, if thou art become surety for thy neighbour, If thou hast struck thy hands for a stranger — , thou art snared by the words of thy mouth. . . do this, now, my son, and deliver thyself, seeing thou art come into the hand of thy neighbour; go, humble thyself, and urge thy neighbour.<sup>18</sup> If he has a claim of money upon you, open the palm of your hand to him,<sup>19</sup> and if not, send many friends to him.<sup>20</sup> R. Hisda said: He should endeavour to pacify him through three groups

of three people each, as it is said: He cometh before me and saith: I have sinned and perverted that which was right, and it profited me not.<sup>21</sup> R. Jose b. Hanina said: One who asks pardon of his neighbour need do so no more than three times, as it is said: Forgive. I pray thee now . . . and now we pray thee.<sup>22</sup> And if he [against whom he had sinned] had died, he should bring ten persons and make them stand by his grave and say: I have sinned against the Lord, the God of Israel, and against this one, whom I have hurt. R. Abba had a complaint against R. Jeremiah. He [R. Jeremiah] went and sat down at the door of R. Abba and as the maid poured out water, some drops fell upon his head. Then he said: They have made a dung-heap of me, and he cited this passage about himself: He raiseth up the poor out of the dust.<sup>23</sup> R. Abba heard that and came out towards him, saying: Now, I must come forth to appease you, as it is written: 'Go, humble thyself and urge thy neighbour'. When R. Zera had any complaint against any man, he would repeatedly pass by him,<sup>24</sup> showing himself to him, so that he may come forth to [pacify] him. Rab once had a complaint against a certain butcher, and when on the eve of the Day of Atonement he [the butcher] did not come to him,<sup>25</sup> he said: I shall go to him to pacify him. R. Huna met him and asked: Whither are you going, Sir? He said, To pacify So-and-so. He thought: Abba<sup>26</sup> is about to cause one's death.<sup>27</sup> He went there and remained standing before him [the butcher], who was sitting and chopping an [animal's] head. He raised his eyes and saw him [Rab], then said: You are Abba, go away. I will have nothing to do with you. Whilst he was chopping the head, a bone flew off, struck his throat, and killed him.

Once Rab was expounding portions of the Bible<sup>28</sup> before Rabbis, and there entered

---

(1) [This bracketed passage is left out in MS.M.].

(2) V. Sanh. 7b.

(3) Job XX, 6-7.

(4) He was advanced in age and unable to walk quickly, and thus he was carried so that the audience should not have to wait long for his arrival.

(5) When he would preach on the Festival laws.

(6) Prov. XXVII, 24.

(7) Ibid. XVIII, 5.

(8) I Kings XXI, 29.

(9) Prov. XVIII, 5.

(10) Lev. X, 12, the suggestion being 'they were left to survive', having also deserved the punishment suffered by their two brethren.

(11) The official ordination, lit., 'laying hands' on the scholar,

(12) Ps. XVI, 9.

(13) Prov. XXVIII, 17.

(14) Lit., 'by the way of'. Since he relies upon the capacity of the Day of Atonement to forgive, for sinning, such forgiveness is not procured by that day.

(15) Supplemented from Bah.

(16) I Sam. II, 25. E.V. 'shall judge him', Elohim may mean either 'God' or 'judge,' and so the Hebrew verb 'pallel' may mean either 'judge' or 'pray', thus 'pacify', 'forgive'. The two meanings of the words are represented in the two suggestions here.

(17) [An instance of aposiopesis, in which part of the sentence is suppressed, cf. Giesenius Kautzsch, \*\* 159dd and which part of the sentence is suppressed, cf. Gesenius Kautzsch, 159dd and 162. V. Maharsha. Rashi explains differently].

(18) Prov. VI 1-3.

(19) So Bah. I.e., pay him. The Hebrew is a play on the word **התרפם** 'humble thyself'.

(20) The Hebrew is a play on **רהב רעיד** 'urge thy neighbour'.

(21) Job XXXIII, 27. The root for 'right' — 'yashar' is interpreted as if derived from 'shur', from which the noun 'shurah', 'row', 'group' is derived.

(22) Gen. L, 17. The brethren, in their appeal to Joseph to forgive the wrong they had done to him, use the term 'na' (O, pray) three times.

(23) I Sam. II, 8.

(24) To, make it easier for him to endeavour reconciliation.

(25) To pacify him.

(26) Because the butcher had neglected to make his effort to reconcile Rab. Abba was the real name of Rab.

(27) As he knew that the butcher was a hard man and would not take advantage of Rab's offer at reconciliation.

(28) פסיק סדרא V. Shab., Sonc. ed., p. 572, n. 1.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 87b

R. Hiyya, whereupon Rab started again from the beginning; as Bar Kappara entered, he started again from the beginning; as R. Simeon, the son of Rabbi entered, he started again from the beginning. But when R. Hanina b. Hama entered, he said: So often shall I go back? And he did not go over it again. R. Hanina took that amiss. Rab went to him on thirteen eves of the Day of Atonement, but he would not be pacified. But how could he do so, did not R. Jose b. Hanina Say: One who asks pardon of his neighbour need not do so more than three times?<sup>1</sup> — It is different with Rab.<sup>2</sup> But how could R. Hanina act so [unforgivingly]? Had not Raba said that if one passes over his rights, all his transgressions are passed over [forgiven]? — Rather: R. Hanina had seen in a dream that Rab was being hanged on a palm tree, and since the tradition is that one who in a dream is hanged on a palm tree will become head [of an Academy] he concluded that authority will be given to him, and so he would not be pacified, to the end that he departed to teach Torah in Babylon.<sup>3</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: The obligation of confession of sins comes on the eve of the Day of Atonement, as it grows dark. But the Sages said: Let one confess before one has eaten and drunk, lest one become upset<sup>4</sup> in the course of the meal. And although one has confessed before eating and drinking, he should confess again after having eaten and drunk, because perchance some wrong has happened in the course of the meal, And although he has confessed during the evening prayer, he should confess again during the morning prayer; [and although he has confessed] during the morning prayer, he should do so again during the Musaf [additional prayer]. And although he had confessed during the Musaf, he should do so again during the afternoon prayer; and although he had done so in the afternoon prayer, he should confess again in the Ne'ilah [concluding prayer]. And when shall he say [the confession]? The individual after his 'Amidah Prayer',<sup>5</sup> the public reader in the middle thereof. What is it [the confession]? — Rab said: 'Thou knowest the secrets of eternity'.<sup>6</sup> Samuel said: From the depths of the heart.<sup>7</sup> Levi said: And in thy Torah it is said . . .<sup>8</sup> R. Johanan said: Lord of the Universe, [etc.].<sup>9</sup> Rab Judah: 'Our iniquities are too many to count, and our sins too numerous to be counted'. R. Hamnuna said: 'My God, before I was formed, I was of no worth, and now that I have been formed, it is as if I had not been formed. I am dust in my life, how much more in my death. Behold I am before Thee like a vessel full of shame and reproach. May it be thy will that I sin no more, and what I have sinned wipe away in Thy mercy, but not through suffering'.<sup>10</sup> That was the confession [of sins] used by Rab all the year round, and by R. Hamnuna the younger, on the Day of Atonement. Mar Zutra said: All that [is necessary only] when he did not say: 'Truly, we have sinned'.<sup>11</sup> but if he had said: 'Truly, we have sinned', no more is necessary, for Bar Hamdudi said: Once I stood before Samuel, who was sitting, and when the public reader came up and said: 'Truly, we have sinned', he rose. Hence he inferred that this was the main confession.

We learned elsewhere: On three occasions of the year the priests raise their hands [in benediction] four times during the day; at the morning prayer, at Musaf, at Minhah [afternoon prayer] and at the closing of the [Temple] gates. Viz., on fast days, at the ma'amads and on the Day of Atonement.<sup>12</sup> What [is the prayer at] 'the closing of the [Temple] gates'? — Rab said: An extra prayer.<sup>13</sup> Samuel said: 'Who are we, what is our life, etc.'?<sup>14</sup>

The following objection was raised: On the evening of the Day of Atonement one reads seven [benedictions]<sup>15</sup> and then makes the confession, in the morning prayer one reads seven

[benedictions] and makes confession, at Musaf one reads the seven [benedictions] and makes confession, at Minhah one reads the seven [benedictions] and makes confession, and at Ne'ilah one reads the seven [benedictions] and makes confession?<sup>16</sup> [And further was]<sup>17</sup> it taught: On the Day of Atonement as it becomes dark one reads the seven benedictions and makes confession, and concludes with the confession<sup>18</sup> — that is the view of R. Meir, whereas the Sages say: He should read the seven [benedictions], and if he wishes to conclude with the confession, he may do so. That would be a refutation of Samuel?<sup>19</sup> — It is a refutation.

'Ulla b. Rab came down [to the reader's desk] before Raba, commencing the Ne'ilah prayer with 'Thou hast chosen us and concluding with 'What are we, what is our life', and he praised him. R. Huna b. Nathan said: The individual should say it<sup>20</sup> after his prayer.

Rab said: The concluding prayer exempts from evening prayer [to follow]. Rab goes according to his idea that it is all extra prayer, and since one has said it already [at dusk] it is not required any more. But did Rab say so? Did not Rab say: The halachah is according to the view that the evening Prayer is not obligatory?<sup>21</sup> He said this on the view that it is obligatory.<sup>22</sup>

An objection was raised: On the evening of the Day of Atonement he should read seven [benedictions] and make confession, in the morning also seven and make confession, at Musaf also seven and make confession, at Minah also seven and make confession,<sup>23</sup> at Ne'ilah also seven and make confession, at the evening Prayer he reads seven benedictions [the seventh consisting of] the substance of the eighteen benedictions.<sup>24</sup> R. Hanina b. Gamaliel said in the name of his ancestors: One must read the complete prayer of eighteen benedictions,

---

(1) V. supra p. 435.

(2) He goes beyond what the law requires, his humility and kindness refuse to recognize limits in such matters.

(3) After the death of Raba, R. Hanina became head of the Academy (v. Keth. 103b) and he interpreted the dream to mean that he would die soon, to make place for Rab. In order to allow for another interpretation, with less fatal results to himself of that vision, he refused to become reconciled to Rab, forcing the latter to go to Babylon, where in accord with that dream he did become before long head of the School of Sura.

(4) Through drink.

(5) The 'Amidah, the prayer par excellence.

(6) V. P.B., p. 259.

(7) [Probably the same as the prayer mentioned by Rab, except that Samuel substitutes 'The depths of the Heart' for 'secrets of the eternity' V. D.S. a.l.].

(8) [For us this day He shall make atonement for you (Rashi); v. P. B., p. 257].

(9) V. P.B., p. 7.

(10) V. P.B., p. 263.

(11) V. P.B., p. 258.

(12) For notes v. Ta'an., Sonc. ed., p. 136.

(13) I.e., an extra Amidah consisting of the usual seven benedictions like all the other Amidahs of Festivals.

(14) V. P.B., p. 267.

(15) I.e., the Amidah, cf. n. 2.

(16) This contradicts Samuel's opinion.

(17) [So emended by Ronsburg, v. Marginal Glosses; cur. edd. This is a point of dispute between Tannas, v. note 8].

(18) [I.e., he ends the middle benedictions of the 'Amidah with the usual formula, Blessed art Thou O Lord . . . Who forgivest (Rashi).]

(19) [Here at any rate all agree that at the concluding service there is an Amidah in contradiction to Samuel. MS.M. deletes this and reads in the Baraita. But the Sages say he need not read the seven (benedictions), which would be in support of Samuel. Thus the view of Samuel is 'a point of' dispute among Tannas'. V. n. 6; cur. edd. present a conflated text].

(20) I.e., What are we, etc.

- (21) In which case there is no point in his present ruling.  
 (22) Not arguing for himself, but for the scholar of the opposite view.  
 (23) So MS.M..  
 (24) V. Ber. 29a.

## Talmud - Mas. Yoma 88a

because one must make mention of Habdalah<sup>1</sup> in the benediction [commencing with] ‘Thou favourest’.<sup>2</sup> That is a dispute of Tannaim, for it was taught in a Baraitha: All those obliged to immerse themselves may do so in their usual manner on the Day of Atonement, the menstruating woman, and the woman after childbirth immerse themselves in their usual manner on the evening of the Day of Atonement. One who had a pollution may do so until the afternoon prayer.<sup>3</sup> R. Jose said: He may do so throughout the day. But the following contradiction is to be pointed out: A man or woman afflicted with gonorrhoea, or with leprosy, one who had had intercourse with a menstruant, or one rendered unclean by contact with a dead person, may immerse themselves in their usual manner on the Day of Atonement. A menstruating woman, and a woman after childbirth may immerse themselves in their usual manner on the night before the Day of Atonement. One who had experienced a pollution may immerse himself throughout the day.<sup>4</sup> R. Jose said: From the Minhah onwards, he may not immerse himself? — This is no difficulty: The one refers to the case that he had read the Ne'ilah prayer,<sup>5</sup> the other that he had not read the Ne'ilah. If he had prayed, what is the reason for the view of the Rabbis?<sup>6</sup> — The Rabbis hold: It is obligatory to take the ritual bath at the proper times.<sup>7</sup> This implies that R. Jose would not hold this not to be obligatory, but surely it was taught: If he has had the name [of God] inscribed on his body he must not bathe, nor anoint himself, nor stand in an unclean place; if it happens that he is obliged to immerse himself, he should tie some reed around, go down and immerse himself, R. Jose said: He may go down and immerse himself in the usual manner, provided he does not rub it off. And we know that they are disputing the principle as to whether it is obligatory to take the ritual bath at its definite time!<sup>8</sup> [The Tanna of] that [former Baraitha]<sup>9</sup> is R. Jose b. Judah, for it was taught: R. Jose b. Judah said: The [one] immersion at the end suffices for her.<sup>10</sup> Our Rabbis taught: One who experiences a pollution on the Day of Atonement should go down and immerse himself and in the evening he should rub himself off properly. ‘In the evening’? What is passed, is it not passed?<sup>11</sup> Rather say: He should rub himself off on the eve before!<sup>12</sup> He holds it is obligatory to rub oneself off. A tanna<sup>13</sup> recited before R. Nahman: To one who experienced a pollution on the Day of Atonement, all sins will be forgiven. But it was taught: All his sins will be arranged before him? — What does ‘arranged’ mean? Arranged to be forgiven. In the School of R. Ishmael it was taught: One who experienced a [night-] pollution on the Day of Atonement, let him be anxious throughout the year, and if he survives the year, he is assured of being a child of the world to come. R. Nahman b. Isaac said: You may know it [from the fact that] all the world is hungry, and he is satisfied. When R. Dimi came, he said: He will live long, thrive and beget many children.<sup>14</sup>

(1) Lit., ‘division’. The reference to the distinction between holy and profane recited in the Amidah on the termination of the Sabbath and Festivals.

(2) V. P.B., p. 46.

(3) That means, if he had experienced pollution before then, he may immerse himself until Minhah, so that he may pray the afternoon prayer. But if it happened after the afternoon prayer, he should not immerse himself, but await until dark therewith. The Sages hold that the Ne'ilah is to be said at night, and therefore in agreement with Rab's teaching, renders exempt the evening prayer; whereas R. Jose, who holds that the man who had experienced pollution may immerse himself throughout the day, so that even if he had experienced after the afternoon prayer, he may immerse himself in order that he might pray the concluding prayer, is of the opinion that the Ne'ilah prayer is not said at night, and therefore does not exempt the evening service.

(4) V. supra 6b.

(5) Before he experienced the pollution, and therefore R. Jose holds that he may not immerse himself after the Minhah.

- (6) In the second Baraita, allowing immersion after Minhah.
- (7) And since the time of the immersion of those who experienced pollution is during the day, they may do so even after Minhah.
- (8) V. supra 8a.
- (9) Who does not permit immersion after Minhah because he does not regard it as an obligation to immerse at the proper time.
- (10) V. Shab., Sonc. ed., p. 598, n. 11.
- (11) How can a later action influence something completed before?
- (12) So that his body be sufficiently clean, and in the case of a pollution the immersion will touch every part of his body. An immersion is ritually effective only if the waters reach unimpeded the whole surface of the body.
- (13) V. Glos. s.v. (b).
- (14) His experience indicates that his seed will multiply.