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**Triennial Cycle (Triennial Torah Cycle) / Septennial Cycle (Septennial Torah Cycle)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Three and 1/2 year Lectionary Readings** | **Second Year of the Triennial Reading Cycle** |
| **Tebet 04, 5774 – Dec 06/Dec 07, 2013** | **Fifth Year of the Shmita Cycle** |

**Candle Lighting and Habdalah Times:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| **Conroe & Austin, TX, U.S.**  Fri. Dec 06 2013 – Candles at 5:12 PM  Sat. Dec 07 2013 – Habdalah 6:09 PM | **Brisbane, Australia**  Fri. Dec 06 2013 – Candles at 6:14 PM  Sat. Dec 07 2013 – Habdalah 7:12 PM | **Chattanooga, & Cleveland, TN, U.S.**  Fri. Dec 06 2013 – Candles at 5:11 PM  Sat. Dec 07 2013 – Habdalah 6:10 PM |
| **Jakarta, Indonesia**  Fri. Dec 06 2013 – Candles at 5:39 PM  Sat. Dec 07 2013 – Habdalah 6:32 PM | **Manila & Cebu, Philippines**  Fri. Dec 06 2013 – Candles at 5:08 PM  Sat. Dec 07 2013 – Habdalah 6:00 PM | **Miami, FL, U.S.**  Fri. Dec 06 2013 – Candles at 5:12 PM  Sat. Dec 07 2013 – Habdalah 6:07 PM |
| **Olympia, WA, U.S.**  Fri. Dec 06 2013 – Candles at 4:05 PM  Sat. Dec 07 2013 – Habdalah 5:14 PM | **Murray, KY, & Paris, TN. U.S.**  Fri. Dec 06 2013 – Candles at 4:19 PM  Sat. Dec 07 2013 – Habdalah 5:20 PM | **San Antonio, TX, U.S.**  Fri. Dec 06 2013 – Candles at 5:17 PM  Sat. Dec 07 2013 – Habdalah 6:14 PM |
| **Sheboygan & Manitowoc, WI, US**  Fri. Dec 06 2013 – Candles at 3:56 PM  Sat. Dec 07 2013 – Habdalah 5:02 PM | **Singapore, Singapore**  Fri. Dec 06 2013 – Candles at 6:39 PM  Sat. Dec 07 2013 – Habdalah 7:30 PM | **St. Louis, MO, U.S.**  Fri. Dec 06 2013 – Candles at 4:21 PM  Sat. Dec 07 2013 – Habdalah 5:23 PM |
|  |  |  |

**For other places see:** [**http://chabad.org/calendar/candlelighting.asp**](http://chabad.org/calendar/candlelighting.asp)

**Roll of Honor:**

**This Torah commentary comes to you courtesy of:**

His Honor Rosh Paqid Adon Hillel ben David and beloved wife HH Giberet Batsheva bat Sarah

His Honor Paqid Adon Mikha ben Hillel

His Honor Paqid Adon David ben Abraham

Her Excellency Giberet Sarai bat Sarah & beloved family

His Excellency Adon Barth Lindemann & beloved family

His Excellency Adon John Batchelor & beloved wife

His Excellency Adon Ezra ben Abraham and beloved wife HE Giberet Karmela bat Sarah,

His Excellency Dr. Adon Yeshayahu ben Yosef and beloved wife HE Giberet Tricia Foster

His Excellency Adon Yisrael ben Abraham and beloved wife HE Giberet Elisheba bat Sarah

His Excellency Adon Eliyahu ben Abraham and beloved wife HE Giberet Vardit bat Sarah

Her Excellency Giberet Laurie Taylor

His Honor Paqid Dr. Adon Eliyahu ben Abraham and beloved wife HH Giberet Dr. Elisheba bat Sarah

Her Excellency Prof. Dr. Conny Williams & beloved family

Her Excellency Giberet Gloria Sutton & beloved family

His Excellency Adon Albert Carlsson and beloved wife Giberet Lorraine Carlsson

His Excellency Adon John Hope & beloved family

**For their regular and sacrificial giving, providing the best oil for the lamps, we pray that G-d’s richest blessings be upon their lives and those of their loved ones, together with all Yisrael and her Torah Scholars, amen ve amen!**

**Also a great thank you and great blessings be upon all who send comments to the list about the contents and commentary of the weekly Torah Seder and allied topics**.

**If you want to subscribe to our list and ensure that you never lose any of our commentaries, or would like your friends also to receive this commentary, please do send me an E-Mail to** [**benhaggai@GMail.com**](mailto:benhaggai@GMail.com) **with your E-Mail or the E-Mail addresses of your friends. Toda Rabba!**

**Shabbat “Tsav” – “Command”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Shabbat** | **Torah Reading:** | **Weekday Torah Reading:** |
| **צַו** |  | **Saturday Afternoon** |
| **“Tsav”** | Reader 1 – Vayiqra 6:1-3 | Reader 1 – Vayiqra 6:1-3 |
| **“Command”** | Reader 2 – Vayiqra | Reader 2 – Vayiqra 6:4-6 |
| **“Manda”** | Reader 3 – Vayiqra | Reader 3 – Vayiqra 6:1-6 |
| Vayiqra (Lev.) 6:1 – 7:10 | Reader 4 – Vayiqra |  |
| Ashlamatah: Mic. 6:6-8 + 7:14-20 | Reader 5 – Vayiqra | **Monday & Thursday**  **Mornings** |
|  | Reader 6 – Vayiqra | Reader 1 – Vayiqra 6:1-3 |
| Psalm 76:1-7 | Reader 7 – Vayiqra | Reader 2 – Vayiqra 6:4-6 |
|  | Maftir – Vayiqra | Reader 3 – Vayiqra 6:1-6 |
| 1 Pet 2:11-12; Luk 10:38-42;  Acts 20:17-38 | Micah 6:6-8 + 7:14-20 |  |

**Blessings Before Torah Study**

**Blessed are You, Ha-Shem our G-d, King of the universe, Who has sanctified us through Your commandments, and commanded us to actively study Torah. Amen!**

**Please Ha-Shem, our G-d, sweeten the words of Your Torah in our mouths and in the mouths of all Your people Israel. May we and our offspring, and our offspring's offspring, and all the offspring of Your people, the House of Israel, may we all, together, know Your Name and study Your Torah for the sake of fulfilling Your desire. Blessed are You, Ha-Shem, Who teaches Torah to His people Israel. Amen!**

**Blessed are You, Ha-Shem our G-d, King of the universe, Who chose us from all the nations, and gave us the Torah. Blessed are You, Ha-Shem, Giver of the Torah. Amen!**

**Ha-Shem spoke to Moses, explaining a Commandment. "Speak to Aaron and his sons, and teach them the following Commandment: This is how you should bless the Children of Israel. Say to the Children of Israel:**

**May Ha-Shem bless you and keep watch over you; - Amen!**

**May Ha-Shem make His Presence enlighten you, and may He be kind to you; - Amen!**

**May Ha-Shem bestow favor on you, and grant you peace. – Amen!**

**This way, the priests will link My Name with the Israelites, and I will bless them."**

**These are the Laws for which the Torah did not mandate specific amounts: How much growing produce must be left in the corner of the field for the poor; how much of the first fruits must be offered at the Holy Temple; how much one must bring as an offering when one visits the Holy Temple three times a year; how much one must do when doing acts of kindness; and there is no maximum amount of Torah that a person must study.**

**These are the Laws whose benefits a person can often enjoy even in this world, even though the primary reward is in the Next World: They are: Honouring one's father and mother; doing acts of kindness; early attendance at the place of Torah study -- morning and night; showing hospitality to guests; visiting the sick; providing for the financial needs of a bride; escorting the dead; being very engrossed in prayer; bringing peace between two people, and between husband and wife; but the study of Torah is as great as all of them together. Amen!**

**Contents of the Torah Seder**

* Fire for the Daily Burnt Offering – Leviticus 6:1-6
* Further Directions Concerning the Meal Offering – Leviticus 6:7-11
* The High Priest’s Daily Meal Offering – Leviticus 6:12-16
* Holiness of the Sin Offering – Leviticus 6:17-23
* The Guilt Offering – Leviticus 7:1-10

**Reading Assignment:**

**The Torah Anthology: Yalkut Me’Am Lo’Ez - Vol. XI: The Divine Service**

By: Rabbi Yaaqov Culi & Rabbi Yitschaq Magriso, Translated by: Rabbi Aryeh Kaplan

Published by: Moznaim Publishing Corp. (New York, 1989)

Vol. 11 – “The Divine Service,” pp. 119-141

**Rashi & Targum Pseudo Jonathan**

**for: Vayiqra (Leviticus) 6:1 – 7:10**

| **RASHI** | **TARGUM PSEUDO JONATHAN** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, | 1. And the Lord spoke with Mosheh, saying |
| 2. **Command** Aaron and his sons, saying, This is the law of the burnt offering: That is the burnt offering which burns on the altar all night until morning, and the fire of the altar shall burn with it. | 2. **Instruct** Aharon and his sons, saying, This is the law of the burnt offering which is brought to make atonement for the thoughts (errors) of the heart: it is a burnt offering, which is made in (the manner of) the burnt offering at Mount Sinai, and abides upon the place of burning on the altar all the night until the morning: for the fire of the altar will be burning in it. |
| 3. And the kohen shall don his linen tunic, and he shall don his linen trousers on his flesh. And he shall lift out the ashes into which the fire has consumed the burnt offering upon the altar, and put them down next to the altar. | 3. And the priest will dress himself in vestments of linen, and put drawers of linen upon his flesh; and will separate the ashes which the fire (makes) in consuming the burnt offering upon the altar, and will place them at the side of the altar. |
| 4. He shall then take off his garments and put on other garments, and he shall take out the ashes to a clean place outside the camp. | 4. And he will take off his vestments and put on other garments, and carry forth the ashes without the camp into a clean place. |
| 5. And the fire on the altar shall burn on it; it shall not go out. The kohen shall kindle wood upon it every morning, and upon it, he shall arrange the burnt offering and cause the fats of the peace offerings to [go up in] smoke upon it. | 5. But the fire upon the altar will burn upon it unextinguished, and the priest will lay wood upon it from morning to morning, at four hours of the day, and will set in order the burnt offering upon it, and burn upon it the fat of the sanctified oblations. |
| 6. A continuous fire shall burn upon the altar; it shall not go out. | 6. The fire shall be ever burning upon the altar; it shall never be extinguished. |
| 7. And this is the law of the meal offering: that Aaron's sons shall bring it before the Lord, to the front of the altar. | 7. And this is the law of the Mincha, which the priests, the sons of Aharon, will offer in the presence of the LORD before the altar. |
| 8. And he shall lift out of it in his fist, from the fine flour of the meal offering and from its oil and all the frankincense that is on the meal offering, and he shall cause its reminder to [go up in] smoke on the altar as a pleasing fragrance to the Lord. | 8. And he will separate his handful of the flour of the mincha, of the best thereof, with all the frankincense which is upon the mincha, and burn it at the altar to be received with favor, as a memorial of praise before the LORD. |
| 9. And Aaron and his sons shall eat whatever is left over from it. It shall be eaten as unleavened bread in a holy place; they shall eat it in the courtyard of the Tent of Meeting. | 9. And that which remains of it will Aharon and his sons eat; unleavened will they eat it in the holy place, in the court of the tabernacle of ordinance will they eat it. |
| 10. It shall not be baked leavened. [As] their portion, I have given it to them from My fire offerings. It is a holy of holies, like the sin offering and like the guilt offering. | 10. Their portion of the residue of the mincha of My oblations given to them will not be baked with leaven; it is most sacred, as the sin offering and as the trespass offering. |
| 11. Any male among Aaron's sons may eat it. [This is] an eternal statute for your generations from the fire offerings of the Lord. Anything that touches them shall become holy. | 11. Every man of the sons of Aharon may eat of it. This is an everlasting statute for your generations concerning the oblations of the LORD: everyone who touches them must be sanctified. |
| 12. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, | 12. And the LORD spoke with Mosheh, saying: |
| 13. This is the offering of Aaron and his sons, which they shall offer to the Lord, on the day when [one of them] is anointed: One tenth of an ephah of fine flour for a perpetual meal offering, half of it in the morning and half of it in the evening. | 13. **This is the oblation of Aharon and of his sons, which they are to offer before the LORD on the day that they anoint him, that he may possess the inheritance of the high priesthood. A tenth of three seahs of fine flour for a mincha, one half in the morning and a half at eventide.** |
| 14. It shall be made with oil on a shallow pan, after bringing it scalded and repeatedly baked; you shall offer a meal offering of broken pieces, [with] a pleasing fragrance to the Lord. | 14. **You will make it upon a pan, mixed with olive oil will you offer it; in divided pieces will you offer the mincha, to be received with acceptance before the LORD,** |
| 15. And the kohen who is anointed instead of him from among his sons, shall prepare it; [this is] an eternal statute; it shall be completely burnt to the Lord. | 15. And the high priest who is anointed with oil, (and also when (any one) of his sons who are constituted priests (is consecrated) in his place) will perform this: it is an everlasting statute before the LORD: the whole will be set in order and burned. |
| 16. Every meal offering of a kohen shall be completely burnt; it shall not be eaten. | 16. For every mincha of the priest will be wholly set in order and consumed: it will not be eaten. |
| 17. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, | 17. And the LORD spoke with Mosheh, saying: |
| 18. Speak to Aaron and to his sons, saying, This is the law of the sin offering: The sin offering shall be slaughtered before the Lord in the place where the burnt offering is slaughtered. It is a holy of holies. | 18. Speak with Aharon and with his sons, saying: This is the law of the sin offering which is to be killed in the place where the burnt offering is killed; it will be slain as a sin offering before the LORD; it is most sacred. |
| 19. The kohen who offers it up as a sin offering shall eat it; it shall be eaten in a holy place, in the courtyard of the Tent of Meeting. | 19. The priest who makes atonement with blood may eat of it in the holy place; it will be eaten in the court of the tabernacle of ordinance; |
| 20. Anything that touches its flesh shall become holy, and if any of its blood is sprinkled on a garment, [the area of the garment] upon which it has been sprinkled, you shall wash in a holy place. | 20. whosoever touches the flesh of it must be sanctified. And if any one let some of its blood fall upon a garment, (the garment so) dropped will be washed in the holy place. |
| 21. An earthenware vessel in which it is cooked shall be broken, but if it is cooked in a copper vessel, it shall be purged and rinsed with water. | 21. And every earthen vessel in which (the flesh of it) is boiled will be broken, lest that which is common be boiled in it; or if it be boiled in a vessel of brass, it will be scoured with potter's earth and washed in waters. |
| 22. Every male among the kohanim may eat it. It is a holy of holies. | 22. Every man of the priests may eat thereof; it is most sacred. |
| 23. But any sin offering some of whose blood was brought into the Tent of Meeting to make atonement in the Holy, shall not be eaten; it will be burnt in fire. | 23. But no sin offering whose blood is carried into the tabernacle of ordinance to make atonement in the sanctuary may be eaten; it must be burned with fire. |
|  |  |
| 1. And this is the law of the guilt offering. It is a holy of holies. | 1. And this is the law of the Trespass Offering; it is most holy. |
| 2. They shall slaughter the guilt offering in the place where they slaughter the burnt offering; and its blood shall be dashed upon the altar, around. | 2. In the place where they kill the burnt sacrifice they will kill the trespass offering, and the blood thereof will he sprinkle upon the altar round about. |
| 3. And all of its fat he shall offer from it: the tail and the fat covering the innards, | 3. And he will offer all the fat thereof, and the tail, and the fat which covers the inwards; |
| 4. and the two kidneys [along] with the fat that is upon them, which is on the flanks, and the diaphragm with the liver; along with the kidneys he shall remove it. | 4. and the two kidneys, and the fat which is upon them, and upon the inwards. And the caul that is upon the liver upon the kidneys will he take away; |
| 5. And the kohen shall cause them to [go up in] smoke on the altar as a fire offering to the Lord. It is a guilt offering. | 5. and the priest will burn them at the altar, an oblation before the LORD: it is a trespass offering. |
| 6. Any male among the kohanim may eat it; it shall be eaten in a holy place. It is a holy of holies. | 6. Every man of the priests may eat of it, in the holy place will it be eaten it is most sacred. |
| 7. Like the sin offering, so is the guilt offering, they have one law; the kohen who effects atonement through it to him it shall belong. | 7. As the rite of the sin offering, so is the rite of the trespass; there is one law for them: the priest who makes atonement with its blood will have it. |
| 8. And the kohen who offers up a person's burnt offering, the skin of the burnt offering which he has offered up, belongs to the kohen; it shall be his. | 8. And when the priest offers another man's burnt sacrifice, the skin of the burnt sacrifice which he offers will be the priest's. |
| 9. And any meal offering baked in an oven, and any one made in a deep pan or in a shallow pan, belongs to the kohen who offers it up; it shall be his. | 9. And every mincha which is baked in the oven, and every one that is made in a pot, or in a frying pan, or upon a dish, the priest who offers it will have it for his own. |
| 10. And any meal offering mixed with oil or dry, shall belong to all the sons of Aaron, one like the other. | 10. And every mincha mixed with oil, or which is dry, will be for any of the sons of Aharon, a man as his brother. |
|  |  |

**Welcome to the World of P’shat Exegesis**

In order to understand the finished work of the P’shat mode of interpretation of the Torah, one needs to take into account that the P’shat is intended to produce a catechetical output, whereby a question/s is/are raised and an answer/a is/are given using the seven Hermeneutic Laws of R. Hillel and as well as the laws of Hebrew Grammar and Hebrew expression.

The Seven Hermeneutic Laws of R. Hillel are as follows

[cf. <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=472&letter=R>]:

**1. Ḳal va-ḥomer:** "Argumentum a minori ad majus" or "a majori ad minus"; corresponding to the scholastic proof a fortiori.

**2. Gezerah shavah:** Argument from analogy. Biblical passages containing synonyms or homonyms are subject, however much they differ in other respects, to identical definitions and applications.

**3. Binyan ab mi-katub eḥad:** Application of a provision found in one passage only to passages which are related to the first in content but do not contain the provision in question.

**4. Binyan ab mi-shene ketubim:** The same as the preceding, except that the provision is generalized from two Biblical passages.

**5. Kelal u-Peraṭ and Peraṭ u-kelal:** Definition of the general by the particular, and of the particular by the general.

**6. Ka-yoẓe bo mi-maḳom aḥer:** Similarity in content to another Scriptural passage.

**7. Dabar ha-lamed me-'inyano:** Interpretation deduced from the context.

**Rashi’s Commentary for: Vayiqra (Leviticus) 6:1 – 7:10**

**2** **Command Aaron** Heb. צַו. **The expression צַו always denotes urging [to promptly and meticulously fulfill a particular commandment] for the present and also for future generations. Rabbi Simeon taught: Scripture especially needs to urge [people to fulfill commandments,] where monetary loss is involved.-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:1]**

**This is the law of the burnt-offering…** This passage comes to teach us that the burning of [sacrificial] fats and parts [of an animal] is valid throughout the entire night [following the day it is offered up].-[*Meg.* 21a] And [this passage also] teaches us regarding invalid sacrifices: which one, if it has already been brought up [on the altar], must be taken down, and which one, if it has been brought up [on the altar], need not be taken down. [And how do we know the latter case from Scripture?] Because every [instance of] תּוֹרַת [in the Torah] comes to include. [Thus here, it comes] to say that there is one law (תּוֹרָה for all sacrifices that go up [on the altar], even invalid ones, namely, that if they have already been brought up [on the altar], they need not be taken down. [However,]

**That is the burnt-offering** Heb. הִוא הַָעֹלָה [While the words תּוֹרַת הַָעֹלָה include invalid offerings, the words הִוא הַָעֹלָה come] to exclude the case of animals which have cohabited with a human, whether the animal was an active or a passive party to the transgression, and similar cases, in which their becoming invalid did not occur within the Holy [Temple precincts], but rather, they became invalid before they even arrived at the courtyard [of the Holy Temple]. -[*Torath Kohanim* 6:3]

**3 his linen tunic** Heb. מִדּוֹ, lit. his measure. This is כֻּתֹּנֶת, a long tunic (see Exod. 28:39:40). Now why does it say מִדּוֹ ? [To teach us] that it must be [made] according to his size [of the *kohen* wearing it].-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:7]

**on his flesh** i. e., nothing must interpose between [the trousers and his flesh].-[*Zev.* 19a]

**and he shall lift out the ashes** He would scoop out a full pan of ashes from the innermost [mass of ashes from] burnt out sacrificial parts [on the altar] and deposit them at the east side of the ramp [that led up to the altar (see Exod. 20: 23, *Rashi*)].-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:11; *Tamid* 28b]

**the ashes into which the fire has consumed the burnt-offering** and made it into ashes, and some of these ashes the *kohen* should lift out and put them down next to the altar.

**upon the altar** If he finds any [animal] parts which were not yet consumed, he must put them back onto the altar, after raking the burning embers in all directions and scooping out some of the innermost [ashes], because it is said, “the burnt-offering upon the altar,” [i.e., while it is still in the form of a burnt-offering, and not yet ashes, it must remain “upon the altar”].- [*Yoma* 45a].

**4 He shall then take off his garments** This is not an obligation, but proper practice, that, by taking out the ashes, he should not soil the garments in which he constantly officiates. [By analogy:] The clothes worn [by a servant] while cooking a pot [of food] for his master, he should not wear when he mixes a glass [of wine] for his master. Hence, [the verse continues,] “and put on other garments,” inferior to those [garments of the *kehunah* he had been wearing till now].-[*Yoma* 23b]

**and he shall take out the ashes** [By contrasting verse 3, “And he shall lift out (וְהֵריִם) the ashes,” with verse 4 here, “And he shall take out (וְהוֹצִיא) the ashes,” we see that there were two distinct obligations with regards to removing ashes from the altar: a) תּרוּמַת הַדֶּשֶׁן, “lifting out” some of the innermost ashes from the altar and placing them next to the altar, and b) הַדֶּשֶׁן הוֹצָאַת, “taking out” the heap of ashes from atop the altar when they became overflowing, to a place “outside the camp.” Thus, our verse here, “And he shall take out the ashes,” refers to those ashes] which were heaped up in the apple- shaped pile [of ashes on top of the altar]. When this pile became so large that there was no longer any room on the wood-pile, he [the *kohen*] would take it out of there. Now, this was not a daily obligation (*Tamid* 28b), but lifting out [some innermost ashes] was a daily obligation.-[*Tamid* 20a]

**5 And the fire on the altar shall burn on it** Heb. תּוּקַד. [In this passage,] we have many phrases employing the term יְקִידָה, “burning: ” עַל מוֹקְדָה, תּוּקַד בּוֹ וְאֵשׁ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ (verse 2), וְהָאֵשׁ עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ תּוּקַד בּוֹ (verse 5), and הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֵשׁ תָּמִיד תּוּקַד עַל (verse 6). All these are expounded on in Tractate *Yoma* (45a), where [it is discussed how] our Rabbis differ regarding the number of wood-piles [that had to be arranged on that altar].

**and upon it, he shall arrange the burnt- offering** [This teaches us that] the עוֹלַת תָּמִיד, the [morning] daily burnt-offering, must come first [in the order of sacrifices offered up on the altar]. -[*Pes.* 58b]

**the fats of the peace-offerings** Heb. עָלֶיהָ חֶלְבֵי הַשְּׁלָמִים, [i.e.] if they bring peace- offerings [they are to be offered up on that fire]. Our Rabbis derived from here, however, “with it (עָלֶיהָ), i.e., with the morning burnt-offering [i.e., after the morning burnt-offering, but not after the evening burnt-offering], complete (הַשְּׁלֵם) all the sacrifices [of the day].” Hence, there must be no sacrifice offered after the [evening] daily burnt-offering. -[*Pes.* 58b]

**6** **A continuous fire** Heb. אֵשׁ תָּמִיד, the fire regarding which it says, “[to kindle the lamps] continually (תָּמִיד)” (Exod. 27:20) this fire must also be kindled from [the fire] on the outer altar.-[*Yoma* 45b]

**it shall not go out** [Since “it shall not go out” is stated twice, once in verse 5 and a second time here,] anyone who extinguishes the fire on top of the altar, transgresses two negative commandments.

**7 And this is the law of the meal-offering** Heb. וְזֹאת תּוֹרַת הַמִּנְחָה. [Since the תּוֹרַת (law) is always inclusive, the Torah teaches us that there is] one law for all meal-offerings, to require that they have oil and frankincense, as explained in this section. For one might think that only meal-offerings of ordinary Israelites [i.e., non- *kohanim*] need oil and frankincense, because their meal-offerings require scooping out (קְמִיצָה). How do we know [that] meal-offerings of *kohanim*, which are burned in their entirety (see verse 16 below), [also require oil and frankincense]? Scripture, therefore, תּוֹרַת [an inclusive term, in this case coming to include all meal-offerings in the requirement of oil and frankincense].-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:24]

**shall bring it** This refers to bringing the offering near the south- west ern corner [of the altar]. [And how do we know that it must be brought near this specific corner? Because the verse says:]

**before the Lord** This refers to the west ern [side of the altar], which faced the Tent of Meeting, [and then it says:]

**to the front of the altar** This refers to the south [side of the altar], which is the front of the altar for the ramp—כֶּבֶשׂ, [leading up to it] was placed on that side [of the altar. Hence, the south-western corner of the altar].-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:26]

**8 And he shall lift out of it** i.e., out of what is attached, meaning that [the amount of the mixture from where he lifts out,] should be a complete tenth [of an *ephah*,] at one time, namely at the time of the scooping.-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:27]

**in his fist** [This teaches us that] he may not make a measure for a fistful [but rather, he must use his fingers directly]. -[Torath Kohanim 6:27]

**from the fine flour of the meal-offering and from its oil** [Now, we already know that the flour to be scooped up is mixed with oil, so why does the verse specifically mention oil here?] From here, we learn that the fistful [must be taken] from a place [in the meal-offering] where there is an abundance of its oil [i.e., where the oil is mixed thoroughly with the flour].-[*Sotah* 14b]

**the meal-offering** [I.e., from that particular meal-offering;] it must not be mingled with another [meal- offering].-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:27]

**and all the frankincense that is on the meal- offering, and he shall cause to [go up in] smoke** [meaning] that he must gather up [all] its frankincense after the scooping, and cause it togo up in smoke. And since Scripture specifically stated this law only in one case of the meal-offerings mentioned in וַיִּקְרָא (see Lev.2:2), Scripture found it necessary to repeat this section [including this law], to include all [kinds of] meal-offerings, in accordance with their law.

**9 in a holy place** And which place is this? In the courtyard of the Tent of Meeting.-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:32].

**10** **It shall not be baked leavened. [As] their portion** [literally, “It must not be baked leavened, their portion.” I.e., from the juxtaposition of these words, is derived the law that] even the leftover portions [of the meal-offering, which go to the *kohanim*,] are prohibited to be leavened.-[*Men*. 55a]

**like the sin-offering and like the guilt-offering** [This refers to two different cases:] “Like a sin- offering” refers to the meal-offering of a sinner. [How is this sacrifice like a sin- offering? Insofar as just as the sin-offering must be sacrificed for that specific purpose, so too, the מִנְחַת חוֹטֵא] if [the *kohen*] performed the scooping while having in mind that should not be for the purpose of this sacrifice, it is invalid. And “like a guilt-offering” refers to a meal- offering brought as a voluntary donation. Therefore, if [the *kohen*] performed the scooping while having in mind that it should not be for the purpose of this sacrifice, it is still valid.-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:35].

**11** **Any male** Even if he has a blemish [which disqualifies him from performing the sacrificial service]. And why is this stated? If [this refers] to eating [the meal- offering, this is already stated [in Lev. 21:22, where Scripture says, referring to a *kohen* who has a blemish], “The offerings to his God from the holiest of the holy things [and from the holy things he may eat].” Rather, [Scripture here comes] to include blemished *kohanim* in the equal division [of meal-offerings, among all the *kohanim* [of the watch (מִשְׁמָר), see *Rashi* Lev. 7:9)]

**Anything that touches [them, shall become holy]** Sacrifices that have a lesser degree of holiness or ordinary food that comes in contact with a meal-offering and absorbs from it,

**shall become holy** to be like it [i.e., like the meal-offering], that if it is invalid, they will becomes invalid; and if it is valid, they will have to be eaten under the same stringency as the meal-offering [namely, within holy ground and only during the day of offering and the night following, until midnight].-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:38; *Zev* . 97b]

**13 This is the offering of Aaron and his sons** Ordinary *kohanim* must also offer [a meal-offering, consisting of] a tenth of an *ephah* [of flour], on the day they are inaugurated into service. The *Kohen Gadol*, however, must bring [this meal- offering] every day, as it is said, “a perpetual meal-offering…” (verse 15), “And the *kohen* who is anointed instead of him from among his sons …an eternal statute.”-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:39,44].

**14 scalded** Boiling water is poured over it [i.e., over the dough], until it is thoroughly scalded.-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:46]

**repeatedly baked** Heb. תֻּפִינֵי, baked many times over, namely, after the scalding (חֲלִיטָה), he bakes it in an oven and afterwards fries it in a shallow pan.-[*Men.* 50b]

**a meal-offering of broken pieces** [This] teaches [us] that it requires breaking up. [Old *Rashi* edition continues: But not really breaking of the offering into separate pieces and crumbs, since it is not scooped, but he folds it in two, and folds it again in four, [first] vertically and [then] horizontally. However, he does not separate it [into pieces]. In this form, he burns it as a fire-offering. This is explained in *Torath Kohanim*.-[see *Torath Kohanim* 6:48, *Men.* 75b]

**15 who is anointed instead of him from among his sons** [This is to be understood as if transposed: The *kohen*] who is anointed from among his sons instead of him.

**It shall be completely burnt** [When there is a קְמִיצָה procedure, what is scooped out is burned on the altar, and the remainder is eaten by the *kohanim*. However, in this offering,] there is no קְמִיצָה procedure to enable any remainder to be eaten; but, it is burnt in its entirety. Similarly, any voluntary meal-offering brought by a kohen, must be completely burned.

**17** **completely** Heb. כָּלִיל All of it must be equally offered to God on High.

**19 who offers it as a sin offering** Heb. הַמְחַטֵּא אתהּ, who performs the components of its service, i.e., the one through whom it becomes a sin-offering. [Thus, the word הַמְחַטֵּא means, “the one who makes it into a sin-offering (חַטָּאת).”]

**The kohen who offers it as a sin offering shall eat it** [Any *kohen*] fit for the service; this comes to exclude a *kohen* who is unclean at the time of the dashing of the blood, who does not take a share in the flesh. -[*Torath Kohanim* 6:58] But, it is impossible to say that [this verse] prohibits other *kohanim* from eating it, except the *kohen* who dashes its blood, for it says further (verse 22),“Any male among the *kohanim* may it it.”

**20 Anything that touches its flesh** Any item of food that touches it and absorbs from it.-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:60]

**shall become holy** to be like it, insofar as: If [that sin-offering] is invalid, it [whatever touched the sin-offering], becomes invalid, and if [that sin-offering] is valid, it [whatever touched the sin-offering] must be eaten under the same stringency as the sin-offering [namely, only during the day of offering and the following night.-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:60]

**and if some of its blood is sprinkled on a garment** Heb. וַאֲשֶׁר יִזֶּה, [usually, and *what* will be sprinkled …, which would mean that the blood must be sprinkled on the garment. Therefore, *Rashi* remarks that אֲשֶׁר in this case is like אִם, and the verse is to be rendered:] And *if* some of its blood is sprinkled on a garment, [the area of the garment] which it has been sprinkled, shall be washed within the courtyard [of the Holy Temple].-[*Torath Kohanim* 6:63]

**upon which it has been sprinkled** [The verb יִזֶּה is in the passive form, having the meaning: To be sprinkled and thus here, the phrase, אֲשֶׁר יִזֶּה עָלֶיהָ means, “upon which it has been sprinkled”]. This is similar to the verse, “neither will the gratification of their desire be extended (יִטֶּה) to the earth” (Job 15:29), [where the verb יִטֶּה is also in the passive form, with the meaning:] “to be extended.”5

**21 [An earthenware vessel in which it is cooked,] shall be broken** Because the absorption that had been absorbed in the vessel becomes נוֹתָר [literally, “left over.” I.e., the food remains within the vessel’s wall (see next *Rashi*), and subsequently, when the time limit for eating the sacrifice has expired, the absorption in the vessel wall is “left over.” Since נוֹתָר, “left over,” must be destroyed by burning, the food in the wall of this earthenware vessel must be destroyed by breaking the vessel]. The same law [of breaking the earthenware vessel in which meat of a sacrifice has been cooked,] applies also to all holy sacrifices [i.e., not just the sin-offering].

**it is to be purged** Heb. וּמֹרַק, an expression stemming from the same root as “and with the ointments of the women (וּבְתַמְרוּקֵי הַנָשִׁים)”(Esther 2:12), [substances used for cleansing and perfuming women.] *Escuremant* in Old French [like the English, “scouring”].

**purged and rinsed** to expel its absorption. [This is in the case of a metal vessel.] But an earthenware vessel, Scripture teaches you here [by requiring that it be broken,] that it never rids itself of its defect - [Pes. 30b].

**22 Every male among the** *kohanim* may eat it From here, we learn that, “[The *kohen*] who offers it up as a sin-offering [shall eat it],” stated above (verse 19) does not come to exclude all other *kohanim*, but to exclude one who is unfit to offer it up as a sin-offering.

**23 But any sin-offering [some of whose blood was brought into the Tent of Meeting … shall not be eaten]** [This verse teaches us] that if one brings any of the blood of a sin-offering to be sacrificed on the outside altar, inside [the Holy], it [the sacrifice] becomes invalid.-[*Zev.* 81b]

**any** [This seemingly superfluous word comes] to include all other holy sacrifices [in this law].

**Chapter 7**

**1** **It is a holy of holies** *It* shall be sacrificed, but an animal substituted for it may not be sacrificed, [rather it remains in pasture until it becomes defective and then is redeemed].-[*Torath Kohanim* 7:79].

**2** **They shall slaughter** Heb. יִשְׁחֲטוּ. [By using the plural verb, יִשְׁחֲטוּ, Scripture here has seemingly] come to describe many slaughterers [i.e., it has included the case of a communal guilt-offering, which has “many slaughterers,” i.e., is slaughtered for many]. However, since we do not find a case of a communal guilt-offering [mentioned in Scriptures, the verse is understood somewhat differently: it uses the plural pronoun,] as it links the guilt-offering with the burnt-offering [where we do have a case of a communal sacrifice], in order to include also the communal burnt-offering in the requirement that it too be slaughtered in the northern sector [of the Holy Temple courtyard, just as is required of an individual’s burnt-offering].-[*Torath Kohanim* 7:82] [*Rashi*, as amended by *Maharshal* in *Yerioth Shelomo*, quoted by *Leket Bahir*. For alternative interpretations, see Chavel, *Yosef Hallel*. Many scholars consider this comment an addendum to *Rashi* because it does not appear in any early editions or manuscripts.]

**3 All of its fat...** Until here, the sacrificial parts of a guilt-offering had not yet been delineated. This is why Scripture needs to delineate them here (verses 34). However, [the sacrificial parts of] the sin-offering have already been delineated in the *parashah* of וַיִּקְרָא (see Lev. 4:89), [and that is why its sacrificial parts were not delineated in the section describing the law of the sin-offering (see verses 6: 18-23 above)].

**the tail** [In the case of the peace-offering, the Torah treated sheep and goat offerings as two separate entities, by specifying the sacrificial procedures for each one separately (see Lev. 3:7-15). Why, then, is no distinction made between sheep and goats in the case of guilt-offerings?] Since [for] a guilt- offering only a ram (אַיִל) or a lamb (כֶּבֶשׂ) may be brought, and rams and lambs are included in [the category of those animals whose] tail [is one of the sacrificial parts, [no distinction is made between sheep and goats].

**5** **It is a guilt-offering** Heb. אָשָׁם הוּא, [meaning that it is a guilt-offering] until its name is removed from it [by sending it out to pasture]. This teaches us concerning a guilt-offering whose owner has died, or whose owner has [lost the original animal, and subsequently] received atonement [through another animal], although it [the original guilt-offering animal] stands ready that its value [in money used to buy another animal which] is to be offered up as an מִזְבֵּחַ עוֹלַת קַיִץ (i.e., “a burnt-offering which was provision for the altar"; see *Rashi*, Lev. 1: 2), nevertheless, if the [original guilt-offerings] were slaughtered, [if this had been done] before they are sent out to pasture. [Actually, the law is that the animals in these cases, the animal is sent out to pasture so that it become blemished and consequently unfit for sacrifice. Then it is sold, and its proceeds used for burnt-offerings for “provision for the altar." Here, however, *Rashi* tells us that the status of “guilt-offering” is removed from the animal as soon as it is sent out to pasture, even before it becomes blemished. This expression, אָשָׁם הוּא, “It is a guilt-offering,”] does not come to teach us that a guilt-offering becomes invalid if it was sacrificed for another purpose [other than for a guilt-offering], as they expounded on [the word] הִיא in the case of the sin-offering (see *Rashi* Lev. 4:24, 5:9). [That is] because in the case of a guilt-offering, Scripture states “It is a guilt-offering” only after the sacrificial parts have been burnt. [And if we say that the verse is teaching us that the guilt-offering must be sacrificed for that specific purpose, not for any other, then this law must include also the procedure of burning the sacrificial parts, that they too must be burned for the purpose of a guilt-offering]. However, [we learned in Tractate *Zev.* (5b) that in the case of a guilt-offering,] if its sacrificial parts were not offered up [at all], it is valid.

**6 It is a holy of holies** [But has this not already been stated in verse 1?] This is expounded on in *Torath Kohanim* 7:84.

**7 They have one law** in regard to this matter:

**the kohen who effects atonement through it** i.e., [any *kohen*] who is fit to effect atonement, takes a share in it. This excludes one who immersed himself on that day [for his uncleanness, who may not perform the sacrificial service or eat holy things until sunset], one lacking atonement [if he did not yet bring his sacrifice on the day after his immersion, such as a זָב or a מְצֹרָע], and one whose close relative died on that day, [who is also disqualified from performing the sacrificial service]. - [*Torath Kohanim* 7:86].

**8 the skin of the burnt-offering which he has offered, belongs to the kohen; it shall be his** This excludes one who immersed himself on that day, one lacking atonement, and one whose close relative died on that day.-[Torath Kohanim 7:89].

**9 belongs to the kohen who offers it up** One might think that it belongs to him alone. Scripture, therefore, states (in the next verse), “[And any meal-offering...] shall belong to all the sons of Aaron.” One might think, then, that it [indeed] belongs to all of them. Scripture, therefore, states (in the preceding verse), “belongs to the *kohen* who offers it up.” So how [can this be reconciled]? [It belongs] to the family of the day when they offer it up. [The *kohanim* were divided into twenty-four divisions called “watches,” each watch being on duty for the temple service for one week. Each day of the week, a different family of *kohanim* from that week’s watch was on duty. When a *kohen* offered up an Israelite’s meal-offering, it was shared equally among all of his family, who were on duty that day].-[Torath Kohanim 7:92].

**10** **mixed with oil** This is a voluntarily donated meal-offering. - [see Lev. 2:1]

**or dry** This is a sinner’s meal-offering (Lev. 5:11) and the meal-offering of jealousies [sacrificed during the investigation ritual of the סוֹטָה, woman suspected of adultery] (Num. 5:15), which do not contain oil [and thus the term “dry”].

**Ramban’s Commentary for:** **Vayiqra (Leviticus) 6:1 – 7:10**

**6:2. TZAV (COMMAND) AARON.** In the [preceding] section of ***Vayikra,***Scripture stated, ***Speak unto the children of Israel****,[[1]](#footnote-1)* for there He gave the command about the bringing of the offerings, and it is upon the Israelites to bring them. But here He states, ***Command Aaron and his sons****,[[2]](#footnote-2)* for He now speaks of the rites of the offerings and these are performed by the priests.

Now Rashi wrote: ***"Command Aaron****.* The expression 'command ...' always implies urging [to fulfill the command] at once, and also for future generations. Rabbi Shimon said: Scripture found it especially necessary to urge, in cases where fulfillment of a command involves monetary loss." [[3]](#footnote-3) But the explanation of Rabbi Shimon was not [said] with reference to this command, for here there is no monetary loss involved to the priests to whom this command was given. Indeed, they gain profit and reward from all the offerings,[[4]](#footnote-4) even the burnt-offering.[[5]](#footnote-5) Rather, the intention of the First Sage [whom Rashi quoted] in saying, "the expression 'command ...' always implies urging [to fulfill the command] at once and also for future generations," was to say that in those sections of the Torah where Scripture wanted to urge fulfillment, saying that they should be fulfilled immediately and that they apply throughout the generations, it uses this expression of "command ..." But in other sections it will say, "speak" to the children of Israel, or "say" unto them. With this [generalization] Rabbi Shimon differed, saying that sometimes[[6]](#footnote-6) this expression **["command ..."]** occurs in a matter which is not to be fulfilled immediately and throughout the generations, but it is used because the command involves a monetary loss. Such [a use of the word] **"command"** is that found in the case of the oil of the lighting[[7]](#footnote-7) [where, according to Rabbi Shimon, the expression **"command ..."** is used because it applies immediately and for all generations, as well as for the reason that it involves a monetary loss], and that which Scripture states, ***Command the children of Israel, that they give unto the Levites of the inheritance of their possession cities to dwell in****,[[8]](#footnote-8)* [which is a case where the use of the expression **"command"** can only be because monetary loss is involved, since it did not apply at once, but only after they had taken possession of the Land].

It is possible that we say that our command does involve a monetary loss to the priests, as a result of that which it says further on [in this section], ***This is the offering of Aaron and his sons****,[[9]](#footnote-9)* which is a continuation of this command. However, at the beginning of the Sifre,[[10]](#footnote-10) the opinions [of the First Sage and that of Rabbi Shimon] are taught in a manner indicating that they hold opposing views.[[11]](#footnote-11)

**THIS IS TORATH' (THE LAW OF) THE BURNT OFFERING.** "This text is intended to teach us that the burning of the fats and limbs of offerings is valid [if performed anytime] during the whole night [following the day on which they were slaughtered]. It is also intended to teach us which of the disqualified offerings, although already brought up on to the altar, must be taken down, and which of them if already brought up need not be taken down. For all expressions of ***torath****[[12]](#footnote-12)* [introducing a group of laws] denote inclusion — one law for all offerings that are brought up on to the altar, including some disqualified ones, namely that if they are already brought up on to the altar, they need not be taken down." This is Rashi's language.

But this law does not [in fact] apply to ***everything***that has already been brought up on to the altar, but only to all offerings proper, for if drink-offerings[[13]](#footnote-13) are brought on to the altar [when they are not supposed to be] they must be taken down; and even if the libations are correctly offered up and the offering is disqualified, or the offering is correctly offered up and the libations disqualified, and definitely where both are disqualified — in all these cases, the offering itself is not to be taken down again, and the libations are to be taken down! For such is the sense of the inclusive term ***torath ha'olah******(the law of the burnt-offering),***teaching, "one law for all that goes up [as the due of the altar-fires]" but not for the drink-offerings [since they are not poured on the fires, but into a silver bowl placed at the south-west corner of the altar],[[14]](#footnote-14) nor for the blood [which was sprinkled on the sides of the altar], in accordance with the words of Rabbi Yehoshua.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Now this verse [also] teaches that we should not *offer* the burnt-offering at night, but if it was slaughtered and its blood sprinkled [on the altar] during the daytime, we may burn its limbs all night, the same law applying to the fats of the peace-offering. And the explanation of the expression ***'hi ha'olah'***is as if it said: ***'tiheyeh' ha'olah***(the burnt-offering "will be") ***on the firewood upon the altar all night****.* He uses the word ***hi***[literally: "she"] in order to exclude[[16]](#footnote-16) those things which the Rabbis have specified in the interpretation thereof. Now according to the [Rabbinical] interpretation this verse does not teach us that we are to bring up the limbs [of the offerings] from the ground to the altar at night, for this [principle] they have already derived from another verse, ***Neither will the fat of My feast remain all night until the morning****,[[17]](#footnote-17)* [which the Sages interpreted[[18]](#footnote-18) to mean, ***"Neither will the fat of My feast remain***on the stone pavement of the Court below, ***all night until the morning****,* but you should bring it up to the altar"]. For it is from that verse that the Rabbis have derived the law that [fats and limbs of the offerings] become disqualified [for the altar] if they remained upon the pavement [until the morning], but they may be brought up to the altar at any time during the night. Here Scripture speaks of those limbs which had already been brought up during daytime, [to teach] that the priest turns them over on the altar during the whole night until the morning. It is for this reason that He says ***hi ha'olah***[using the definite article], meaning: "the one which has already come up" on the altar. It also teaches us that even those that are invalid, are not to be brought down again, [once they were taken up onto the altar], provided they became invalid in the Court of the Sanctuary [such as where they had remained overnight or had been unclean, etc.; but if they became invalid before reaching the Sanctuary Court, such as an animal that had been set apart for idolatry, or had been worshipped etc., these must be brought down].[[19]](#footnote-19) It also teaches that [invalid] drink-offerings13 must come down [since they do not go upon the fires on the altar], and so also the blood [which had become invalidated], as I have written.

**AND THE FIRE OF THE ALTAR WILL BE BLAZING IN IT.** Scripture is stating that it should burn on the altar during the whole night, it being a positive commandment that the priests should put on at daytime a lot of wood in order that it should not be burnt up completely and the fire [should not] become extinguished from it [during the night]. In my opinion, that which He said, ***Fire will be kept burning upon the altar continually; it shall not go out****,[[20]](#footnote-20)* **is a commandment directed to the priests to keep fire burning continually upon the altar, just as He said, *and the priest shall kindle wood upon it,[[21]](#footnote-21)* commanding them that they should be careful about this — to set fire in order and put enough wood on it to keep the fire burning continually, all day and all night. He gave an additional caution by means of a negative commandment, *[it shall not go out],[[22]](#footnote-22)* meaning that it should never be allowed to become extinguished. Thus if the priests were careless and the fire became extinguished they would transgress this negative commandment. It is for this reason that our Rabbis have said[[23]](#footnote-23) that [in addition to the large wood-stack burning on the altar] there was a second wood-stack solely for the purpose of keeping up the fire. And that which Scripture states, *And the fire upon the altar will be blazing in it; it will not go out,* is a redundant verse, and is therefore interpreted by our Rabbis[[24]](#footnote-24) as having reference to all people, teaching that whoever extinguishes the fire, transgresses a negative commandment.** Even if he extinguishes only one of the live coals of the wood-stack, he is liable to whipping, whether he put it out on top of the altar, or whether he extinguished it below [on the pavement of the Court] after he had taken it down. It appears to me that he violates only one negative commandment.[[25]](#footnote-25)

**3. AND THE PRIEST WILL PUT ON 'MIDO' (HIS GARMENT OF) LINEN.** "This is a reference to the ***k'toneth***(tunic). **Why then does Scripture here call it *mido* [which means 'his measure']? It is to indicate that the tunic is to be made to his measure.**

**AND HIS LINEN BREECHES WILL HE PUT UPON HIS FLESH** - that there should be nothing interposing between them." This is Rashi's language.

Now the [daily] removal of the ashes [from the altar, which is the subject-matter of this verse], must be done with the priest wearing the [four] garments of priesthood,[[26]](#footnote-26) as no Service can be performed with only two of the [four] garments! However, He mentioned only these two garments because of new points that are added here to them, namely, **that the tunic must be made to the priest's measure.** This means to say that if it was raised [above his feet], being so short that it did not reach his feet, and he performed therein one of the acts of offering, his Service is invalid. It further teaches that there must be nothing intervening between the breeches and his flesh. But the law requires equally that the priest who removes the ashes from the altar should wear all [four] priestly garments, for since Scripture mentioned that the removing of the ashes must be done with priestly garments, we know [automatically] that it requires four for the common priest and eight for the High Priest. So also is it explained in the second chapter of Tractate Yoma[[27]](#footnote-27) and in Torath Kohanim:[[28]](#footnote-28) "Why does Scripture repeat the term ***yilbash***['he shall put on' — ***'V'lavash hakohein' (and the priest will put on) his linen garment, and his linen breeches 'yilbash' (he will put) upon his flesh]?***It is to include the turban and the belt" [which the priest is also to put on for the removing of the ashes].

Now Onkelos translated the word ***mido***as ***levushin***["garments" — as opposed to Rashi's interpretation, according to which it refers only to one garment, the tunic]. It would appear then that according to Onkelos, the word ***mido***is a term which includes all of the priest's garments, as if the verse were stating, "and the priest shall put on linen garments." Similarly we are to understand the expressions: ***'madav' (his clothes) rent****;[[29]](#footnote-29)* ***that comes down upon the collar 'midothav'****,[[30]](#footnote-30)* which means upon the edge of his garments; ***girded with 'mido' (his apparel) of war****,[[31]](#footnote-31)* which means his garments. This then will be in accordance with the opinion of the Sage who says[[32]](#footnote-32) that the belt of the common priest was unlike the belt of the High Priest.[[33]](#footnote-33)

4. **AND HE WILL PUT OFF HIS GARMENTS, [AND PUT ON OTHER GARMENTS, AND CARRY FORTH THE ASHES WITHOUT THE CAMP UNTO A CLEAN PLACE].[[34]](#footnote-34)** "This was not compulsory for him to do so, but it would be a matter of propriety, so that he should not soil the garments in which he regularly ministers at the altar, by the removal of the ashes to a place without the camp. Garments worn when boiling the pot for one's master, one should not wear when pouring out a glass of wine for him. That is why He said, ***and he will put on other garments***— of [a quality] inferior [to those in which he ministers at the altar]." This is Rashi's language. Now the intent of our Rabbis in this remark was to state that the taking of the ashes [to a place outside the camp] must be done with the priests wearing the priestly garments, and thus the ***other garments***[mentioned in the verse] are not ordinary clothes. Thus I do not know the source for that which the Rabbi [Rashi] said, that "it was not compulsory" [that he remove the garments in which he performs the regular Divine Service, and put on other garments when taking out the ashes to a place outside the camp]. For it would appear that it is a positive commandment to the priest, that the garments in which he performs the acts of offering, including the [daily] lifting up of the ashes, be clean ones, and that he must not perform the regular Divine Service with those garments in which he takes the ashes [outside the camp]. **This commandment [of the changing of the garments] is of the nature of a servant's etiquette towards his master**. **Therefore the priests should have more expensive garments for performing the acts of offering, and ones of inferior quality for removing the ashes [to a place outside the camp or city of Jerusalem].**

All this is in accordance with this reasoning which the Rabbi [Rashi] wrote [i.e., that the removal of the ashes must be done in priestly garments]. But there are some of our Rabbis mentioned there in Tractate Yoma[[35]](#footnote-35) who say that the taking out of the ashes did not have to be done in priestly garments. Thus the verse stating, ***and he will put on other garments***means "ordinary clothes," and this is also the plain meaning of the verse, commanding the priest that he should not soil ***the linen garments, which are the holy garments****,[[36]](#footnote-36)* with the taking out of the ashes; instead he is to put on ordinary clothes.

**7. AND THIS IS THE LAW OF THE MEAL-OFFERING.** This section, according to the plain meaning of Scripture, adds [to Chapter 2 above where the law of the meal-offering was discussed] four commandments about the meal-offering: that [the residue be] eaten unleavened, that it be eaten ***in the Court of the Tent of Meeting****,[[37]](#footnote-37)* that ***every male among the children of Aaron may eat of it****,[[38]](#footnote-38)* and that whatever touches it becomes holy.[[39]](#footnote-39)

Now according to the Rabbinical interpretation thereof, there are many new teachings added [in this section, among them being the following]: that even of a meal-offering brought by priests the handful is taken out [and burnt on the altar, in the same way as the residue which must be burnt on the altar];[[40]](#footnote-40) that the priest must bring it near ***before the Eternal[[41]](#footnote-41)***which means to the western corner [of the altar, since the Tent of Meeting where the ark of the covenant stood, was to the west of the altar, and therefore nearest to it], and ***in front of the altar***which means to the southern corner [since the ramp of the altar which is its "front," was on the south side thereof]. Thus you find that it had to be "presented" [i.e., brought near] to the southwestern corner of the altar. [And this section further teaches:] ***And he will take up from it[[42]](#footnote-42)***a handful — "from it" as one joined mass, meaning that he is not to bring one tenth of an ephah of flour [which is the amount brought for a meal-offering] in two receptacles [but it must be a full tenth of an ephah in one receptacle], nor is he to make a fixed measure that holds as much as his handful [to remove the amount of flour for the altar, but he must do it with his hand]. He also states, ***It will not be baked as anything leavened****.[[43]](#footnote-43)* This is to liken all the stages of work [in the preparation of the meal-offering] to baking, thus teaching that one is also liable for kneading and rolling it if it be leavened, and that for each and every such act he transgresses a negative commandment and is liable to whipping on each count.

**10. I HAVE GIVEN IT AS THEIR PORTION OF MY OFFERINGS**. Even to apportion it [i.e., the residue of the meal-offering which the priests are to eat] they are not permitted to do until after the parts given to the fire [i.e., the handful] have gone up on the altar. It is from here that we learn that the same law applies to all hallowed offerings, as it is written, ***I have given it as their portion of My offerings; it is most holy****.[[44]](#footnote-44)*

***It will not be baked as anything leavened. Their portion ...*** *[[45]](#footnote-45) —* even the residue [which the priests receive as their share of the meal-offering] may not be baked with leaven. ***As the sin-offering, and as the guilt-offering*** *—* **this teaches that just as the sin-offering must come from ordinary money,[[46]](#footnote-46) and can be offered only at daytime, and the priest performs all its acts with his right arm — so also this meal-offering must come from ordinary money, and be brought at daytime, and its acts must be performed with the priest's right hand.** ***Every male among the children of Aaron may eat of it*** *—* it may be apportioned even amongst those priests who have a bodily blemish [such as are mentioned further in Chapter 21:16-21 as disqualifying them from performing the acts of offering, but they may eat the residue of the meal-offering].

Now with regards to the meal-offering of the priests He added [this command]: ***And every meal-offering of the priest will be wholly burnt; it will not be eaten****.[[47]](#footnote-47)* On this the Rabbi [Moshe ben Maimon] wrote in the Moreh Nebuchim[[48]](#footnote-48) that the reason [for the meal-offering of the priest being entirely burnt] is because every priest offered up his own meal-offering himself, and if he were to offer it and eat the residue of it himself, it would appear as if he had brought no offering. For nothing was offered of an ordinary individual's meal-offering[[49]](#footnote-49) except the frankincense and the handful of the flour. If then, in addition to the fact that the whole offering was small, he who offered it were to eat it himself, he would imagine[[50]](#footnote-50) that he had brought no offering at all. Therefore [the Torah required] that it be entirely burnt.

**18. THIS IS THE LAW OF THE SIN-OFFERING**. In ***Seder Vayikra***He commanded concerning [the offerings in the following order]: the burnt-offering, the meal-offering, the peace-offerings, the sin-offering and the guilt-offering, [the reason for this order being] that at First He spoke about the freewill offerings [namely the burnt-offering, the meal-offering and the peace-offerings], and afterwards He mentioned those offerings which are obligatory upon the sinner. Here, however, [in ***Seder Tzav***]the explanation is given first in connection with the burnt-offering and meal-offering, and only then about the sin-offering and guilt-offering, because He wished to explain the laws of the most holy offerings [in one group], since there is one law for them all, as He said [above in Verse 10] with reference to the meal-offering, ***it is most holy, as the sin-offering and the guilt-offering****,* and only afterwards He explains the law of those offerings which are less holy [namely, the peace-offerings].

Now in this section [dealing with the sin-offering] He added many new laws. [The verse] ***This is the law of the sin-offering***teaches that there is one law for all sin-offerings,[[51]](#footnote-51) meaning that even the blood of "the inner sin-offerings"[[52]](#footnote-52) [if sprinkled upon a garment] must be washed off ***[in a holy place].***I might think that this applies also to a sin-offering brought from a bird, Scripture therefore says ***zoth ['zoth' torath hachatath ('this' is the law of the sin-offering)*** *—* and the word ***zoth***denotes exclusion]. He also states here [in the verse before us], ***in the place where the burnt-offering is slaughtered will the sin-offering be slaughtered before the Eternal****,* thus indicating that all sin-offerings must be slaughtered only on the northern side of the altar, since in the section of *Vayikra* this was stated only with reference to the sin-offering of the prince[[53]](#footnote-53) and of the individual;[[54]](#footnote-54) therefore here [in this section] they are all included — the sin-offerings of the public and "the inner sin-offerings."

The Rabbis have further interpreted: ***Most holy****,* this comes to include the peace-offerings of the public,[[55]](#footnote-55) teaching that they may only be slaughtered on the northern side of the altar, as all offerings of the most holy degree are required to be slaughtered on the northern side, ***Hi (this)*** — ***'this' is the law of the sin-offering****,* comes to exclude the thanks-offering[[56]](#footnote-56) and the ram of the Nazirite[[57]](#footnote-57) [thus teaching that they may be slaughtered anywhere in the Temple Court, as their holiness is of a lesser degree]. He further commanded here to give the meat of the sin-offerings to the sons of Aaron[[58]](#footnote-58) — that is, to the males and not the daughters of Aaron — and commanded them to eat it ***within the Court of the Tent of Meeting****.[[59]](#footnote-59)* In addition He mentioned [in this section] many new laws concerning absorption [of the taste of] the sin-offerings [by the vessels in which they are boiled].[[60]](#footnote-60)

**20. YOU MUST WASH IT IN A HOLY PLACE**. Scripture laid down a strict law in connection with the blood [of a sin-offering] which became absorbed by a garment, giving it the law it [the blood] had before it was sprinkled [on the garment, namely] that it may not be taken outside the curtains[[61]](#footnote-61) [and therefore it must be washed within the Court]. He states, ***and the earthen vessel wherein it is sodden will be broken****.*This too is to be broken in the holy place [i.e., within the Court], and the pieces of pottery are swallowed up in the place [where they are broken],[[62]](#footnote-62) and there does not have to be any scouring and rinsing at all [as required if it was boiled in a copper pot]. Similarly, the scouring and rinsing required if [the meat of the sin-offering] was boiled in a copper pot have to be done in a holy place, for all the verses [i.e., Verses 20-21] are connected with "the holy place" mentioned [above in Verse 19: ***in ‘a holy place’ will it be eaten, in the Court of the Tent of Meeting].***

23. **AND EVERY SIN-OFFERING, WHEREOF ANY OF THE BLOOD IS BROUGHT INTO THE TENT OF MEETING etc. "** This means that if the priest brought any of the blood of 'an outer sin-offering' into the interior of the Sanctuary it becomes invalidated, [and the offering may not be eaten, and must be burnt]." Thus the language of Rashi. According to this opinion, the phrase ***to atone in the holy place***which Scripture says [in continuation], is not to be understood in its simple sense, since this blood does not [in fact] bring atonement, for it became invalidated as soon as it was brought into the Sanctuary, and it is on account of that very invalidation that it is to be burnt. Rather, the expression ***to atone***means [according to Rashi] that if he brought it into the interior "with the intent to atone," [namely] to sprinkle there of its blood as is done with the blood of "the inner sin-offerings," even though he has not [in fact] atoned with it, meaning that he has not sprinkled any of its blood, it is nonetheless invalidated from the moment of entry, and [the offering] is to be burnt. It is possible according to this that if he brought it in with the intent of not sprinkling thereof at all [in the Sanctuary], that the offering remains valid. According to the words of Rabbi Shimon,[[63]](#footnote-63) it only becomes invalidated if he "atoned" with the blood, meaning that he actually sprinkled thereof in the same manner as is done in the case of "the inner sin-offerings" [i.e., in front of the Veil and on the corners of the golden altar].[[64]](#footnote-64) It is for this reason that Scripture states ***to atone***—- not [meaning] that he actually effected atonement, but that he brought of its blood to atone with it, and, according to his thinking, effected atonement. The meaning of the term "into the interior" [which Rashi mentioned above] is "into the Sanctuary." The same [is also the meaning of the phrase] "if he brought into the 'interior of the interior' [i.e., the Holy of Holies]" of the bullock of the anointed priest,[[65]](#footnote-65) or that of "forgetting a matter of law,"[[66]](#footnote-66) or of the goats brought for worshipping the idols,[[67]](#footnote-67) namely that if he brought their blood into a more interior place than that designated for them, [since in these cases of sin-offering the blood is to be brought into the Sanctuary proper to effect atonement], then the offerings become invalidated. Scripture states ***'of the blood***in order to indicate that even bringing in part of the blood invalidates the offering. Thus if the priest received the blood in two cups, and brought only one of them into the interior, the offering is invalidated.

By way of the plain meaning of Scripture,[[68]](#footnote-68) the verse speaks only with reference to "the inner sin-offerings," concerning the burning of which He had already commanded,[[69]](#footnote-69) and here Scripture came to add a negative commandment against eating them,[[70]](#footnote-70) for this section is intended to complete the laws of sin-offerings.[[71]](#footnote-71) This is the interpretation of Rabbi Yosei the Galilean in the Torath Kohanim[[72]](#footnote-72) and in Tractate Zebachim.[[73]](#footnote-73)

**8. AND THE PRIEST THAT OFFERS ANY MAN'S BURNT OFFERING, EVEN THE PRIEST WILL HAVE TO HIMSELF THE SKIN OF THE BURNT-OFFERING.** This law applies to all offerings, and although Scripture mentions only the burnt-offering, it holds good of the sin-offering and guilt-offering mentioned above.[[74]](#footnote-74) Such is not the case, however, in reference to the peace-offerings [the skin of which belongs to the owner]; therefore Scripture mentioned the law of the priests' due in the middle of the offerings, before it speaks of the peace-offerings [further on in Verses 11-21].

The interpretation of the Rabbis as found in the Torath Kohanim is as follows:[[75]](#footnote-75) "[From the verse here] I know only that the skin of the burnt-offering [belongs to the priest]. Whence do I know that the same law applies to the skins of [the other] most holy offerings? Scripture therefore says, ***that offers.***Or perhaps I might think that I am to include [also] the skins of the offerings which are holy to a lesser degree [such as the peace-offering etc.]; Scripture therefore says, ***burnt-offering****,* thus teaching that just as the burnt-offering is distinguished by being of the most holy degree of offerings, [so also this law holds good of all most holy offerings], thus excluding those which are holy in a minor degree."

By way of the plain meaning of Scripture, it was not necessary to state this law [that the skin of the animal belongs to the priest] in connection with the sin-offering and guilt-offering, since they are part of the gifts given to the priests,[[76]](#footnote-76) and the priests thus are entitled to the meat and also the skin, but in the case of the burnt-offering [where the priests do not receive any of the meat, since it is wholly burnt on the altar], it was necessary for Scripture to say that they do acquire the skin. This is the interpretation of Rabbi [Yehuda Hanasi] who says,[[77]](#footnote-77) "Essentially we need this verse only for the skin of the burnt-offering [to teach that it belongs to the priest], since the skin always follows the meat"[[78]](#footnote-78) [and here Scripture tells us that it is not to be burnt with the meat]. So also is it explained in the Torath Kohanim.78

**9. AND EVERY MEAL OFFERING THAT IS BAKED IN THE OVEN, [AND EVERYTHING MADE IN THE BOILING POT, AND IN THE PAN, WILL BE THE PRIEST'S THAT OFFERS IT].** The simple explanation of this verse is apparent, namely that He is commanding here that if one vows to bring one of the three kinds of meal-offering — the one baked in the oven, or made in the boiling pot, or in the pan — that they should all be given exclusively to the priest who offered them. Then He states concerning all the other meal-offerings, — such as if a person vowed to bring a meal-offering without specification of which kind, in which case he brings it of fine flour, and the meal-offering of first-fruits,[[79]](#footnote-79) which are both mixed with oil; and the meal-offering of the sinner[[80]](#footnote-80) and of the suspected adulteress[[81]](#footnote-81) which are dry [without oil and without frankincense] — that they should be divided ***among all the sons of Aaron****,[[82]](#footnote-82)* that is to say, among all priests of their Father's House.[[83]](#footnote-83) The meaning of the expression, ***and every meal-offering, mingled with oil, or dry***— is that a meal-offering which is of Fine flour only, whether it be mixed with oil or dry, which is not one of these [three] mentioned above [the one baked in the oven, or made in the boiling pot, or in the pan — belongs to all priests who were ministering on that day, and not exclusively to the priests who offered them]. The reason for the difference between them is because [in the case of the three meal-offerings mentioned above] the priest took pains in baking them, and therefore he deserves to be given a greater reward. [All this is in accordance with the plain meaning of Scripture].

Our Rabbis, however, did not want to explain the verses in this way because Scripture said, ***and every meal-offering, mingled with oil or dry****,* which includes ***all***possible meal-offerings, since they are all either mingled with oil or dry. Therefore the Rabbis understood the expression ***it will be the priest's that offers it***[mentioned here in Verse 9 in connection with the three meal-offerings: the one baked in the oven, etc.] as meaning that it will belong to all pure priests who are present there. Similarly, when He said, ***And the priest that offers any man's burnt-offering****,[[84]](#footnote-84)* and ***the priest that makes atonement therewith, he will have it****,[[85]](#footnote-85)* these verses are only intended to say that they do not belong to the owners who brought them, but that in reward for offering them they belong to the pure priests who are present there, for all of them are engaged in offering them, whether physically or by command, since any individual priest or two or three of them who offered up [the particular offering], did so with the permission of all of them and acting as their deputy, and all of them would stand by the offering. ***As is the share of him that goes down to the battle, so will be the share of him that tarries by the baggage; they will share alike****.[[86]](#footnote-86)* After He had said [in general terms] that they shall belong to the priests as a reward for their service, He explained it again in detail: ***and every meal-offering, mingled with oil, or dry****,* which includes all meal-offerings, ***will all the sons of Aaron have****,* meaning all the officiating priests mentioned [in the preceding verses], ***one as well as another****,* that is to say, all clean priests of the Father's House, as they are all the officiating priests mentioned previously. Thus Scripture [first] mentioned the meal-offerings by their individual names — the one baked in the oven, or made in the boiling pot, or in the pan — and then mentioned them all again in a general rule, saying [that they belong to all the priests], ***one as well as another****,* meaning that one priest should only have [of the kind of meal-offering] that the other priest has, [and they cannot give one priest his share of one kind of meal-offering, and the others a share of another kind]. Even if the meal-offering was of fine flour, each is to be given his share from that offering.[[87]](#footnote-87) Scripture thus states that this law applies to meal-offerings, and all the more so to the other offerings, which are of greater monetary value. It is tradition which decides [in favor of the Rabbis' interpretation mentioned above],[[88]](#footnote-88) and it isfurthermore for the benefit of [all] the priests and conducive to peace in the Sanctuary.

It is possible that the interpretation of the verses according to this opinion of the Rabbis is as follows: ***"And every meal-offering that is baked in the oven, and everything made in the boiling pot, and in the pan, will be the priest's that offers it; and every meal-offering, mingled with oil, or dry* will [also] be so, and *all the sons of Aaron will have it, one as well as another****.”* [[89]](#footnote-89)

**Ketubim: Tehillim (Psalms) 76:1-7**

| **Rashi** | **Targum** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. For the conductor on neginoth, a psalm of Asaph, a song. | 1. For praise, as a psalm; a psalm composed by Asaph, a song. |
| 2. God is known in Judah; in Israel His name is great. | 2. God has become known among those of the house of Judah; His name is great among those of the house of Israel. |
| 3. His Tabernacle was in Salem, and His dwelling place in Zion. | 3. And His sanctuary has come to be in Jerusalem, and the dwelling of the house of His holy presence is in Zion. |
| 4. There He broke the arrows of the bow, shield and sword and war forever. | 4. When the house of Israel did His will, He made His presence abide among them; there He broke the arrows and bows of the Gentiles who were making war; He made forever the shields and battle-lines of no account. |
| 5. You are destructive; mightier than the mountains of prey. | 5. Bright and awful are You, O God, acclaimed from Your sanctuary; the kings who dwell in the mountain fortresses, the place where their spoil is gathered, will tremble in Your presence. |
| 6. The stout-hearted became mad; they slumbered in their sleep, and none of the men of the army found their hands. | 6. The mighty in heart have stripped from them the weapons of war; they have slumbered in their sleep; and all the men of might have not been able to grasp their weapons in their hands. |
| 7. From Your rebuke, O God of Jacob, chariot and horse were stunned. | 7. At Your rebuke, O God of Jacob, the chariots have fallen asleep, and the cavalry have been disabled. |
|  |  |

**Rashi’s Commentary for: Psalms 76:1-7**

**4** **There He broke the arrows of the bow** of Sennacherib and his hosts.

**the arrows of the bow** Heb. רשפי. רִשְׁפֵי is not an expression of sparks of fire, because sparks of fire are not appropriate to a bow. Moreover, this word has no “dagesh,” yet רִשְׁפֵּי does have a “dagesh.” Rather, רִשְׁפֵי is an expression of (Deut. 32:24): “fought by demons (רשף),” which is translated as עוֹף, flying creatures, as (Job 5:7): “but flying creatures fly (רשף) upward.” Similarly (below 78:48): “and their cattle to the flying creatures (לרשפים). to the birds. Similarly, בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף are flying creatures, demons, who fly upward. This one too is an expression of arrows, which fly, as the matter that is stated (below 91:5): “from an arrow that flies by day.” There He broke the arrows (רִשְׁפֵי) of the bow, the arrows that the bow lets fly, and this entire psalm speaks of the downfall of Sennacherib, for we find no enemy falling in Jerusalem but he.

**5** **You are destructive; mightier** Heb. נאור, an expression of (Lam. 2:7): “He destroyed His Sanctuary”; (below 89:40), “You abolished the covenant of Your servant.” You destroy Your enemies and those who rise up against You and sweep them from the world. Because of His deeds, He is called נאור, destructive, like חנוּן, gracious; רחום, merciful; קנוא jealous, because He grants, because He pities, because He acts with zeal.

**mightier than the mountains of prey** Stronger than the predatory giants, who are as tall as mountains, but against You, their might is not known.

**6 became mad** Heb. אשתוללו, like השתוללוּ. As (II Chron. 20:35): “And afterwards, Jehoshaphat the king of Judah joined (אתחבר) Ahaziah the king of Israel,” like התחבר. [The word] אשתוללוּ is derived from (Job 12:17): “He leads counselors away with madness (שולל).” It is an expression of error and tranquility, as madmen err, and the “tav” falls into the middle of the word in the reflexive, as in every word beginning with “shin.”

**slumbered in their sleep** They Heb. נמו. They fell into a deep sleep, an expression of תנוּמה slumber.

**and none... found** their hands and their strength when You came to punish them.

**7 chariot and horse were stunned** Heb. ורכב וסוס. The “vav” of ורכב is superfluous, as (Gen. 36:24): “These are the sons of Ziv’on: Ayyah (ואיה) and Anah.” The “vav” of ואיה is superfluous.

**Meditation from the Psalms**

**Psalms ‎‎76:1-7**

**By: H.Em. Rabbi Dr. Hillel ben David**

The superscription of this psalm ascribes authorship to Assaf. With this psalm, Assaf sought to compensate for Chizkiyahu’s failure by composing an especially ecstatic song of praise, embellished by a vast variety of neginot - נגינת, instrumental music.[[90]](#footnote-90)

The preceding psalm spoke of the final days of Jewish exile; this psalm, continuing that theme, describes the war of Gog and Magog[[91]](#footnote-91) - גּוֹג וּמָגוֹג,[[92]](#footnote-92) which will be waged at the end of the exile.[[93]](#footnote-93) This final battle has a historical precedent in the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib, who amassed an army composed of all the nations he had conquered.

At an earlier date, the armies of Assyria had led the Ten Tribes of Israel into exile. Only the small Kingdom of Judah remained; it was led by King Chizkiyahu,[[94]](#footnote-94) who ruled over the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin. This illustrious monarch’s very name testifies to the source of his authority, for Chizkiyahu literally means *My strength is HaShem*.[[95]](#footnote-95)

HaShemdid not fail those who trusted in Him, for Assyria was annihilated and HaShem’s fame spread far and wide: ***HaShem is recognized in Judah, in Israel His Name is great***.[[96]](#footnote-96)

Similarly, HaShem’s majesty is now concealed in the shrouds of exile. The future triumph over Gog and Magog will signal the return of Divine prestige.[[97]](#footnote-97) HaShem’s glory will gradually spread, until it is recognized throughout the world.

All the nations will be broken,[[98]](#footnote-98) but Divine protection will envelop Jerusalem like a tabernacle, as the psalm says, ***When His Tabernacle was in Salem [Jerusalem] and His dwelling in Zion***.[[99]](#footnote-99)

Rav Hai Gaon transmitted a Rabbinical tradition that the war of Gog and Magog is destined to take place in the month of Tishri[[100]](#footnote-100) [in conjunction with Succoth, the Feast of Tabernacles].[[101]](#footnote-101)

Therefore, the Gaon of Vilna[[102]](#footnote-102) designates this psalm as the Song of the Day, for the first day of Succoth.[[103]](#footnote-103)

Lets explore the war of Gog and Magog.

Brief Overview: In Yehezekel (Ezekiel) chapters 32, and 38-39, the prophet describes a leader named Gog, from the land of Magog, who will lead a large array of armies in a cataclysmic war against the Jewish people in Eretz Israel. There will ultimately be great devastation, particularly among the legions of Gog. HaShem will bring about a severe retribution against Gog and the nations that follow him and those who remain will come to recognize HaShem, and His total providence, as a result. They will no longer oppress the Jewish people, and will recognize HaShem's unique plan for His chosen people. In Zechariah chapter 14, the prophecy concerning Gog and Magog is concluded with the full restoration and Redemption of the Jewish people (and presumably the coming of Mashiach) and the nations of the world worshiping HaShem in the Bet HaMikdash, on the holiday of Succoth, alongside the Jewish people. According to the Malbim,[[104]](#footnote-104) the war of Gog and Magog is divided into three principle wars. The chapters in Yehezekel (32, 38-39) describe the first two wars, while in Zechariah chapter 14 the final war, of the three, is depicted.[[105]](#footnote-105)

The Septuagint teaches us the following relationship: **Agag[[106]](#footnote-106) = Gog**

In the Septuagint the name Gog appears in two other places where it is not mentioned in the Hebrew text. In Numbers 24:7, Gog appears instead of Agag, and in Amos 7:1, the reading is “Gog,” instead of *gizei* (“the mowings”). These variants indicate the antiquity of the connection between the war of Gog and the advent of the Messiah. Thus, according to the Septuagint, Gog is *Agag*, a generic term used for kings of Amalek. Any war against the Children of Israel, meant to annihilate them, has to involve Amalek.

***Bamidbar (Numbers) 24.7*** *Water will flow from their buckets; their seed will have abundant water. “Their king will be greater than Agag; their kingdom will be exalted.*

***LXX version******Bamidbar (Numbers) 24.7****: There shall come a* ***man out of his seed****, and he shall rule over many nations; and the kingdom of Gog shall be exalted, and his kingdom shall be increased.(!)* The word **Gog** uses not only the same consonants but has the same meaning as **Agag**; namely *roof, or that which covers*.

We also see that Agag was taken alive by King Saul, the Benjamite,[[107]](#footnote-107) after destroying the Amalekites.[[108]](#footnote-108) His life was spared by Saul and the Israelites took the best of the sheep, cattle, fat calves and lambs from the Amalekites. It is a tradition that the children of Esav[[109]](#footnote-109) are only defeated by the children of Rachel (Rachel had two sons: Yosef and Benyamin. She also had two sons by Bilha: Dan and Zebulon).[[110]](#footnote-110)

Haman, in Megillat Esther, is called an Agagite[[111]](#footnote-111) and was understood to be a descendant of king Agag.[[112]](#footnote-112)

The war of Gog and Magog is in essence a war against HaShem.

The subject of the Haftarah[[113]](#footnote-113) of Shabbat chol HaMoed Succoth is the war of Gog[[114]](#footnote-114) and Magog that will precede the final redemption. Its connection to the holiday of Succoth is that according to tradition the war will take place during the month of Tishri, the month when the holiday of Succoth falls. In addition, this war is identical to the one described in the fourteenth chapter of Zachariah, the Haftarah read on the first day of Succoth, which concludes by saying that the Gentile survivors of this war will be required to go to Jerusalem every year on the holiday of Succoth to pay homage to HaShem.

Chazal have taught us that the battle with Gog and Magog will take place during Succoth, on the eve of the Messianic era. The mitzvot of Succoth are the survival mechanism for this great war. The Succah and the waving of the lulav and etrog are essential to our survival during this war. Complete trust is the critical requirement against a foe who trusts only in his own might. The Haftarah on Shabbat cholHaMoed is taken from Ezekiel 38, which contains a prophecy of the terrible war of Gog and Magog. This will be the last war ever to be fought, but it will engulf the whole world. Then will come a new era of peace, when HaShem will be recognized by all the nations of the world. The prophecy is very similar to that of Zechariah 14, read on the first day of Succoth.

Every Shabbat chol HaMoed Succoth we read the Haftarah[[115]](#footnote-115) about the final confrontation at the end of days between Gog / Magog and the Children of Israel. How does Succoth connect with Gog and Magog and the end of days? Every year, when the Jew leaves his home for a week to eat, sleep and live in a Succah; a flimsy structure with a roof made of bits of wood, reed, bamboo, etc., he actualizes the idea that his ultimate care and protection come only from HaShem. The Admor of Zejichov, who lived some 200 years ago, wrote in his book, a commentary about Exodus 4:13: The Hakham asks, how come the word “na” (which is translated in English as ‘please’) is written in the verse. And the Admor writes: ***Know this: Gog and Magog war will start at Hoshana Rabba.***

How do we identify Amalek today? Wherever you find someone with a fanatical, implacable and illogical enmity to the Jewish People, you have found Amalek. His very existence is founded on his antipathy and hatred for the offspring of Yaakov.

Rabbi Akiva was of the opinion that the judgment of Gog would endure for 12 months.[[116]](#footnote-116) This judgment will bring great calamities upon Israel that will cause all previous calamities to fade into insignificance.[[117]](#footnote-117) Eliezer b. Hyrcanus connects it with the pangs of the Messiah and the great day of judgment.[[118]](#footnote-118) The war of Gog and Magog will be the final war, after which there will be no servitude, and it will presage the advent of the Messiah.[[119]](#footnote-119) In the Palestinian Targums the Messiah plays an active role in this war. Gog and Magog and their armies will go up to Jerusalem and fall into the hands of the Messianic king,  but the ingathering of the exiles – contrary to what is said in Ezekiel – will come only after the victory.[[120]](#footnote-120) A kind of compromise is found in the Targum, namely, that the house of Israel will conquer Gog and his company through the assistance of Messiah the son of Ephraim.[[121]](#footnote-121) In the Nazarean Codicil’s vision of Revelation 20, the war of Gog and Magog takes place at the end of the millennium after the first resurrection.

**Amalek and the Descendants of Rachel[[122]](#footnote-122)**

Why is it specifically the children of Rachel who are victorious over Amalek?

There is a third difficulty in understanding the war with Amalek. The victory over Amalek is of vital significance. The eyes of all the other nations are turned towards Amalek; if they are victorious, it will be a sign to all the other nations that Israel is indeed a realistic target for war. Why is the war against Amalek a regular, physical war rather than a miraculous one? Why does HaShem not rain down stones from the heavens as occurs under the leadership of Yehoshua decades later, in the war against the five Emori kings?[[123]](#footnote-123)

The answer to all of these questions lies in the nature and character of Amalek. Amalek does not believe in HaShem’s providence over what happens in the world. As Chazal point out, Amalek stands out in his ideology of “coincidence” (“mikreh”); “asher karekha ba-derekh”.[[124]](#footnote-124) Amalek sees miracles happening around the nation of Israel, but he explains all of them as natural phenomena. He sees the splitting of the sea, but insists that it is a coincidental instance of tides rising and falling. He believes that their victory over Egypt was coincidental, and cannot see any reason why that “good luck” should repeat itself. Hence he is not afraid, and goes out to war against Israel.

The children of Rachel represent precisely the opposite ideology: there is no “coincidence” in the world. Her eldest son, Yosef, lives his life with a constant sense of standing before HaShem, feeling HaShem’s presence and His providence over the whole world. There is no other figure to be found anywhere in Tanach who mentions HaShem as many times as Yosef does (19 times). The following examples of Yosef’s speech demonstrate this ideology:

A) “And HaShem sent me before you to preserve you a remnant in the earth...”.[[125]](#footnote-125)

B) Yosef tells Pharaoh, “It is not me - HaShem shall give Pharaoh a favorable answer.”[[126]](#footnote-126)

Yosef not only attempts, but succeeds in bringing about awareness of HaShem’s presence amongst the nations. Pharaoh declares, “Is there another man like this, one in whom the spirit of HaShem rests?”[[127]](#footnote-127)

Furthermore, the more a person believes in HaShem’s providence, the more that providence acts on him. Indeed, Yosef is rewarded for his unwavering faith in HaShem: “And HaShem was with Yosef and he became successful;[[128]](#footnote-128) And HaShem blessed the house of the Egyptian because of Yosef”.[[129]](#footnote-129)

Clearly, then, Yosef (and therefore his descendant, Yehoshua) is the most suitable candidate to wage war against Amalek. Amalek aims to wipe out HaShem’s name, he wishes to negate HaShem’s rule of the world. Yosef, more than anyone else, represents HaShem’s rulership, and therefore it is he who is worthy of fighting against Amalek. He fights not only in defense of Am Israel, but also as a “war on behalf of HaShem”. This idea can be learned from the midrash:[[130]](#footnote-130) He who fears HaShem is the best candidate for the war against someone who does not fear Him.

“Why (was the command to wage war given) to Yehoshua? He (Moshe) said to him (Yehoshua) - your forefather (Yosef) said, ‘I fear HaShem’. Let the son of he who said ‘I fear HaShem’ come and punish the one about whom it was said, ‘and he feared not HaShem’.”

The descendants of Binyamin, Rachel’s second son, are involved in the fight as well. Shaul and Mordechai both wage war against Amalek. Let’s examine Mordechai’s fight against Amalek.

Mordechai, too, is aware that he is fighting against someone who does not believe in HaShem’s existence and providence. The midrash teaches, “‘And Mordechai told Hatakh all that had happened to him’ (“karahu”).[[131]](#footnote-131) He (Mordechai) said to Hatakh, ‘Go and say to her, the descendant of “karahu” has come upon you’ (referring to the Torah’s description of Amalek - “asher karekha ba-derekh”)”.[[132]](#footnote-132)

According to the midrash, Mordechai calls Haman “karahu”, a name which denotes coincidence. Even on the literal level of the story itself, we see how Haman plans each step based on luck and lots. Even the planned date of the murder of the Jews is chosen by means of a lot, “they cast the lot before Haman”.[[133]](#footnote-133) Mordechai stands ready to oppose this ideology. He knows that there is no such thing as chance, the world has a ruler and a governor, the capital has owners!

The Rambam[[134]](#footnote-134) warns against seeing events as being coincidental: “If they do not cry out and do not shout, but rather say ‘this thing happened to us through the natural course of events; this trouble came about by chance,’ this is the way of cruelty.” Mordechai lives according to the Rambam’s perspective; no sooner does he find out about the impending disaster for Am Yisrael than he turns to the Ruler of the world: “And he cried out a great and bitter cry”.[[135]](#footnote-135) Mordechai also knows that Am Yisrael is not led by chance. Even if they are not saved through Esther, “relief and deliverance shall arise for the Jews from elsewhere”.[[136]](#footnote-136)

The question still remains as to why the war with Amalek is a natural, non miraculous one. In general, when open miracles take place, even simple people believe that the hand of HaShem was somehow involved. The Egyptian magicians themselves admitted, “it is the finger of HaShem”.[[137]](#footnote-137) Amalek, on the other hand, is not impressed by even the most obvious miracles, and sees them as occurring in the natural course of events. In doing so Amalek diminishes HaShem’s name, “As it were, so long as descendants of Amalek exist in the world, neither HaShem’s name nor His throne are complete”.[[138]](#footnote-138) The war against Amalek repairs this diminishing of HaShem’s name: “‘To you, O HaShem, is the Kingship’ - this refers to the war against Amalek”.[[139]](#footnote-139) “In other words, by waging war for HaShem against Amalek, His throne is exalted.”[[140]](#footnote-140)

The war against Amalek takes place specifically in a natural way, in order that all should know that even those phenomena which appear altogether natural are brought about by HaShem’s hand. The first natural victory brings proof, so that there can be no doubt: “And it was that when Moshe raised his hand Israel prevailed, and when he lowered his hand Amalek prevailed.”[[141]](#footnote-141) Chazal expand on this: “‘And it was that when Moshe raised his hand Israel prevailed’, surely it cannot be the case that Moshe’s hands brought about victory or destruction in the war! Rather, this comes to teach us that so long as the eyes of Israel are directed upwards and they submit themselves to their Father in heaven, they will be successful, if not, they will fall”.[[142]](#footnote-142)

Megillat Esther, too, recounts an altogether natural story. The name of HaShem is not mentioned even once in the Megillah. Mordechai commands that the days of Purim be commemorated, and it is through this that the nation comes to the realization that even those things that appear natural are in fact directed by HaShem. Indeed, in the Megillah itself the victory over Amalek leads to the reinstatement of HaShem’s name:

“In place of the thorn-bush a cypress will rise, and in place of the nettle, a myrtle...”[[143]](#footnote-143) “In place of the thorn-bush”, in place of Haman “a cypress will rise”, this refers to Mordechai. “In place of the nettle”, in place of Vashti “a myrtle”, this is Esther the righteous one, who is called Hadassah. “And it shall be for HaShem for a name”, this refers to the reading of the Megillah’.[[144]](#footnote-144)

There is yet another connection between the fighters of Amalek; Yehoshua (Yosef) and Mordechai. Those cities that were surrounded by a wall in the days of Yehoshua read Megillat Esther on the 15th of Adar, according to the opinion of the Tanna quoted in the first Mishna of Megillah. R. Yehoshua bar Karcha, on the other hand,[[145]](#footnote-145) holds that the determining date is not “the days of Yehoshua ben Nun,” but rather “the days of Achashverosh”. At first glance the Tanna of the Mishna seems difficult to understand: What is the connection between Yehoshua and Megillat Esther?

Indeed, this question was posed by the Yerushalmi and several Rishonim, and a number of possible explanations were provided. According to what we have explained above, the problem is easily solved. Yehoshua and Mordechai both fought against Amalek. In both cases HaShem’s providence was masked by seemingly natural occurrences. However, in the case of Yehoshua there was also visible proof: “And it was that when Moshe raised his hand, Israel prevailed, and when he lowered his hand, Amalek prevailed”.[[146]](#footnote-146) Yehoshua is the one who taught a lesson to all generations: that even a seemingly “natural” victory is dependent on HaShem’s will and His involvement. The “natural” victory of Mordechai and Esther takes on a new perspective in light of Yehoshua’s war. The latter comes to interpret the former: just as Yehoshua’s war was an example of HaShem’s wonders, so was the story of the Megillah. Mordechai hints at this himself when he makes the reading of the Megillah dependent on “the days of Yehoshua ben Nun”.

This idea may also be contained in the words of the Ritva:[[147]](#footnote-147) “Chazal asked: Why did the Men of the Great Assembly choose to refer this matter back to Yehoshua ben-Nun? The Rishonim explained that it was because Yehoshua was the first to fight against Amalek, and Haman was a descendant of Amalek.”

**The Malbim on Yehezekel 38**: Chazal say that Gog will come to Yerushalayim three times. Prophet Yehezekel says he'll come twice to Yerushalayim and Prophet Zechariah says he will come a third time. We do not know who Gog is and who is Magog, we only know that Gog is the president of Meshech and Tuval and are descendants of Yefet and are not circumcised.

Amalek excels in his ideology of chance and coincidence, and therefore he has no fear of waging war against Am Yisrael since he sees their victories as pure luck. Yosef is the antithesis of Amalek, he feels the presence of HaShem everywhere. His descendants and those of his brother (Binyamin), too, continue this line and fight against Amalek (Yehoshua and Mordechai). Their wars are natural wars, demonstrating that not only were all the miracles of Egypt from HaShem, but even those events and phenomena which appear altogether natural are brought about by HaShem.

Curiously, we are reading psalm 76 and studying about the war to destroy Jerusalem (Gog u’Magog) at the same time of the year when the siege of Jerusalem began on Tevet 10:

Tevet 10: *Babylon lays siege to Jerusalem, in 586 BCE. Ezekiel 24:1, 2 Kings 25*

We will finish this psalm a day after the fast of the tenth of Tevet.

The Shulchan Aruch[[148]](#footnote-148) gives us an understanding of why the tenth day of the tenth month is significant. He writes that on the tenth day of Tevet, the wicked Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Bavel, laid siege to the city of Jerusalem. Three years later, on the 17th of Tammuz, he broke through the city walls. The siege ended with the destruction of the Temple three weeks later, on the 9th of Av, the end of the first Kingdoms and the exile of the Jewish people to Babylon. This was the end of southern Israel’s Kingdom of Judah.

There is a rule when it comes to prophecy, and that is, whereas ALL good prophecies MUST come true, negative prophecies DO NOT have to come true. They can be avoided through national teshuva and world rectification. Let us return NOW!

In any case, whomever Gog and Magog will be, whatever war they will wage at whatever time in history, and, for however long it will last (some say not more than three hours!), it's main purpose will be to test the faith of the righteous/generous of that time. For those alive at the time, it may seem like an issue of PHYSICAL survival only. However, according to tradition, all of that will only be to test our ability to SPIRITUALLY survive, to remain steadfast in our belief in spite of the terrible storm brewing on the horizon.

***Micah 7:15*** *As in the days of your coming forth out of the land of Egypt will I show unto him marvelous things.*

***Vayikra (Leviticus) 6:6****Fire will be kept burning upon the altar continually; it will not go out.*

Fire is a metaphor for passion. Let us nurture the fire towards our service of HaShem and let Him deal with Gog u’Magog.

**Ashlamatah: Micah 6:6-8 + 7:14-20**

| **Rashi** | **Targum** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. ¶ Hear now what the Lord says; Rise; contend with the mountains, and may the hills hear My voice. | 1. ¶ Hear now what the LORD is saying: "Rise up, contend with the mountains and let the hills hear your voice." |
| 2. Hear ye, O mountains, the controversy of the Lord; and you mighty ones, the foundations of the earth; for the Lord has a controversy with His people, and with Israel He shall contend. | 2. Hear the LORD's case, you mountains, and you roots of the foundations of the earth, for there is a case before the LORD against His people, and against the house of Israel He is conducting a suit. |
| 3. O My people, what have I done, and how have I wearied you? Testify against Me. | 3. "My people, what good have I said that I would do to you and I have not done it? Or what severe hardship have I increased against you?' Testify before Me. |
| 4. For I brought you up out of the land of Egypt and redeemed you from the house of slavery, and I sent before you Moses, Aaron, and Miriam. | 4. For I brought you up from the land of Egypt and rescued you from the house of bondage; and I sent before you my three prophets. Moses to teach the tradition of judgments. Aharon to atone for the people, and Miriam to instruct the women. |
| 5. My people, remember now what Balak king of Moab planned, and what Balaam the son of Beor answered him. From Shittim to Gilgal, may you recognize the righteous deeds of the Lord. | 5. My people, remember what Balak king of Moab advised and what Balaam son of Beor answered him. Were mighty deeds not done to you from the valley of Shittim to the house of Gilgal so that you might know the righteous/generous deeds of the LORD? |
| 6. **With what shall I come before the Lord, bow before the Most High God? Shall I come before Him with burnt offerings, with yearling calves?** | 6. **With what will I worship before the LORD, or do homage to God whose Shekinah is in the high heavens? Will I worship before him with burnt offerings, with calves a year old?** |
| 7. **Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, with myriad streams of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?** | 7. **Will the LORD be pleased with thousands of rams, with tens of thousands of rivers of oil? Will I give my first-born for my transgressions, the loved one of my body for my own sins?** |
| 8. **He has told you, O man, what is good, and what the Lord demands of you; but to do justice, to love loving-kindness, and to walk discreetly with your God.** **{S}** | 8. **It has been told to you, o man, what is good. And what does the LORD seek from you, except to carry out true justice and to love acts of kindness. You will be modest by walking in the fear of your God.** **{S}** |
| 9. The voice of the Lord calls out to the city, and the wisdom of the Torah, the one who sees Your name; hearken to the staff and Who appointed it. | 9. With a cry the prophets of the LORD call out to the city, and the teachers fear Your name. Hear O king and prince, and the rest of the people of the land. |
| 10. **Does the house of the wicked last long, [or do] the treasures of wickedness? And an ephah of leanness is condemned.** | 10. **Are there still in the house of the wicked man storehouses of wickedness and fraudulent measures bringing a curse?** |
| 11. **Will I merit with scales of wickedness or with a bag of deceitful weights?** | 11. **Can they be acquitted despite wicked scales and a bag in which there are greater and smaller weights?** |
| 12. **For the wealthy thereof are full of violence, and the inhabitants thereof speak lies, and their tongue is guile in their mouth.** | 12. **Whose rich men fill their storehouses by violence, and whose inhabitants speak falsehood, with deceitful tongues in their mouths?** |
| 13. **Therefore I, too, will smite you with sore wounds and make [you] desolate because of your sins.** | 13. **I for my part have brought upon you sickness and plague, and I have made you desolate because you have sinned."** |
| 14. **You shall eat and not be sated, and it shall bend you over in your innards; and you shall overtake, but you shall not rescue, and those whom you rescue I will deliver to the sword.** | 14. **You will eat, but not be satisfied; and there will be sickness in your insides. You will obtain, but not carry off, and what you do carry off I will deliver to the sword.** |
| 15. **You shall sow, but you shall not reap; you shall tread the olives, but you shall not anoint yourself with oil; and the must; but you shall not drink wine.** | 15. **You will sow but not reap, you will tread the olives, but not anoint yourself with oil; you will press grapes, but not drink wine.** |
| 16. **And the statutes of Omri shall be observed, and every deed of the house of Ahab; and you shall walk in their counsels, in order that I make you an astonishment, and its inhabitants a hissing; and the disgrace of My people you shall bear.** **{P}** | 16. **For you have kept the decrees of the house of Omri and you have performed the practices of the house of Ahab, and you have followed their laws so that they might deliver you to desolation and her inhabitants to devastation. You will receive the scorn of My people.** **{P}** |
|  |  |
| 14. ¶ Lead Your people with Your rod - the flock of Your inheritance who dwell alone, a forest in the midst of a fruitful field - and they shall graze in Bashan and Gilead as in days of yore. | 14. ¶ Sustain Your people by Your Memra; the tribe of Your inheritance will dwell by themselves in the world which will be renewed. Those who were desolate in the forest will be settled in Carmel; they will be sustained in the land of Bashan and Gilead as in the days of old. |
| 15. As in the days of your exodus from the land of Egypt, I will show him wonders. | 15. As in the day when they came out of the land of Egypt, I will show them wondrous deeds. |
| 16. Nations shall see and be ashamed of all their might- they shall place a hand upon their mouth; their ears shall become deaf. | 16. The nations will see and be ashamed despite all their might; they will put their hands on their mouths; their ears will be deafened. |
| 17. They shall lick the dust as a snake, as those who crawl on the earth. They shall quake from their imprisonment; they shall fear the Lord, our God, and they shall fear you. | 17. They will prostrate themselves on their faces upon the ground like snakes, crawlers in the dust. They will come trembling out of their fortresses, and from before the LORD our God they will be destroyed; and they will be afraid before You. |
| 18. Who is a God like You, Who forgives iniquity and passes over the transgression of the remnant of His heritage? He does not maintain His anger forever, for He desires loving-kindness. | 18. There is none besides You; You are the God forgiving iniquities and passing over the transgressions of the remnant of His inheritance, who does not extend His anger forever, because He delights in doing good. |
| 19. He shall return and grant us compassion; He shall hide our iniquities, and You shall cast into the depths of the sea all their sins. | 19. His Memra will again have mercy on us, He will tread upon our transgressions in His love and He will cast all the sins of Israel into the depths of the sea. |
| 20. You shall give the truth of Jacob, the loving-kindness of Abraham, which You swore to our forefathers from days of yore. **{P}** | 20. You will show (Your) faithfulness to Jacob to his sons, as You swore to him in Bethel. Your kindness to Abraham to his seed after him, as You swore to him between the pieces; **You will remember for us the binding of Isaac who was bound upon the altar before You.** You will perform kind deeds with us as You swore to our fathers in days of old. **{P}** |
|  |  |

**Rashi’s Commentary to: Micah 6:6-8 + 7:14-20**

**Chapter 6**

**1** **with the mountains** -with the Patriarchs.

**the hills** -the Matriarchs.

**3 what have I done for you** -Put your heart to recognizing what benefit I have done for you.

**and how have I wearied you** -with My worship?

**Testify against Me** Heb. עֲנֵה בִּי

**4 For I brought you up** -Although I bestowed all this benefit upon you, I did not weary you with much worship or with large sacrifices.

**Moses, Aaron, and Miriam** - *Jonathan* paraphrases: Moses to teach the transmission of the laws, Aaron to atone for the people, and Miriam to instruct the women.

**5 and what Balaam the son of Beor answered him** -(Num. 23:8) “How shall I be angry if God is not angry?” for I did not become angry all those days. [from *Berachot* 4a]

**from Shittim** -where you sinned before Me. You should recognize My righteous deeds, for I did not withhold My kindness and My assistance from you until I brought you to Gilgal, and I conquered the land before you.

**6** **bow** I will be humbled.

**7** **streams of oil** -for meal offerings.

**Shall I give my firstborn?** -as a sacrifice for my transgression.

**8 He has told** -The Holy One, blessed be He, has told you what is good for you to do.

**and to walk discreetly** - *Jonathan* renders: Walk discreetly in the fear of your God. Another explanation: And walk discreetly. The standard of flesh and blood is not like the standard of the Holy One, blessed be He. The standard of flesh and blood is: If one man embarrasses his fellow and comes to placate him, the fellow says to him, “I will not accept your apology until so and so and so and so, before whom you disgraced me, come.” But the Holy One, blessed be He, desires only that the man’s return to Him be between the two of them. [from *Pesikta d’Rav Kahana* 163b].

**9 The voice of the Lord calls out in the city** -The voice of the prophets of the Lord calling out, calling them [the people] to repentance. [from *Jonathan*]

**and the wisdom of the Torah, the one who sees Your name** -The prophet who sees Your name calls out the wisdom of the Torah; i.e., the one who puts his heart to contemplate and to see Your ways. The word וְתוּשִׁיּה refers to the verse above it.

**hearken to the staff and Who appointed it** -Bend your ears, and hearken to the staff of retribution that will punish you, concerning which the prophets warn you; and hearken to who it is Who appointed that retribution, whether He has the ability to fulfill what He decreed. But *Jonathan* did not render in this manner.

**and the wisdom of Torah, the one who sees Your name** From here we deduce that whoever recites daily a verse beginning [with the letter] and ending [with the letter] as his name begins and ends, the Torah saves him from Gehinnom.

**10** **Does the house of the wicked last long, [or do] the treasures of wickedness?** -The “hey” of הַאִשׁ is vowelized with a “pattach” [not a kamatz] because it denotes a question. And this is its meaning: עוֹד is an expression of longevity. הַאִשׁ is like הֲיֵשׁ, is there. In I Chronicles (2:13) we find: “Ishai the father of David,” instead of “Yishai.” Here, too, is אִשׁ instead of יֵשׁ. And so in II Samuel (14:19): “If anyone can (אִשׁ) turn to the right or to the left.” [This is identical to] “If anyone can (יֵשׁ) turn to the right or to the left.” So did *Jonathan* render it: Is there. Will it enter your mind that the house of the wicked will last long, and the treasures of wickedness?

**And an ephah of leanness is condemned** -A small measure with which your wealthy deceive the poor and bring them to leanness - that is condemned by the wrath of the Holy One, blessed be He.

**13 I will smite you with sore wounds** -I have made your wounds sore - strong and ill and incurable.

**and make [you] desolate** Heb. הַשְׁמֵם, to make you desolate because of your sins.

**14 and it shall bend you over in your innards** Heb. וְיֶשְׁחֲךָ. The food that you eat - I will bring a curse into it within your intestines, and it will cause you illness, that you will be ill and walk bent over. So it is explained in *Sifre*: How do we know that, even within the intestines? Scripture states: “And it shall bend you over in your innards.” In the parashah of Ekev, in expounding (Deut. 11:12) “The eyes of the Lord your God are upon it,” *Jonathan*, too, renders [our verse] in this manner: And it shall be to you for illness and a wound in your intestines.

**and you shall overtake** -your enemies who lead your sons and daughters away, into captivity; but you shall not rescue them, and if you rescue them, their end will be to the sword. In the name of Rabbi Menahem I heard: You shall gain your desire for sexual intercourse, but you shall not ejaculate. You shall not have the strength to ejaculate semen; and, if you do ejaculate them [and beget children], their end will be that I will deliver them to the sword [of the enemy].

**16** **And the statutes of Omri shall be observed** -I know that you will not obey Me, but through you and your children will all the statutes of Omri and Ahab [the evil kings of Israel] be observed.

**and the disgrace of My people you shall bear** -You shall bear the iniquity for the disgrace that the peoples of the world deride My people, for the Torah admonished them concerning (Deut. 25: 14): “You shall not have in your house two kinds of ephah,” but they do not keep it.

**Chapter 7**

**14 who dwell alone** -That they should dwell alone, in security.

**a forest in the midst of a fruitful field** - *Jonathan* renders: Those who were desolate in a forest shall settle in the “karmel”; those who were desolate in the forests shall dwell alone in the midst of the “karmel,” which is a settled place. It is also possible to explain:

**who dwell alone** -In the forests will not fear the wild beasts as [they would not] in the midst of a fruitful field.

**17 as those who crawl on the earth** -They are snakes, which crawl on their bellies on the dust of the earth.

**They shall quake from their imprisonment** - They shall quake because of the extreme narrowness of their imprisonment and the confinement of their captivity.

**20 You shall give the truth of Jacob** - *Jonathan* paraphrases: You shall give the truth of Jacob to his sons, as You swore to him in Bethel; the loving-kindness of Abraham to his seed after him, as you swore to him ‘between the parts.’ **You shall remember for us the binding of Isaac, etc.** Give us the truth that You promised Jacob. Cause to come true Your word that You promised Jacob (Gen. 28:15): “For I will not forsake you.”

**the loving-kindness of Abraham** The reward for the loving-kindness of Abraham, [out of] which he commanded his sons to keep the way of the Lord: to perform righteousness/generosity and justice. Therefore, it does not say, “And the loving-kindness,” but “the loving- kindness.” The truth - that you will make come true the promise to Jacob - that will be the payment of the reward for Abraham’s loving-kindness.

**which You swore** - **at the binding of Isaac, (Gen 22:16) “I swore by Myself, says the LORD, that because you did this thing, etc.”**

**Verbal Tallies**

**By: H. Em. Rabbi Dr. Hillel ben David**

**& HH Giberet Dr. Elisheba bat Sarah**

**Vayikra (Leviticus) 6:1 – 7:10**

**Micah 6:6-8 + 7:14-20**

**Tehillim (Psalms) 76:1-7**

**1 Pet 2:11-12, Lk 10:38-42, Acts 20:17-38**

**The verbal tallies between the Torah and the Ashlamata are:**

LORD - יהוה, Strong’s number 03068.

Sons / Old - בן, Strong’s number 01121.

Burnt offering - עלה, Strong’s number 05930.

**The verbal tallies between the Torah and the Psalm are:**

All - כל, Strong’s number 03605.

Broken / Broke - , Strong’s number 07665

**Vayikra (Leviticus) 6:1** And the LORD <03068> spoke unto Moses, saying, 2 Command Aaron and his sons <01121>, saying, This is the law of the burnt offering <05930>: It is the burnt offering <05930>, because of the burning upon the altar all <03605> night unto the morning, and the fire of the altar will be burning in it.

**Vayikra (Leviticus) 6:21** But the earthen vessel wherein it is sodden will be broken <07665> (8735): and if it be sodden in a brazen pot, it will be both scoured, and rinsed in water.

**Micah 6:6** Wherewith will I come before the LORD <03068>, and bow myself before the high God? Will I come before Him with burnt offerings <05930>, with calves of a year old <01121>?

**Tehillim (Psalms) 76:4** There He broke <07665> the fiery shafts of the bow; the shield, and the sword, and the battle. Selah

**Tehillim (Psalms) 76:6** The stout-hearted are bereft of sense, they sleep their sleep; **{N}**  
and none of all <03605> the men of might have found their hands.

**Hebrew:**

| **Hebrew** | **English** | **Torah Seder**  **Lev 6:8 – 7:10** | **Psalms**  **Psa 76:1-7** | **Ashlamatah**  **Mic 6:6-8 + 7:14-20** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~yhil{a/ | GOD |  | Ps 76:1 Ps 76:6 | Mic 6:6 Mic 6:8 Mic 7:17 |
| @a; | angry |  | Ps 76:7 | Mic 7:18 |
| dy" | hands |  | Ps 76:5 | Mic 7:16 |
| hwhy | LORD | Lev 6:8 Lev 6:14 Lev 6:15 Lev 6:18 Lev 6:19 Lev 6:20 Lev 6:21 Lev 6:22 Lev 6:24 Lev 6:25 Lev 7:5 |  | Mic 6:6 Mic 6:7 Mic 6:8 Mic 7:17 |
| ~Ay | day | Lev 6:20 |  | Mic 7:14 Mic 7:15 Mic 7:20 |
| bqo[]y" | Jacob |  | Ps 76:6 | Mic 7:20 |
| ac'y" | carry | Lev 6:11 |  | Mic 7:15 |
| lKo | all, entire, whole | Lev 6:9 Lev 6:15 Lev 6:18 Lev 6:23 Lev 6:27 Lev 6:29 Lev 6:30 Lev 7:3 Lev 7:6 Lev 7:9 Lev 7:10 | Ps 76:5 | Mic 7:16 Mic 7:19 |
| aol | no | Lev 6:30 | Ps 76:5 |  |
| ymi | who |  | Ps 76:7 | Mic 7:18 |
| !mi | outside,any, when | Lev 6:11 Lev 6:22 Lev 6:27 Lev 6:30 | Ps 76:4 Ps 76:7 | Mic 7:17 |
| !t;n" | given | Lev 6:17 |  | Mic 6:7 Mic 7:20 |
| ~l'A[ | permanent, old | Lev 6:18 Lev 6:22 |  | Mic 7:14 |
| l[; | next | Lev 6:10 |  | Mic 7:18 |
| hn<P' | front, before | Lev 6:14 Lev 6:25 | Ps 76:7 |  |
| rb;v' | broken | Lev 6:28 | Ps 76:3 |  |
| ~Wf | place | Lev 6:10 |  | Mic 7:16 |
| !m,v, | oil | Lev 6:15 Lev 6:21 Lev 7:10 |  | Mic 6:7 |
| taJ'x; | sin | Lev 6:17 Lev 6:25 Lev 6:30 Lev 7:7 |  | Mic 6:7 Mic 7:19 |
| arey" | feared |  | Ps 76:7 | Mic 7:17 |
| hl'[o | burnt offering | Lev 6:9 Lev 6:10 Lev 6:12 Lev 6:25 Lev 7:2 Lev 7:8 |  | Mic 6:6 |
| hf'[' | prepared | Lev 6:21 Lev 6:22 Lev 7:9 |  | Mic 6:8 |

**Greek:**

| **Greek** | **English** | **Torah Seder**  **Lev 6:8 – 7:10** | **Psalms**  **Ps 76:1-7** | **Ashlamatah**  **Micah 6:6-8**  **+ 7:14-20** | **Peshat**  **Mk/Jude/Pet**  **1 Pet 2:11-12** | **Remes 1**  **Luke**  **Lk 10:38-42** | **Remes 2**  **Acts/Romans**  **Acts 20:17-38** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **αἷμα** | blood | Lev 6:27  Lev 6:30  Lev 7:2 |  |  |  |  | Acts 20:26 Acts 20:28 |
| **ἀνήρ** | men |  | Psa 76:5 |  |  |  | Acts 20:30 |
| **ἀντιλαμβάνομαι** | hold of, help |  |  | Mic 6:6 |  |  | Acts 20:35 |
| **ἀφαιρέω** | remove,  taken away | Lev 6:10  Lev 6:15 |  |  |  | Luke 10:42 |  |
| **diakoni,a** | preparations, ministry |  |  |  |  | Luke 10:40 | Acts 20:24 |
| **δίδωμι** | give, given | Lev 6:17 |  | Mic 6:7 Mic 7:20 |  |  | Acts 20:32 Acts 20:35 |
| **ἔθνος** | nations |  |  | Mic 7:16 | 1 Pet 2:12 |  |  |
| **ei|j** | one |  |  |  |  | Luke 10:42 | Acts 20:31 |
| **εἰσέρχομαι** | entered,  will come |  |  |  |  | Luke 10:38 | Acts 20:29 |
| **ἐπιβαίνω** | mounting,  set foot |  | Psa 76:6 |  |  |  | Acts 20:18 |
| **ἡμέρα** | day | Lev 6:20 |  | Mic 7:14 Mic 7:15 Mic 7:20 | 1 Pet 2:12 |  | Acts 20:18 Acts 20:26 Acts 20:31 |
| **καθαρός** | clean,  innocent | Lev 6:11 |  |  |  |  | Acts 20:26 |
| **καλός** | good |  |  | Mic 6:8 | 1 Pet 2:12 |  |  |
| **καταλείπω** | remainder | Le v 6:16 |  |  |  | Luke 10:40 |  |
| **κληρονομία** | inheritance |  |  | Mic 7:14 |  |  | Acts 20:32 |
| **κύριος** | LORD | Lev 6:8 Lev 6:14 Lev 6:15 Lev 6:18 Lev 6:19 Lev 6:20 Lev 6:21 Lev 6:22 Lev 6:24 Lev 6:25 Lev 7:5 |  | Mic 6:6 Mic 6:7 Mic 6:8 Mic 7:17 |  | Luke 10:39 Luke 10:40 Luke 10:41 | Acts 20:19 Acts 20:21 Acts 20:24 Acts 20:35 |
| **λαλέω** | spoke,  speak | Lev 6:19  Lev 6:24  Lev 6:25 |  |  |  |  | Acts 20:30 |
| **λέγω** | saying | Lev 6:8  Lev 6:19  Lev 6:24  Lev 6:25 |  |  |  | Luke 10:40 Luke 10:41 | Acts 20:18 Acts 20:23 Acts 20:35 Acts 20:36 Acts 20:38 |
| **λόγος** | words |  |  |  |  | Luke 10:39 | Acts 20:24 Acts 20:32 Acts 20:35 Acts 20:38 |
| **μερίς** | portion,  part | Lev 6:17 |  |  |  | Luke 10:42 |  |
| **νύξ** | night | Lev 6:9 |  |  |  |  | Acts 20:31 |
| **ὄνομα** | name |  | Psa 76:1 |  |  | Luke 10:38 |  |
| **ὁράω** | see |  |  | Mic 7:16 |  |  | Acts 20:25 |
| **πᾶς** | all, entire,  whole | Lev 6:9 Lev 6:15 Lev 6:18 Lev 6:23 Lev 6:27 Lev 6:29 Lev 6:30 Lev 7:3 Lev 7:6 Lev 7:9 Lev 7:10 | Ps 76:5 | Mic 7:16 Mic 7:19 |  |  | Acts 20:18 Acts 20:19 Acts 20:25 Acts 20:26 Acts 20:27 Acts 20:28 Acts 20:32 Acts 20:35 Acts 20:3 |
| **ποιμαίνω** | tend,  shepherd |  |  | Mic 7:14 |  |  | Acts 20:28 |
| **πορεύομαι** | go,  traveling |  |  | Mic 6:8 |  | Luke 10:38 | Acts 20:22 |
| **χείρ** | hands |  | Psa 76:5 | Mic 7:16 |  |  | Acts 20:34 |
| **χρεία** | necessary,  needs |  |  |  |  | Luke 10:42 | Acts 20:34 |
| **Χριστός** | anointed one | Lev 6:22 |  |  |  |  | Acts 20:21 |
| **ψυχή** | soul |  |  | Mic 6:7 | 1 Pet 2:11 |  | Acts 20:24 |

**Nazarean Talmud**

**Sidra of Vayikra (Lev.) Lev 6:1 – 7:10**

**“Tsav” “Command”**

**By: H. Em Rabbi Dr. Adon Eliyahu ben Abraham &**

**H. Em. Hakham Dr. Yosef ben Haggai**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **School of Hakham Shaul**  **Tosefta**  **Luqas (Lk) 10:38-42**  Mishnah **א:א** | **School of Hakham Tsefet**  **Peshat**  **1 Tsefet (1 Pet.) 2:11-12**  Mishnah **א:א** |
| **Now as they departed, he entered into a certain village. And a certain woman named Martha welcomed him** into her house**. And** she had **a sister named Miriam, who also sat at the feet of the Master** and **was listening to his teaching** (of the Oral Torah)**. But Martha was distracted with much serving,[[149]](#footnote-149) so she approached** the Master and **said, “Master, is it not a concern to you that my sister has left me alone to serve? Tell her then that she should help me!”[[150]](#footnote-150) But the Master answered** and **said to her, calling** her **“Martha, Martha, you are anxious[[151]](#footnote-151) and distressed about many** things**! But one** thing **is necessary, and Miriam has chosen the good portion, that cannot be taken** away from **her.”** | ¶ **Beloved, I urge you as sojourners[[152]](#footnote-152) and exiles to distance[[153]](#footnote-153) yourselves from excessive** (and abnormal) **passions of the Yetser HaRa** (evil inclination), **which wage war against your Nefesh** (soul breathed into a body of “flesh”). **Guard** (shomer) **your conduct,** showing that you are **men of nobility[[154]](#footnote-154)** among **the Gentiles, so that when they speak against you as evildoers, they can see your good[[155]](#footnote-155) works[[156]](#footnote-156)** (tsedaqah – works of righteous/ generosity) **and glorify God on the day[[157]](#footnote-157) you are to take office** (are ordained or vested) **as a Paqid/Hakham.[[158]](#footnote-158)** |

|  |
| --- |
| **School of Hakham Shaul**  **Remes**  **2 Luqas (Acts) 20:17 – 38**  **Mishnah א:א** |
| **And from Miletus he sent** word **to Ephesus** and **summoned[[159]](#footnote-159) the Zeqenim of the congregation. And when they came to him, he said to them, “You yourselves know how I lived among you the whole time from the first day that I set foot in Asia, serving the Master with all humility and** with **tears, and with the trials that happened to me through the plots of the** Shammaite **Jews, how I did not draw back from proclaiming** the Mesorah **to you,** and **anything that would** **be profitable, and** from **teaching you in public and from the Esnoga (Synagogue – House of study), testifying both to Jews and to Greeks with respect to repentance toward God and faithful obedience in our Master Yeshua** HaMashiach**. “And now behold, bound by the ruach[[160]](#footnote-160)** (spirit) **I am traveling to Yerushalayim, not knowing the things that will happen to me there, except that the Spirit of Prophecy** (Ruach HaKodesh) **shows me from every city** that I have visited**, saying that bonds and trouble await me. But I consider** my **life** as **worth nothing to myself, in order to finish my mission and the ministry that I received from the Master Yeshua** HaMashiach through Hakham Tsefet**, to testify** to **the Mesorah of God’s chesed** (loving-kindness)**.”**  **“And now behold, I know that all** of **you, among whom I went about proclaiming the kingdom/governance** (sovereignty) **of God** through the Hakhamim and Bate Din as opposed to human kings**, will not see my face again. Therefore I tell you on this very day that if any of you should perish, I am not responsible, for I did not hold back from proclaiming to you the whole counsel** (Mesorah) **of God. Be on guard for yourselves and for all the flock among which the Mesorah has appointed you** as **Paqidim, to shepherd the congregation of God which he obtained through his own life. I know that after my departure fierce wolves will come in among you, not sparing the flock. And from among you yourselves men will arise, speaking perversions of the truth in order to draw the talmidim** away **after them. Therefore be on watch, mindful that night and day** for **three** and half **years I did not stop teaching each one** of you **with tears. “And now I entrust you to God and to the message of His loving-kindness, which is able to build** you up **and to give** you **the inheritance among all those who are set apart. I have desired no one’s silver or gold or clothing! You yourselves know that my hands served** to meet **my needs and** the needs of **those who were with me. I have shown you** with respect to **all** things **that** by **working hard in this way it is necessary to help those who are in need, and to remember the words of the Master Yeshua** HaMashiach **that he himself said, “It is more blessed to give than to receive.”**  **And** when he **had said these** things**, he knelt down** and **prayed with them all. And there was considerable weeping by all, and hugging Hakham Shaul, they kissed him, especially distressed at the statement that he had said, that they were not going to see his face again. And they accompanied him to the ship.** |

**Nazarean Codicil to be read in conjunction with the following Torah Seder**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lev 6:1 – 7:10 | Psa 76:1-7 | Micah 6:6-8 + 7:14-20 | 1 Pet 2:11-12 | Lk 10:38-42 | Acts 20:17-38 |

**Commentary to Hakham Tsefet’s School of Peshat**

**Jewish/Gentile relationships**

Scholars tell us that the Igeretim (letters) of Hakham Tsefet (1-2 Peter) have a great deal in common with Hakham Shaul’s Igeret to the Romans, specifically the 13th chapter. We will not, now cite what we have recorded there for the sake of time and space. We will point out that the present pericope bears resemblances to Romans chapter one.

**Rom. 1:5 Through him** (Messiah), **we have received the loving-kindness** (of God) **and service as Sheliachim, the Master’s “plenipotentiary agents” for bringing about faithful obedience among all Nations by his authority**.

The **“plenipotentiary agents”** of the master have one objective while living in the Diaspora. That objective is to bring the Gentiles into faithful obedience to the Oral Torah. We interpret the words of Hakham Tsefet as he offers special wisdom to the Master’s “plenipotentiary agents,” in saying, keep yourself at a safe distance. Interaction between Jew and Gentile has historically not been in favour of the Jewish people. Therefore, Hakham Tsefet tells his readers to keep (guard) themselves when interacting with Gentiles. The admonition to “guard” against the Yetser HaRa is not because the Jewish people have an exceptional difficulty with their negative impulse. His warning is because the Nazarean emissaries will constantly be confronted with these qualities when interacting with Gentiles.

Paula Fredriksen Aurelio Professor of Scripture emerita at Boston University suggests that the typical Jewish view of the Gentile in the first century was less than desirable. As noted from our comments above Professor Fredriksen sees that Jewish opinion of the Gentiles as follows:

What, on the average, did the average Jew think of the average Gentile? I think that we can rely here on Paul who, even when addressing Gentiles and in some sense acting as their advocate, refers to them, quite unselfconsciously, as ‘sinners’ (Gal.2: 15). Their characteristic social and sexual sins—slander, insolence, deceit, malicious gossip, envy, heartlessness, disrespect of parents, homosexual and heterosexual fornication—are the varied expression of a more fundamental spiritual error: they worship idols. Could there be such a thing, then, as a morally good Gentile?[[161]](#footnote-161)

As can be seen from Professor Fredrikson’s summation, the Jewish view of Gentiles was not positive. The interesting point is that Professor Fredrikson cites Hakham Shaul as her source. Therefore, we might think that Hakham Tsefet held similar opinions.

As we have stated in the past Professor Fredrikson also notes that there were those Gentiles who liked the best of both worlds[[162]](#footnote-162). In other words, they possibly attended the Esnoga (Synagogue) and the Pagan Festivals where they indulged in all associated pagan rites.[[163]](#footnote-163)

Who are the Godfearers? They are Gentiles, but not proselytes; if they were proselytes, they would then be Jews. To think of them as “semi-proselytes” is unhelpful: the word suggests some sort of arrested development or objective impediment.[[164]](#footnote-164)

George Foot Moore makes this point clear.

Nothing but misunderstanding can come from calling the *ger toshab* a “proselyte” or semi-proselyte;” he was not a convert to Judaism at all. [[165]](#footnote-165)

These scholars realize the depth of dealing with Gentiles in Diaspora. The production of the “Fiddler on the Roof,” deals with the delicate balance that is to be maintained when dealing with those of different religious and political persuasions. However, Hakham Tsefet realizes that the “mission” of the Nazarean Jew is cosmic, i.e. tikun. Yosef the son of Ya’aqob is the prototypical Messiah. Deeper still is the idea that he is the prototypical Nazarean. Yosef’s brothers sold him into slavery and was carried into Egypt against his own will. Yet, the day dawned when Yosef became the single prototypical agent who possessed the redemptive key to global tikun. In his bringing deliverance to the Gentiles he procured healing and redemption for the Jewish people. The lesson learned from Yosef is that there must be interaction with the Gentiles for the plan of G-d to be fulfilled.

**Guard** (shomer) **your conduct**

The wisdom of our father Ya’aqob teaches us that the Jewish people cannot survive in exile if they do not have houses of study. Hakham Tsefet is telling his Jewish readers that they must “guard – shomer” their conduct through learning the Oral Torah of the Master and the Hakhamim. We note that Yeshua accepted the dictums of the Hakhamim before him. A simple example is attested to when we see Yeshua feeding the multitudes.[[166]](#footnote-166) The mandate to bless G-d before consuming food is a decision made by the Hakhamim before Yeshua’s time. Yeshua’s acceptance is demonstrated in his recital of the appropriate berakhoth.

Ya’aqob knows that the key to Jewish survival is found in the Oral Torah. Therefore, he sent Y’hudah into diaspora before him to establish a Bet HaMidrash.[[167]](#footnote-167)

HaRav Zekharyah Tobi and translated by HaRav Meir Orlian further elucidates this name, stating:[[168]](#footnote-168)

Torah Seder Vayigash tells of the descent of Yaakov and the tribes to Egypt and the designation of their dwelling place, "the land of Goshen," as it says: "Yosef said to his brothers ... when Pharaoh summons you ... Then you are to say, 'Your servants have been cattlemen' ... so that you may be able to settle on the land of Goshen." So it was, "Israel settled in the land of Egypt in the land of Goshen; they acquired property in it and they were fruitful and multiplied greatly." (ch. 46-47)

What was special about that place called "the land of Goshen," and why was it called by this name? The simple understanding is that this place was far from the Egyptian population, **to be separate from the Egyptians and not to be influenced by Egyptian culture.** Therefore, Yosef sought to settle his brothers there. The Kli Yakar writes: "The purpose of all of this was to **distance** them from Pharaoh, so that they would settle in the land of Goshen." This has a practical lesson for our days also, that we should seek to live in a place that is not subject to non-Jewish influence.

The lessons we should be learning from the activities of our ancestors is that the Jewish people in Diaspora cannot survive without houses of study. While, we at present use devices like the internet for teaching centres, this is only a temporary solution. A true Yeshiva must be established in an existing community where talmidim can be taught on a personal basis and communal interaction can take place.

We will further unfold the wisdom of Hakham Tsefet as his talmid, Hakham Shaul illuminates the words of his master.

**Commentary to Hakham Shaul’s School of Remes**

Hakham Shaul’s Remes Gemara (study) of the Mishnaic text of Hakham Tsefet builds on the idea of those who **sojourn** and **men of nobility** among **the Gentiles** found in our Nazarean Mishnah. Hakham Shaul’s relationship to the Mishnah in 2 Luqas is that of an active agent of the Master in diaspora.

Hakham Shaul demonstrates by personal example his “distance from the Gentiles while in diaspora.

**“You yourselves know how I lived among you the whole time from the first day that I set foot in Asia, serving the Master with all humility and** with **tears, and with the trials that happened to me through the plots of the** Shammaite **Jews.**

**Beloved Sojourners**

What may not be obvious to the reader is the paradigm shift in vocabulary. The vocabulary of Hakham Tsefet in his igeretim (letters – 1-2 Peter) is unique. We also note that the vocabulary of 2 Luqas (Acts) has changed dramatically. Scholars have noted the peculiarities of the language used here in both texts of our Nazarean Talmud. Likewise, others have noted the similarities between 1-2 Tsefet (Pe.) and Yehudah (Jude). We have come to learn that this is most likely because Hakham Yehudah (Jude) the brother of the Master was Hakham Tsefet’s amanuensis for these igeretim. We might opine that the transition in language in 2 Luqas (Acts) is due to a temporary absence of Hakham Shaul’s amanuensis Hillel/Luke.

These igeretim, juxtaposed against the readings of Vayikra (Leviticus) in the Triennial Torah Reading cycle have new or very special nomenclature. One is forced to wonder why these igeretim have this special language used in conjunction with the reading of Vayikra. The previous Mishnaic pericope (of the Nazarean Codicil) gives us our needed hint.

**But you** are**a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, His own special people, that you may proclaim the praises of Him (God).[[169]](#footnote-169)**

It is obvious that the letter deals with a “Set Apart Priesthood” that is a Priesthood of…

1. Royalty

2. Purchased possession

3. Called (Predestined) – Vayikra

It would appear that Hakham Tsefet and Hakham Shaul wrote these igeretim as responsa to questions raised about Vayikra. However, these igeretim are not simply a responsa to Vayikra in the usual sense. Hakham Tsefet, setting the background for Hakham Shaul addresses the issue of the “Priesthood of Royalty,” which is a term Hakham Tsefet gives to the Priesthood of the Firstborn. Hakham Tsefet’s responsa to Vayikra is designed to show us that the Levitical Priesthood is based on the model of the Ecclesiology of the Firstborn.

For Hakham Shaul the “distance” between the Gentiles is determined by the Mesorah, or by the Bate Din. We will look at how the study (Gemara) of the Nazarean Mishnah unfolds this truth through allegory.

The Temple was surrounded by a platform called the “Cheil.” this platform was **ten** amot (cubits) wide and a **distance** of **ten** amot from the Soreg.[[170]](#footnote-170) The Soreg is a wall that stood **ten** tefahim (handbreadths – about 38.4 inches) high[[171]](#footnote-171) prohibiting Gentile entry to the Cheil (platform) and courts of the Israelites. The mention of the Soreg and the idea of “distancing ourselves” from the Yetser HaRa of the Gentiles is pictured in Hakham Tsefet and Hakham Shaul’s Temple/Priesthood language. The relevance of these parts relates directly to Chanuka. Therefore, we can see from one of the “Bimodal” aspects of reading the Torah Septennially, that Hakham Tsefet and Hakham Shaul understand the contiguity to Chanuka.

The “Soreg” is a fence per se, that keeps the Gentile from entering the Courts of the Israelites. There seems to be some discrepancy as to its construction. Josephus describes it as a fence of stone. The Mishnah in tractate Middot describes it as a latticework. The difference is resolved when we learn that the Soreg of the First Temple was made of wood, most likely Oak. The Soreg of the Second Temple was changed at some point to stone. This stone Soreg was decorated in the pattern of lattice. The Greek name for this wall is significant to our subject matter. This fence in Greek is called δρύφακτος – *druphactos.* Like many other Greek words δρύφακτος – *druphactos* is actually a compound word. This word can be divided into two words for better understanding. We have used the Lidddell - Scott Lexicon as the primary lexicon out of necessity. This is because this Lexicon is better equipped to handle Josephus and classical Greek texts. The word as defined in the Lexicon is as follows.

Δρύφακτος – *druphactos,* ***a fence* or *railing****,* **serving as *the bar* of the law-courts or council chamber,** Ar.; in pl., like Lat. cancelli*,* Id.[[172]](#footnote-172)

The idea that δρύφακτος – *druphactos* relates to the fence, bench or “bar” of the law courts is because the prefix δρύς – *drus* is the word for the Oak in Greek. Φρασσω – *phrasso* means “fence” in classical Greek. Therefore, δρύφακτος – *druphactos* means a fence of oak. The δρύφακτος – *druphactos* was a wooden rail, fence or partition within the Roman courtrooms. This rail, **bar** was where the defendant stood during judgment in a formal Roman courtroom. The idea of the “**bar**” in the contemporary courtroom and system is based upon this ancient Roman practice. Obviously, the allegory of this “fence” (bar) now shows that Hakham Tsefet and Hakham Shaul are referring to the distance between the Jewish people and the Gentiles that is managed by the Bate Din.

Therefore, the Ecclesiology[[173]](#footnote-173) of the Firstborn is depicted in the “distance” that we are to hold between the Gentiles and ourselves. Hakham Tsefet and Hakham Shaul juxtapose the idea of the ten Men of the Congregation against the courts of the Temple. Ten amot (cubits) is the width of the Cheil – platform, referring allegorically to the Bet Din and the Seven Paqidim who serve at the bench. The Cheil was also ten amot (cubits) above the Azarah (platform) that served as the foundation for all the courtyards. Likewise, the distance from the edge of the Cheil to the Soreg is also ten amot (cubits). Not only does this show us that we must distance ourselves from the Gentiles, but the Gentiles must elevate their conduct (become Jewish) before they can approach G-d in an in-depth relationship. Thus, we understand the reference to Romans 1:5 requiring the faithful obedience of the Gentiles. The Ezrat Nashim – Courtyard of the women was 15 amot (cubits) below the Ezrat Yisrael – Courtyard of Israel. The Ezrat Kohanim – Courtyard of the Priests was 3 amot (cubits) above the Ezrat Yisrael – Courtyard of Israel. The Ezrat Kohanim – Courtyard of the Priests was 12 amot (cubits) below the Ezrat Kodeshim – Courtyards of the Holy places. Here we learn that becoming Jewish is not enough.

**Vested with Atonement**

Interestingly, Rabbinic Judaism[[174]](#footnote-174) and the Nazarean Codicil make no major attempt to discuss “atonement” in the proper sense of the word.[[175]](#footnote-175) Rabbinic Judaism does speak of and deal with atonement. However, atonement in Rabbinic Judaism is for the sake of understanding our role in connection with G-d rather than the Temple. The word “atonement” appears only once in the Igeret to the Romans.[[176]](#footnote-176) And, there the correct translation is not “atonement” but, “reconciliation.” Why did sin and atonement play such a critical role in Rabbinic Judaism that the principal act of piety that it needed to discuss was ritual sacrifice? The answer lies in what, in the Scriptural narrative, led to the sacrificial cult. On the other side of Sinai came the idolatrous celebration of the Golden Calf. Because of this sin, Israel was commanded to sacrifice that which it had chosen to worship in place of God: the calf and comparable beasts.[[177]](#footnote-177)

The Priests garments (vestments) are indicative of his authority and royalty[[178]](#footnote-178) as an intermediary between G-d and the Jewish people. Because of his robes, we understand that the Priesthood of the Firstborn is “vested” with atonement. This plays out in the words “**and glorify God on the day[[179]](#footnote-179) that you are to take office (are ordained or vested) as a Paqid/Hakham.[[180]](#footnote-180)**” From the sin of Adam, there has been a conflict between G-d’s Torah and human will. The Ecclesiology of the Firstborn now functions as an agent for atonement. This is pictured in the vestment of Hakhamim and Paqidim. Their “vestment,” equated with the Priestly regalia is related to Yosef’s coat that was dipped in blood. From this, the Hakhamim have determined in the Mishnah, Yoma that the tunic is atonement for bloodshed.[[181]](#footnote-181) Each article of clothing worn by the Kohanim is an allegorical reference to the vestment of the Hakham or Paqid. The message of Yoma in dealing with the garments of the Kohen shows that there is atonement in the ceremonial gowns worn by the Hakhamim and Paqidim. These robes represent the atonement for the human will that violates the Torah. The Hakham atones for the human will, bearing the sins of the congregation. The Ecclesiology of the Firstborn now stands as the human counterpart to the Divine Presence. This relates to the location of the Mishkan in the wilderness, a “no man’s land” per se. The B’ne Yisrael were not yet in Eretz Yisrael. In a matter of speaking, they were in an allegorical diaspora. Or, we can see them in their transition as allegorically demonstrating what they would experience in each exile.

Bells[[182]](#footnote-182) (**פַּעֲמֹן** – *pa˓ămōn*) and pomegranates lined the robe of the Kohen (Gadol). These bells atoned for “Gossip and involuntary manslaughter. “For gossip, there was no atonement, but the Torah has provided atonement for it, specifically through the bell of the robe: ‘And it will be upon Aaron to minister, and the **sound** (voice) thereof will be heard’ (Exod. 28:35).[[183]](#footnote-183) The voice of the Hakham as he elucidates Torah is now a **פַּעֲמֹן** – *pa˓ămōn* (bell). Allegorically, the Hakham stands as a High Priest; the “bells” of his garment is his voice. This is because the Hakham is a voice.[[184]](#footnote-184) The voice of the Hakham makes atonement for “gossip.” The pomegranates of the Firstborn/Hakham refer to the posterity of that Hakham. This means that he will make many talmidim to stand and the fruit of his lips will flourish with the elucidation of the Torah. The Hakham then becomes the seminal agent for the Ecclesiology of the Firstborn. The Firstborn, as a recipient of the seminal vestment of Hokhmah, is a minister of the endless words of the Mesorah/Oral Torah. The infinity of the Torah is a guarantee of the Olam HaBa.

The idea of **פַּעֲמֹן** – *pa˓ămōn* also relates to time. “There are numerous expressions for “time” in which *pa˓am* is one of the elements.”[[185]](#footnote-185) This relates to the Oral Torah as the structure for the cosmos. As we have discussed in other places “**Time is an energy,”** Jewish souls are energies emitting from the process, ebb and tide in the cycles of energy. The Remes of **פַּעֲמֹן** – *pa˓ămōn* relates to their movement in time and or their movement of time. The priesthood of the Firstborn is inextricably connected with exploits of rectification and refinement within the dimension of time. Yet, their influence relates to the eternality of the Torah. This rectification functions on a cosmic level. Like the Mishkan in the wilderness, it was not restricted to one locale. The Holy of Holies was a room of absolute infinity. It was timeless, immeasurable and boundless. Two curtains concealed the Holy of Holies from view. The Kohen Gadol walked between the curtains (Paroket) that formed a corridor to a timeless dimension. His entrance into that infinite room was as an intermediary for the B’ne Yisrael that atoned for all sin on an incalculable level. G-d abides in the B’ne Yisrael a point in creation where the Heavens and Earth interconnect.

Furthermore, their “vestments” are associated with the garments of Adam, HaRishon (the First man).

**Where’s Aaron?**

We have cited Mishnah Aboth 1:1 Ad nauseam. This is because we can never exhaust the meaning and determinations found in that Mishnah. Again, we cite this inexhaustible text for the sake of determining a commanding truth.

**And as it is said: “Mosheh received the Torah from Sinai and gospelled it down to Yehoshua, and Yehoshua gospelled it down to the Elders, the Elders to the Prophets, and the Prophets gospelled it down to the Men of the Great Assembly. They** (the Men of the Great Assembly) **emphasized three things; Be deliberate in judgment, make stand many disciples, and make a fence around the Torah”** (P. Abot 1:1)

Why does this Mishnah leave Aaron out of its mention? The Mishnah does later on mention Aaron.

**Aboth 1:12 Hillel says, “Be disciples of Aaron, “loving peace and pursuing peace, loving people and drawing them near to the Torah.”[[186]](#footnote-186)**

Hillel’s words concerning Aaron are a reference to being talmidim of the Firstborn, i.e. Priesthood of the Firstborn. This reference has nothing to do with being talmidim of the Levitical Priesthood. Aaron was the firstborn and largely represented the “Priesthood of the Firstborn,” NOT the Levitical or Kohanic line of priests. Aboth 1:1 shows us clearly that the chain of transmission passes from Hakham to talmid. Aboth 1:12 teaches us that each firstborn is the Priest of his family, clan and tribe.

Hakham Tsefet in conjunction with Hakham Shaul, juxtapose their materials building upon the idea that the Firstborn is a Priest offering sacrifices to G-d. They show that Vayikra is an instructional manual for the Firstborn, not the Levitical Priesthood.

It makes sense that the Priesthood of the Tz’dukim (Sadducees) knew that they would never again function as Kohanim in Jewish circles. For this reason, they defected from Yisrael when the second Temple was destroyed. Their defection sent many of them to Rome where they became the priests of a new religion. They intentionally changed the services of G-d into what we now know as “mass.”[[187]](#footnote-187) They made substitutions and altered dates for the sake of their own selfish means as just as they had done while serving as Priests in the Bet HaMikdash. Had this opportunity not availed itself the Tz’dukim (Sadducees) may have eventually blended these things into the services of G-d as Jewish “Priests.” They served as subordinates to Rome while in service in the Bet HaMikdash. Their new employment was to the same master (Rome - Edom) with a new twist per se. These defunct Priests blended paganism, Judaism and Nazarean Judaism with forbidden practices to advance their new creed.

The idea of priesthood and his clothing fits our Nazarean Talmud perfectly when we play off the word “distance.” The Priest was set aside (distanced) for a life of service. He acted as an intermediary for the B’ne Yisrael when they were “distanced” from G-d; it was the Priest that made offerings (korbanot) bringing the B’ne Yisrael back to G-d from their “distance.”

For the past two millennia, we have lived in diaspora with a new (renewed) Priesthood. The Hakham now functions as the Priest bringing us near to G-d through the instruction of Torah. The Ecclesiology of the Firstborn is at the core of Hakham Tsefet and Hakham Shaul’s writings. Not only is this Ecclesiology at the core of the “Nazarean Talmud, it permeates that whole of the Nazarean Codicil. We have counted the Omer looking at the Ecclesiology of the Esnoga (Synagogue) from Passover to Pentecost. It is more than evident that G-d wants us to be thoroughly educated in how to conduct His Services in the spirit of wisdom, unity and joy.

**Questions for Reflection**

1. From all the readings for this week, which particular verse or passage caught your attention and fired your heart and imagination?
2. In your opinion, and taking into consideration all of the above readings for this Sabbath, what is the prophetic message (the idea that encapsulates all the Scripture passages read) for this week?

**Blessing After Torah Study**

**Barúch Atáh Adonai, Elohénu Meléch HaOlám,**

**Ashér Natán Lánu Torát Emét, V'Chayéi Olám Natá B'Tochénu.**

**Barúch Atáh Adonái, Notén HaToráh. Amen!**

**Blessed is Ha-Shem our God, King of the universe,**

**Who has given us a teaching of truth, implanting within us eternal life.**

**Blessed is Ha-Shem, Giver of the Torah. Amen!**

**“Now unto Him who is able to preserve you faultless, and spotless, and to establish you without a blemish,**

**before His majesty, with joy, [namely,] the only one God, our Deliverer, by means of Yeshua the Messiah our Master, be praise, and dominion, and honor, and majesty, both now and in all ages. Amen!”**

**Next Shabbat:**

**Shabbat “Zevach HaSh’lamim” – “Sacrifice of the Peace-Offerings”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Shabbat** | **Torah Reading:** | **Weekday Torah Reading:** |
| **זֶבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים** |  | **Saturday Afternoon** |
| **“Zevach HaSh’lamim”** | Reader 1 – Vayiqra 7:11-14 | Reader 1 – Vayiqra 8:1-3 |
| **“Sacrifice of the Peace-Offerings”** | Reader 2 – Vayiqra 7:15-19 | Reader 2 – Vayiqra 8:4-6 |
| **“sacrificio de la ofrenda de paz”** | Reader 3 – Vayiqra 7:20-23 | Reader 3 – Vayiqra 8:7-9 |
| Vayiqra (Lev.) 7:11-38 | Reader 4 – Vayiqra 7:24-27 |  |
| Ashlamatah: Hosea 14:3-10 +  Yoel 4:16-17 | Reader 5 – Vayiqra 7:28-30 | **Monday & Thursday**  **Mornings** |
|  | Reader 6 – Vayiqra 7:31-34 | Reader 1 – Vayiqra 8:1-3 |
| Psalm 76:8-13 | Reader 7 – Vayiqra 7:35-38 | Reader 2 – Vayiqra 8:4-6 |
|  | Maftir – Vayiqra 7:35-38 | Reader 3 – Vayiqra 8:7-9 |
| 1 Pet 2:13-17; Lk 11:1-14;  Acts 21:1-16 | Hos. 14:3-10 +  Yoel 4:16-17 |  |

**Coming Fast: Fast of the 10th of Tebeth**

**Friday the 13th of December, 2013**

**(sunrise to sundown fast only)**

**For more information see:**

[**http://www.betemunah.org/tevet10.html**](http://www.betemunah.org/tevet10.html)



Hakham Dr. Yosef ben Haggai

Rabbi Dr. Hillel ben David

Rabbi Dr. Eliyahu ben Abraham

1. Above, 1:2. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Thus the question arises: Why are these two sections addressed differently? [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Since Rashi understood Rabbi Shimon's statement as referring to the burnt-offering, it must be understood as follows: In the case of all other offerings, the priest eats part of the meat and thus derives some personal benefit, therefore he does not have to be urged on to perform their rites. In the case of the burnt-offering, however, he derives no benefit, since it is completely burnt on the altar; hence Scripture [speaking here of ***the law of the burnt-offering****],* preceded it by the expression, ***'command' Aaron and his sons, saying: This is the law of the burnt-offering****,* in order to urge them on to fulfill the commandment. — Ramban, however, argues that even from the burnt-offering the priests do derive a personal benefit, namely, the hide (further, 7:8). Accordingly he will interpret Rabbi Shimon's statement as referring to another matter, as he explains further on. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The meat of the sin-offering and the guilt-offering is eaten completely by the priests. They are also given a share of the peace-offering (further, 7 :34). The residue of the meal-offering after the handful was burnt on the altar, was eaten by the priests *(ibid.*, Verse 9). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. This is a reference to the hide of the animal which belongs to the priest (further, 7:8). — Rashi, however, considered this share of little value and hence he understood Rabbi Shimon's statement as applying to the burnt-offering, and that this was why the expression "command ..." is mentioned here, namely, because the priests incur a monetary loss, and hence they had to be urged on to fulfill the command. — Thus according to Rashi, Rabbi Shimon differs with the First Sage, *(Tanna Kamma)* [when a Mishnah or a Beraitha cites a number of different authorities, and the first authority is mentioned anonymously, that opinion generally is referred to that of the *Tanna Kamma]* who said that the expression "command ..." is mentioned here because it is a commandment binding at once and also for future generations, while Rabbi Shimon holds that this is not the reason for its use; instead, the reason for the expression "command ..." is because in attending to the burnt-offering the priests suffer a monetary loss, and hence they have to be urged on. Ramban, however, argues that even in the case of burnt-offerings the priests incur no monetary loss, since they keep the hides, hence Rabbi Shimon also agrees with the First Sage that the reason for the use of the expression "command ..." in this context is because it is a command binding at once and for future generations. Ramban then continues by saying that Rabbi Shimon's statement has no bearing on our subject of the burnt-offering, but its meaning is as will be explained further on. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. I.e., in other places. But here [in the case of the burnt-offering] Rabbi Shimon agrees with the reason stated by the First Sage. See Note 5 above. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Further, 24:2: ***Command the children of Israel, that they bring unto you pure olive oil beaten for the light*** *...* [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Numbers 35:2. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Further, Verse 13. This is interpreted by the Sages to mean that the High Priest is to bring a meal-offering every day, half of it in the morning and half thereof in the evening. The ordinary priest brought such a meal-offering at his installation into the priestly office, and it was known as the "meal offering of initiation." Since the money for these meal-offerings does not come from the public treasury but from the priests themselves, there is thus a monetary loss incurred by them, and hence the expression "Command Aaron and his sons ..." with which this section opens. If this is so, Rabbi Shimon's statement does refer to this section and Rashi was therefore correct in citing his words here as being ***an additional reason***to that of the First Sage as to why the expression "command ..." is mentioned here. However, etc. (see text). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. "Sifre." This is the version found in all texts of Ramban — but it should be "Sifra," as it is found here in Torath Kohanim at the beginning of the Seder. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Ramban's intent is as follows: When in a Tannaitic text the opinion of a second Sage is mentioned in the words: "Rabbi ... says," it indicates that he differs with the opinion of the First Sage. Where, however, it states: "Said Rabbi ..." it usually means that he agrees with the former opinion, but he makes an additional point to strengthen it further. Here, however, [in the text of the Sifra before Ramban] it states: "Rabbi Shimon says," and hence indicates that he ***differs***with the opinion of the First Sage. [It must be noted though that the Sifra text that *we* have has: "Said Rabbi Shimon," which vindicates that there is no difference of opinion between the two Sages. Ramban's Sifra text perforce must have had the reading: "Rabbi Shimon says ..." A similar reading is found in the Sifre *Naso* 1: Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai says ... "] [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. In our Rashi text: ***torah***. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. See Numbers 15:3-12 for the command that burnt-offerings and the peace-offerings had to be accompanied by an offering of wine. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Succah 48a. There were two such bowls there, one for the wine-libation and the other for the special water libation on the Festival of Succoth. "The bowl to the west was for water and that to the east was for wine" *(ibid.,* 48 b). [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Zebachim 83a. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. For just as the term ***torah***(law) denotes inclusion (one law for all things), so does the word ***hi***("she" or "it") denote exclusion, implying that the law under consideration does not apply to everything but is limited in its scope. It is the Sages who in their interpretation of the law determine in which cases it applies and in which it does not. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Exodus 23:18. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Mechilta *ibid.* See also Ramban there. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. See Zebachim 84a for full discussion of these cases. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Further, Verse 6. Ramban thus explains the impersonal language ["shall be kept burning"] as a command addressed to the priests. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. *Ibid.,* 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. See further, Note 25 where Ramban differs with Rashi in interpreting the expression ***Lo* *thichbeh'(it shall not go out)***which appears both in Verse 5 and Verse 6. Consequently Ramban writes here "in my opinion," alluding to the fact that this is not in consonance with Rashi's interpretation. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Yoma 22b. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Torath Kohanim, ***Tzav***2:7. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Ramban's intent is to allude to Rashi who wrote [in Verse 6]: "One who extinguishes the fire on the altar transgresses *two* negative commandments" [i.e., ***Lo* *thichbeh' (it shall not go out)***mentioned in Verse 5 and again in Verse 6]. According to Ramban, however, as explained above, the second ***lo thichbeh***is a special prohibition to the priests who look after the altar not to be careless in permitting the fire to be extinguished. Hence there is only one verse [5] referring to ***any***person who extinguishes the fire on the altar. Hence Ramban's expression, "It appears to me that he violates only one negative commandment." [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. The ordinary priest ministered in four garments: the tunic, breeches, turban, and the belt. To these the High Priest added four more pieces of raiment: the breastplate, the ephod, the robe and the frontlet. — The question then appears: since removing the ashes from the altar had to be done by a priest, why does Scripture here single out only two of the garments, the tunic and the breeches? — The taking up of the ashes was the very first act in the day's Service in the Sanctuary. See "The Commandments," Vol. I, pp. 38-39. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Yoma 22b. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Torath Kohanim, *Tzav* 2:1. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. I Samuel 4:12. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Psalms 133:2. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. II Samuel 20:8. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Rabbi Dosa (Yoma 12 b). See Ramban in Seder Pekudei (Exodus 39:28, Vol. II, p. 614). [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. The belt of the High Priest was made of blue, purple, scarlet [all wool] and twined linen. This is expressly stated in the Torah. The question appears as to how the belt for the common priests was made. Rabbi Dosa is of the opinion that it was made only of linen; Rabbi Yehudah Hanasi differs, holding that it was like that of the High Priest. Now since Onkelos, as explained by Ramban, explains the word *mido* as an inclusive term for "all" the priest's garments, and the verse states, ***and the priest shall put on 'mido'(his 'garments' of) linen,***Onkelos accordingly must agree with Rabbi Dosa that the belt of the common priest was unlike that of the High Priest, as the belt of the common priest was only of linen. Hence it states that the common priest will put on ***all*** his garments of linen which includes the belt. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. The subject-matter of this verse [4] should be clearly distinguished from that of the preceding verse. In Verse 3 the Torah commanded the priests to remove the ashes daily from the altar. This involved the priest's taking a silver pan and going up to the top of the altar, and afterwards "he cleared away the cinders on either side and he scooped up the ashes in the center. He then descended, and when he reached the pavement he turned his face to the north and went along the east side of the ascent for about ten cubits, and then made a heap of the cinders on the pavement three handbreadths away from the ascent" (Tamid 28 b). This process of course did not remove ***all***the ashes from upon the altar. This was done from time to time when there was a need for it, when so much accumulated that there was no more room on the woodpile. Then it was removed to a place outside the camp or Jerusalem. It is this latter subject which is the theme of the present verse. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Yoma 23 b. See my Hebrew commentary p. 29, that the Sage holding this opinion is Rabbi Eliezer. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Further, 16:32. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Verse 9. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Verse 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. "So that it becomes exactly like the meal-offering - that if it had become disqualified to be eaten, the food which touched it is also disqualified. And if the meal offering was fit to be eaten, the other food must also be eaten under the same stringency as the meal-offering" (Rashi, Verse 11). [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. If a meal-offering is brought by a non-priest, a handful of it is taken off by a priest and burnt on the altar, while the residue is eaten by the priests. Now the Torah specifies, however, that if the meal-offering is brought by a priest, it is to be ***wholly*** burnt (further, Verse 16). The question appears: is it necessary that a handful thereof be taken by a priest and be burnt separately on the altar, or that the whole meal-offering should be burnt at the same time as a unit? According to the text in Ramban before us, the answer is clearly in the affirmative. Scholars, however, have pointed to the Talmud (in Menachoth 72 b) where the conclusion is contrary to this text. The suggestion has therefore been made that the text here is faulty, and should be emended to read: "that even a meal offering of priests requires 'oil and frankincense' "(mentioned in Verse 8). See my Hebrew commentary, p. 29. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. In Verse 7 before us. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Verse 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Verse 10. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. The verse thus says that the reason, why the priests are not permitted even to apportion the residue of the meal-offering amongst themselves until the altar's share has gone up as a fire offering, is because the meal-offering is most holy, therefore it follows that the same principle applies to all offerings, since they are all holy. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. The Hebrew text reads: ***lo thei'apheh chametz chelkam . . .***The juxtaposition of the word ***chelkam***(their portion) to the word ***chametz*** (leavened) is the reason for the Rabbis' interpretation that the portion the priests receive from the meal-offering, neither may be baked with leaven. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. **One who is required to bring a sin-offering because of a transgression committed, cannot use sacred money [such as money of the Second Tithe, and the like]; but he must take some of his ordinary money and buy the offering with it. This principle is derived from the verse, *And Aaron will offer the bull of the sin-offering 'which is his'* (further, 16:6), that is, from the money which belongs to him. Sacred money, on the other hand, is not completely his to dispose of as he wishes.** [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Verse 16. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. Guide of the Perplexed III, 46. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. The meal-offerings which accompanied the Daily and Additional Offerings brought in the name of all Israel, were wholly burnt on the altar (Menachoth 73 b). Hence Rambam speaks of the ***minchath yachid***(the meal-offering of the individual). [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. ***"V'yidmeh***(and he will imagine)." Such is the text in Al Charizi's translation of the Moreh Nebuchim, which Ramban follows. The intent would seem to be that the priest who is offering his own meal-offering will imagine that he has performed no Divine Service, and therefore he might violate the laws regarding the eating of the residue. Hence the Torah prohibited him from eating it. In Ibn Tibbon's translation, however, the reading is: ***"V'loyeira'eh***(and it will not appear)," that is, to others, that a Service has been performed, and therefore they will hold the priest in disregard for eating it. That is why the Torah commanded that it be wholly burnt. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. See Note 16 above, that the term ***torah*** or ***torath*** ("law" or "law of")at the beginning of a section, denotes inclusion, while ***hi***denotes exclusion. So also the word ***zoth***(this), as it says here in this case, ***zoth torath*** *. . . (this is the law of. . . ),* means exclusion. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. Sin-offerings were of two kinds: (a) those whose blood was sprinkled on the outer altar, and are therefore referred to as the "outer sin-offerings." These included most of the sin-offerings. After the sprinkling of the blood and the burning of the fats, the meat was eaten by the priests, (b) The second group was called "the inner sin-offerings," because their blood was taken into the interior of the Sanctuary to be sprinkled in front of the Veil overhanging the Holy of Holies, as well as on the golden altar (see above, 4:6-7; 17-18), and on the Day of Atonement also in front of the ark (further, 16:14-15). These sin-offerings were wholly burnt outside the camp [and later, after the Sanctuary was built, they were burnt outside the city of Jerusalem]. Now here in Verse 20 Scripture states the law regarding "the ***outer***sin-offerings," that if any of their blood was sprinkled upon a garment, the garment must be washed in a holy place [i.e., in the Court of the Sanctuary]. But it does not say this law with regard to "the inner sin-offerings." Since the section, however, begins with the expression**[zoth] *'torath' hachatath******(this is 'the law' of the sin offering)****,* and the word ***torath***denotes inclusion, we know that the same law applies to both kinds of sin offering. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Above, 4:24. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Ibid., Verses 29, 33. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Peace-offerings could be brought ***only by an individual****,* and they were considered of a lesser degree of holiness. Only once a year, namely, on the Festival of Shavuoth, were peace-offerings brought by the public (see further, 23: 19). These were considered among **"the most holy offerings."** Offerings which were most holy were slaughtered on the north side of the altar, and could be eaten only by male priests, within the Court of the Sanctuary, during the same day and night; those that were holy to a lesser degree were slaughtered in any part of the Court, and could be eaten by any person, within the enclosed city of Jerusalem, for two days and the intervening night. The thanks-offering and the Nazirite's ram, though holy to a lesser degree, could be eaten only the same day and the ensuing night. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
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