

כאן בגופן שלנו. כאן בגופן שלהן.

אמר ליה אבני: במאי אוקימתא לההיא – בגופן שלהן, מאי אידיא מקרא שכתבו תרגום ותרגום שכתבו מקרא? אפילו מקרא שכתבו מקרא ותרגום שכתבו תרגום נמי, דהא קתני: "עד שיכתבנו אשורית על הספר בדיו!"

אלא, לא קשיא: הא – רבנן, הא – רבן שמעון בן גמליאל.

אי רבן שמעון בן גמליאל, הא איכא יומת! אלא, לא קשיא: כאן – בספרים, כאן – בתפלין ומזוזות.

תפלין ומזוזות מאי טעמא – משום דכתביב בהו: "והיו", בהוייתן יהו, מאי תרגום שכתבו מקרא איכא? בשלמא תורה – איכא "יגר שהדוהא". אלא הכא, מאי תרגום איכא?

אלא לא קשיא: כאן – במגילה, כאן – בספרים. מגילה מאי טעמא – דכתביב בה: "בכתבם וכלשונם", – מאי תרגום שכתבו מקרא איכא?

אמר רב פפא: "ונשמע פתגם המלך". רב נחמן בר יצחק אמר: "וכל הנשים יתנו יקר לבעליהן".

רב אשי אמר: כי תנא ההיא בשאר ספרים, ורבי יהודה היא. דתנא: תפלין ומזוזות אין נכתבין אלא אשורית, ורבתינו התירו יומת.

Here, the mishna is referring to Torah scrolls written in another language **in our script**, i.e., in Hebrew letters. **There**, the *baraita* is referring to Torah scrolls written in another language **in their script**, in the letters of another alphabet.

Abaye said to Rava: **How did you establish that *baraita***, i.e., that it is referring to Torah scrolls written in another language **in their script**? If it is so, **why did the *baraita* specifically teach** that the legal status of a Hebrew verse in the Bible **that one wrote in Aramaic translation, or a verse written in Aramaic translation that one wrote in the Hebrew of the Bible**, is not that of sacred writings? The legal status of **even** a Hebrew verse in the Bible **that one wrote in the Hebrew of the Bible and a verse written in Aramaic translation that one wrote in Aramaic translation** are also not that of sacred writings, **as it is taught** at the end of the *baraita*: A Torah scroll renders the hands impure **only if one writes it in Ashurit script, on a parchment scroll, and in ink**.

Rather, the matter must be explained differently. This is **not difficult**. This ruling in the mishna is according to **the Rabbis**, who permit writing Torah scrolls in any language, and **that ruling in the *baraita*** is according to **Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel**.

The Gemara asks: If the *baraita* is according to **Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel**, in addition to *Ashurit*, **isn't there Greek** in which the Torah may also be written? **Rather**, say this is **not difficult**. **Here**, the mishna is referring to Torah scrolls, which may be written in any language; **there**, the *baraita* is referring to phylacteries and *mezuzot*, which may be written only in Hebrew, using Hebrew script.

The Gemara asks: With regard to **phylacteries and *mezuzot***, **what is the reason** that they must be written in Hebrew? The Gemara explains: It is **because it is written with regard to them**: "And these words shall be" (Deuteronomy 6:6), indicating that **as they are so shall they be**, without change. The Gemara raises a difficulty: If the *baraita* is referring to phylacteries and *mezuzot*, **what Aramaic translation that one wrote in the Hebrew of the Bible is there**? **Granted**, in the Torah **there is a verse written in Aramaic translation**: "*Yegar sahaduta*" (Genesis 31:47); **however, here**, in phylacteries and *mezuzot*, **what verses in Aramaic translation are thereⁿ** that could be written in Hebrew?

Rather, say this is **not difficult**. **Here**, the *baraita* is referring to the *Megilla*, the Scroll of Esther, which must be written in Hebrew; **there**, the mishna is referring to Torah scrolls, which may be written in any language. The Gemara asks: **What is the reason** that the *Megilla* must be written in Hebrew? It is due to the fact **that it is written with regard to the *Megilla***: "According to their writing, and according to their language" (Esther 8:9), without change. The Gemara asks: But if the *baraita* is referring to the *Megilla*, **what Aramaic translation that one wrote in the Hebrew of the Bible is there**? The entire *Megilla* is written in Hebrew.

Rav Pappa said that it is written: "And when the king's decree [*pitgam*] shall be publicized" (Esther 1:20), and that *pitgam* is essentially an Aramaic word. Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said that it is written: "And all the wives will give honor [*yekar*]ⁿ to their husbands" (Esther 1:20), and *yekar* is Aramaic for honor.

Rav Ashi suggested a different explanation and said: **When that *baraita* is taught** it is taught with regard to the rest of the books of the Bible, other than the Torah. **And it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda**, as it is taught in a *baraita*: **Phylacteries and *mezuzot* are written only in Ashurit; and our Rabbis permitted writing them in Greek as well**.

NOTES

What verses in Aramaic translation are there – מאי תרגום – איכא: The *Penei Yehoshua* explains that it was possible to say, according to some *tanna'im*, that the word *totafot* (Deuteronomy 6:8) that refers to the phylacteries donned on the head, is in a foreign language, and therefore it would be possible to translate it.

Will give honor [*yekar*] – יתנו יקר: Some ask: Why doesn't the Gemara cite an earlier verse with the same term: "And the honor [*yekar*] of his excellent majesty" (Esther 1:4)? They answer that in that context, the word could be understood in Hebrew, meaning great value, and not in Aramaic, meaning honor (*Responsa Beit Efrayim; Ginzei HaMelekh*).

NOTES

Only in a Torah scroll – אֵלֶּיָא בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרָה: Although the sanctity of the Torah scroll surpasses all the other books, since there was a unique miracle specifically with regard to the translation of the Torah, it is permitted to write the Torah in Greek. However, other books translated into Greek do not have the status of sacred texts.

God created in the beginning [bereshit] – אֱלֹהִים: See the Tosefta where this explanation and the significance of the change are questioned. The believers in two powers explained that bereshit refers to the logos, the divine will. Since they took it to the next level and totally separated the logos from God, it was necessary to write that it was God who created this world. See the translation in the Jerusalem Targum of the word bereshit as: In His wisdom.

I shall make man – אֶעֱשֶׂה אָדָם: Some note that this translation resolves an additional problem, as from the original verse one could draw the mistaken conclusion that God has human form. Therefore, they wrote: In image and in likeness. See the explanation in Ibn Ezra's commentary on the Torah (Korban HaEda; Rashash; Sefat Emet).

Male and female He created him – זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בְּרָאוּ: It is written in the Jerusalem Talmud and elsewhere that the change was that the creation of the female was not mentioned at all.

BACKGROUND

The Septuagint – תַּרְגוּם הַשֶּׁבַעִים: The Septuagint was the first translation of the Torah into a foreign language. The Sages related to the very translation of the Torah with great concern, to the extent that the day that the Septuagint was completed was designated as a fast in Megillat Ta'anit. Over time, the translation was accepted to a large extent as useful and significant, and as mentioned in the mishna it was accorded status of special significance. Among Egyptian Jews the Septuagint was revered and accorded great sanctity.

There is an extended version of this story in Greek, in the ancient letter of Aristeas, which is similar to the account related in the Gemara. It describes the efforts of the king to organize the translation as well as the wisdom of the Elders who came from Eretz Yisrael for that purpose.

The textual changes in the Septuagint – שִׁנוּיֵי הַנֶּסֶח בְּשַׁבְּעִים: The Septuagint was preserved primarily because the Christians adopted it and ascribed greater significance to it than they ascribed to the Hebrew original. Throughout the generations the translation went through several changes, and apparently even Aquila and Symmachus, the Jewish translators, created a version more in line with the approach of the halakha. In general, there are many differences between the source text and the Septuagint. The current version contains additional passages, and even entire books, i.e., the Apocrypha. Not all of the changes cited here appear in the current version of the Septuagint, although they did appear in the versions used by the Jews.

וְהִכְתִּיב: "וְהָיָה!" אֵלֶּיָא אִימָא: סְפָרִים נִכְתָּבִים בְּכָל לָשׁוֹן, וְרַבּוּתֵנוּ הִתְרוּ יוֹנֵת. הִתְרוּ? מִכָּלֵל דְּתִנָּא קִמָּא אָסְרִ!

אֵלֶּיָא אִימָא: רַבּוּתֵנוּ לֹא הִתְרוּ שִׁיבְתָבוּ אֵלֶּיָא יוֹנֵת. וְתִנָּא, אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה: אִף כִּשְׁהִתְרוּ רַבּוּתֵנוּ יוֹנֵת – לֹא הִתְרוּ אֵלֶּיָא בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרָה.

וּמִשׁוֹם מַעֲשֵׂה דְתַלְמֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ, דְּתִנָּא: מַעֲשֵׂה בְתַלְמֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁבַעִים שְׁבַעִים וּשְׁנַיִם זְקֵנִים, וְהִכְנִיחֵן בְּשַׁבְּעִים וּשְׁנַיִם בְּתֵימָם, וְלֹא גִילָה לְהֵם עַל מַה כִּינָּחֵן. וְנִכְנַס אֶצְלָם כָּל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד וְאָמַר לְהֵם: כְּתָבוּ לִי תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה רַבְּכֶם. נִתֵּן הַקְדוּשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא בְּלִבְכֶם כָּל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד עֲצָה, וְהִסְכַּמְנוּ בּוֹלָן לְדַעַת אַחַת.

וְכָתְבוּ לוֹ: "אֱלֹהִים בְּרָא בְּרֵאשִׁית", אֶעֱשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמִי וּבְדְמוּתִי,

וַיִּכְלַם בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁשִׁי, וַיְשַׁבֵּת בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי, זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בְּרָאוּ" וְלֹא כְּתָבוּ "בְּרֵאשִׁית"

"וְהָבֵה אֲרָדָה וְאֶבְלָה שָׁם שְׁפָתָם" וַיִּתְצַח שָׂרָה בְּקִרְבָּהּ,

The Gemara asks: How did our Rabbis permit this? Isn't it written with regard to phylacteries and mezuzot: "And these words shall be" (Deuteronomy 6:6), indicating that their language may not be changed. Rather, say that this is what the baraita is saying: Torah scrolls are written in any language; and our Rabbis permitted writing them in Greek as well. Once again the Gemara asks: Our Rabbis permitted? By inference, apparently the first tanna prohibits writing a Torah scroll in Greek. However, he explicitly permits writing a Torah scroll in any language.

Rather, say in explanation of the baraita: And our Rabbis permitted them to be written only in Greek. And it is taught in another baraita that Rabbi Yehuda said: Even when our Rabbis permitted Greek, they permitted it only in a Torah scroll,^N and not for other books of the Bible, which must be written only in Hebrew.

The Gemara continues: And this was due to the incident of King Ptolemy, as it is taught in a baraita: There was an incident involving King Ptolemy^P of Egypt, who assembled seventy-two Elders^B from the Sages of Israel, and put them into seventy-two separate rooms, and did not reveal to them for what purpose he assembled them, so that they would not coordinate their responses. He entered and approached each and every one, and said to each of them: Write for me a translation of the Torah of Moses your teacher. The Holy One, Blessed be He, placed wisdom in the heart of each and every one, and they all agreed to one common understanding.^B Not only did they all translate the text correctly, they all introduced the same changes into the translated text.

And they wrote for him: God created in the beginning [bereshit],^N reversing the order of the words in the first phrase in the Torah that could be misinterpreted as: "Bereshit created God" (Genesis 1:1). They did so to negate those who believe in the preexistence of the world and those who maintain that there are two powers in the world: One is Bereshit, who created the second, God. And they wrote: I shall make man^N in image and in likeness, rather than: "Let us make man in our image and in our likeness" (Genesis 1:26), as from there too one could mistakenly conclude that there are multiple powers and that God has human form.

Instead of: "And on the seventh day God concluded His work" (Genesis 2:2), which could have been understood as though some of His work was completed on Shabbat itself, they wrote: And on the sixth day He concluded His work, and He rested on the seventh day. They also wrote: Male and female He created him,^N and they did not write as it is written in the Torah: "Male and female He created them" (Genesis 5:2), to avoid the impression that there is a contradiction between this verse and the verse: "And God created man" (Genesis 1:27), which indicates that God created one person.

Instead of: "Come, let us go down, and there confound their language" (Genesis 11:7), which indicates multiple authorities, they wrote in the singular: Come, let me go down, and there confound their language. In addition, they replaced the verse: "And Sarah laughed within herself [bekirba]" (Genesis 18:12), with: And Sarah laughed among her relatives [bikroveha]. They made this change to distinguish between Sarah's laughter, which God criticized, and Abraham's laughter, to which no reaction is recorded. Based on the change, Sarah's laughter was offensive because she voiced it to others.

PERSONALITIES

King Ptolemy – תַּלְמֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ: This is the king of Egypt, Ptolemaius II Philadelphus, who ruled over Egypt during the years 246–285 BCE. He inherited his kingdom, which included Eretz Yisrael and parts of North Africa, from his father, Ptolemy I. After his succession to the throne, he worked to establish and organize the kingdom in various ways. He was known as an admirer of culture and science, and during his reign Alexandria developed into the

scientific center of the Hellenistic world. Both the Talmud and the letter of Aristeas attribute the initiative to translate the Torah into Greek to King Ptolemy. Apparently, he showed interest in Eretz Yisrael and had a friendly relationship with the Jews. He renamed the ancient city of Rabat Ammon, which is modern-day Amman, Philadelphia, after himself. The city of Ptolemaius, near Akko, was also named for him.

כִּי בְאַפָּם הָרְגוּ שׂוֹר וּבְרִצּוֹנָם עָקְרוּ אֲבוֹס׃ וַיִּקַּח מֹשֶׁה אֶת אִשְׁתּוֹ וְאֶת בָּנָיו וַיִּרְכְּבֵם עַל נֹשֵׂא בְנֵי אָדָם׃

They also altered the verse: “For in their anger they slew a man and in their self-will they slaughtered an ox” (Genesis 49:6), to read: **For in their anger they slew an ox^N and in their self-will they uprooted a trough**, to avoid the charge that Jacob’s sons were murderers. Instead of: “And Moses took his wife and his sons, and set them upon a donkey” (Exodus 4:20), they wrote: **And Moses took his wife and his sons, and set them upon a carrier of people^N**, which could be understood as referring to a horse or a camel rather than the lowly donkey.

”וּמוֹשֶׁה בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יָשָׁב בְּמִצְרַיִם וּבִשְׂאֵר אַרְצוֹת אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה׃ וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת זַאֲטוּיֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ וְאֵל זַאֲטוּיֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא שִׁלַּח יָדוֹ׃

Instead of: “And the residence of the children of Israel, who resided in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years” (Exodus 12:40), which when read literally is imprecise, for they did not dwell in Egypt that long, they wrote: **And the residence of the children of Israel, who resided in Egypt and in other lands, was four hundred years^N**. Instead of: “And he sent the youth of the children of Israel, who brought burnt-offerings” (Exodus 24:5), which evokes the question of why young men were sent to perform that service, they wrote: **And he sent the elect [za’atutei]^{NL} of the children of Israel**. The same term was substituted again several verses later, rendering the verse: “And upon the nobles of the children of Israel He laid not His hand” (Exodus 24:11), as: **And upon the elect of the children of Israel He laid not His hand**.

NOTES

They slew an ox – הָרְגוּ שׂוֹר: Some point out that had they written man, it could have been misunderstood as saying that Jacob was upset due to the murder of a single individual, Shechem, or, according to certain opinions, due to his sons’ intention to kill Joseph. Therefore, they wrote ox to show that Jacob was upset about the wanton slaying of animals, and all the more so over the slaying of people (*Penei Yehoshua*).

A carrier of people – נֹשֵׂא בְנֵי אָדָם: Some explain that they did not write donkey, so that people would not wonder why Moses did not find a quicker animal, in order to accelerate the redemption of the Jewish people (*Ge’on Ya’akov*). Others explain that it is disrespectful to Moses to mention a donkey, as that would depict him walking on foot alongside the animal (*Gal Naul*).

Four hundred years – אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה: Some write that they wrote specifically four hundred years and not 430 so that it would correspond to the number mentioned in the revelation to Abraham during the Covenant of the Pieces (*Yefe Mareh*).

Elect – זַאֲטוּיֵי: Rav Tzemaḥ Gaon explains that *za’atutei* means relatively young men; not youths and not elders, but in between.

LANGUAGE

Elect [za’atutei] – זַאֲטוּיֵי: This word does not appear in this form in the Septuagint, and there it is translated as: Young man. It might be a Semitic word, with *zut* meaning small in the sense of youth or young man. In the Jerusalem Talmud it is stated that there is an ancient Torah scroll in which this word appears instead of youth. Some maintain that it is the Greek ζήτητής, *zētētēs*, meaning seeker or inquirer.

Perek I
Daf 9 Amud b

”לֹא חָמַד אֶחָד מֵהֶם נִשְׂאֵתִי׃ אֲשֶׁר חָלַק ה’ אֱלֹהֶיךָ אִתָּם לְהָאִיר לְכָל הָעַמִּים׃

Instead of Moses’ assertion: “I have not taken one donkey [*hamor*] from them” (Numbers 16:15), they wrote in more general terms: **“I have not taken one item of value [*hemed*] from them,”^N** to prevent the impression that Moses took other items. To the verse that discusses the worship of the sun and the moon, about which it is written: “Which the Lord your God has allotted to all the nations” (Deuteronomy 4:19), they added a word to make it read: **“Which the Lord your God has allotted to give light to all the nations,”** to prevent the potential misinterpretation that the heavenly bodies were given to the gentiles so that they may worship them.

”וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיַּעֲבֹד אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים אֲשֶׁר לֹא צִוִּיתִי לַעֲבֹדָם׃

The verse: **“And has gone and served other gods, and worshipped them, either the sun, or the moon, or any of the host of heaven, which I have not commanded”** (Deuteronomy 17:3), could be understood as indicating that God did not command their existence, i.e., these entities created themselves. Therefore, when these Elders translated the verse they added a word to the end of the verse to make it read: **Which I have not commanded to serve them**.

”וּכְתָבוּ לוֹ ׀ אֶת צְעִירַת הָרְגָלִים׃ וְלֹא כָתְבוּ לוֹ ׀ אֶת הָאַרְנֶבֶת׃ מִפְּנֵי שֶׁאִשְׁתּוֹ שֶׁל תַּלְמִי אַרְנֶבֶת שְׁמָהּ׃ שְׁלֹא יֵאמַר׃ שֶׁחָקוּ בֵּי הַיְהוּדִים׃ וְהִשְׁלִיחוּ שֵׁם אִשְׁתִּי בַּתּוֹרָה׃

And in the list of unclean animals they wrote for him: **The short-legged beast [*tze’irat haraglayim*].^L And they did not write for him: “And the hare [*arnevet*]” (Leviticus 11:6), since the name of Ptolemy’s wife was Arnevet, so that he would not say: **The Jews have mocked me and inserted my wife’s name in the Torah**. Therefore, they did not refer to the hare by name, but by one of its characteristic features.**

NOTES

I have not taken one item of value from them – לֹא חָמַד אֶחָד מֵהֶם נִשְׂאֵתִי: The Maharsha writes that the Sages explained the verse: “I have not taken one donkey from them,” as follows: Even when Moses needed to travel from Midian to Egypt to take the Jews out of Egypt, he did not take from the children of Israel even the donkey on which he transported his family. Since the seventy-two Elders feared Ptolemy’s reaction, they changed the term from donkey to item of value.

LANGUAGE

Short-legged beast [*tze’irat haraglayim*] – צְעִירַת הָרְגָלִים: The seventy-two Elders, in their translation of the word hare in the list of non-kosher animals, used the word *δασύπους*, *dasupous*, which literally means hairy-legged or rough-footed, instead of the standard term for hare, *λαγός*, *lagos*. They did so because the nickname of the founder of the Ptolemeian kingdom, Ptolemy I, was also named Lagos, and they sought to avoid alluding to him in that context.

NOTES

The beauty of Japheth – יָפֶתְהוּ שֶׁל יָפֶת – It is stated in the Jerusalem Talmud that the Greek language is one of the four beautiful languages in the world, and in Eretz Yisrael, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi preferred Greek to the spoken Aramaic.

A High Priest anointed with the oil of anointing and one consecrated by donning the multiple garments – כֹּהֵן מְשֻׁחַ – בְּשֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה לְמִרְיָבָה בְּגָדִים: When the anointing oil was available, until the time of the King Josiah, who sequestered it together with the Ark of the Covenant and the tablets, the High Priests were consecrated by anointment with this oil. However, afterward, the High Priest was appointed by pronouncement (see Jerusalem Talmud) and assumed his position by donning the eight garments of the High Priest and performing the service of the High Priest.

The bull that comes for transgression of any of the mitzvot – פֶּר הַבָּא עַל כָּל הַמִּצְוֹת: There is a special halakha with regard to a High Priest, as it is written: “If the anointed priest shall sin so as to bring guilt on the people” (Leviticus 4:3). If he mistakenly issued a lenient ruling with regard to a prohibition punishable by karet, and he acted in accordance with his ruling, he is liable to bring a bull as a sin-offering. Based on the phrase “if the anointed priest,” it is clear that any other priest is exempt from bringing that offering.

A High Priest currently serving and a former High Priest – כֹּהֵן מְשֻׁמֵּשׁ וְכֹהֵן שֶׁעָבַר: Most of the commentaries explain this with regard to a High Priest on Yom Kippur who was rendered unfit and unable to perform the service, requiring the appointment of a different priest in his stead. However, the Rambam and Rabbeinu Yehonatan explain that a former High Priest does not refer specifically to one temporarily replaced. Rather it refers to one who retired due to old age or a permanent blemish, who maintains the legal status of a High Priest. See Penei Yehoshua and Sefat Emet, who adopt the explanation in the Jerusalem Talmud.

BACKGROUND

Donning the multiple garments – מִרְיָבָה בְּגָדִים: A common priest wore four garments, while the High Priest wore eight.



Garments of a common priest and the High Priest

רַבֵּן שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל אוֹמֵר אִף בְּסַפְרִים לֹא הִתִּירוּ שְׂיִבְתָּבוּ אֶלְאִי וְיִנִּית. אָמַר רַבִּי אֲבָהוּ אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: הִלְכָה כְּרַבֵּן שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל וְאָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מֵאֵי טַעְמָא דְרַבֵּן שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל – אָמַר קָרָא: “יָפֶתְ אֱלֹהִים לְיָפֶת וַיִּשְׁכֵּן בְּאֶהֱלֵי שֵׁם” דְּבִרְיוֹ שֶׁל יָפֶת יֵהִיוּ בְּאֶהֱלֵי שֵׁם.

וְאֵימָא גּוֹמֵר וּמְגוּג! אָמַר רַבִּי חִיָּא בַר אֲבָא: הֵינּוּ טַעְמָא, דְּכִתְיִב: “יָפֶתְ אֱלֹהִים לְיָפֶת” יָפֶתְהוּ שֶׁל יָפֶת יֵהִיא בְּאֶהֱלֵי שֵׁם.

מִתַּנִּי אֵין בֵּין כֹּהֵן מְשֻׁחַ בְּשֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה לְמִרְיָבָה בְּגָדִים אֶלְאִי פֶּר הַבָּא עַל כָּל הַמִּצְוֹת.

אֵין בֵּין כֹּהֵן מְשֻׁמֵּשׁ לְכֹהֵן שֶׁעָבַר אֶלְאִי פֶּר יוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים וְעֵשִׂירִית הָאֵיפָה.

גַּמ' הָא לְעֵנִין פֶּר יוֹם כִּפּוּרִים וְעֵשִׂירִית הָאֵיפָה – זֶה וְזֶה שְׁוִין.

The mishna cites that Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Even with regard to Torah scrolls, the Sages permitted them to be written only in Greek.^H Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Yohanan said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel. And Rabbi Yohanan said: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel? He based his opinion on an allusion in the Torah, as the verse states: “God shall enlarge Japheth, and He shall dwell in the tents of Shem” (Genesis 9:27), indicating that the words of Japheth shall be in the tents of Shem. The language of Javan, who is the forbear of the Greek nation and one of the descendants of Japheth, will also serve as a sacred language in the tents of Shem, where Torah is studied.

The Gemara asks: And say that it is the languages of Gomer and Magog that serve as sacred languages, as they too were descendants of Japheth (see Genesis 10:2). The Gemara answers that Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba said: This is the reason, as it is written: “God shall enlarge [yafet] Japheth [Yefet].” Yafet is etymologically similar to the Hebrew term for beauty [yofit]. The verse teaches that the beauty of Japheth^N shall be in the tents of Shem, and Greek is the most beautiful of the languages of the descendants of Japheth.

MISHNA The difference between a High Priest anointed with the oil of anointing, which was the method through which High Priests were consecrated until the oil was sequestered toward the end of the First Temple period, and one consecrated by donning multiple garments^{NHB} unique to the High Priest, which was the practice during the Second Temple period, is only that the latter does not bring the bull that comes for transgression of any of the mitzvot.^N An anointed High Priest who unwittingly issued an erroneous halakhic ruling and acted upon that ruling, and transgressed a mitzva whose unwitting violation renders one liable to bring a sin-offering, is obligated to bring a sin-offering unique to one in his position.

The difference between a High Priest currently serving in that capacity and a former High Priest,^{NH} who temporarily filled that position when the High Priest was unfit for service, is only with regard to the bull brought by the High Priest on Yom Kippur, and the tenth of an ephah meal-offering brought daily by the High Priest. Each of these offerings is brought only by the current High Priest, and not by a former High Priest.

GEMARA The Gemara infers that with regard to the matter of the bull brought by the High Priest on Yom Kippur, and with regard to the tenth of an ephah meal-offering, both this, the anointed High Priest, and that, the High Priest consecrated by donning multiple garments, are equal.

HALAKHA

With regard to Torah scrolls, the Sages permitted them to be written only in Greek – בְּסַפְרִים לֹא הִתִּירוּ שְׂיִבְתָּבוּ אֶלְאִי וְיִנִּית: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel who permitted the Torah to be written in Greek, and it has the sanctity of a Torah scroll. Due to the fact that the modern Greek language is not the Greek discussed in the Gemara, Torah scrolls written in Greek are no longer sacred (Rambam Sefer Ahava, Hilkhot Tefillin 1:19).

Anointed with the oil of anointing and donning the multiple garments – מִשְׁחָה בְּשֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה וּמִרְיָבָה בְּגָדִים: The difference between a High Priest anointed with the anointing oil and a High Priest consecrated by donning multiple garments

is only with regard to the bull that comes for transgression of any of the mitzvot, which a priest consecrated by donning multiple garments does not bring. In all other respects, they are equal (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash 4:14).

A High Priest currently serving and a former High Priest – כֹּהֵן מְשֻׁמֵּשׁ וְכֹהֵן שֶׁעָבַר: In the case of an anointed High Priest who left his position, if he sinned unwittingly he brings a bull as a sin-offering, as the only difference between a current High Priest and a former High Priest is with regard to the bull brought by the High Priest on Yom Kippur and the tenth of an ephah meal-offering he brings daily (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Shegagot 15:7).

לְכָל – With regard to all other matters this and that are equal – דְּבָרֵיהֶן זֶה וְזֶה שְׁוִין: The sanctity, the status, and all the prohibitions of the High Priest continue to apply to a former High Priest. When he serves, he dons eight garments; he may not become impure even when his relatives die; he does not grow his hair or rip his garments when he is in mourning; he sacrifices offerings during his period of acute mourning; it is prohibited for him to marry a widow; he is required to marry a virgin; and one who killed another unwittingly returns home from the city of refuge upon his death.

The second is fit neither as a High Priest nor as a common priest – שְׁנֵי אֵינּוּ רְאוּי לֹא לְכַהֵן גְּדוּל וְלֹא לְכַהֵן הֶדְיוּט – This is explicit in the Jerusalem Talmud; see *Orah HaHalakha* with regard to the opinion of the Rambam. Even according to Rabbi Yosei the replacement priest is not fundamentally unfit to be the High Priest; it is merely to prevent animosity and competition that two High Priests cannot serve simultaneously. Although the sanctity and status of the second priest is that of a High Priest, he does not serve as the High Priest. The Ramban writes that when the first priest dies, the priest who temporarily replaced him takes precedence in the choosing of his successor.

HALAKHA

אִירַע בּוֹ – If temporary disqualification befell the High Priest – פְּסוּל: If a High Priest is rendered temporarily unfit and another priest is appointed in his stead for the Yom Kippur service, the High Priest reassumes his position after Yom Kippur, and his replacement is relieved of his duty. Nevertheless, all the mitzvot of the High Priest remain incumbent upon the temporary replacement, although he does not perform the service of the High Priest. If he does perform the service of the High Priest, the service is valid, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Yosei, as the *halakha* is in accordance with his opinion in tractate *Yoma* (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 1:3).

PERSONALITIES

Yosef ben Elem – יוֹסֵף בֶּן אֵלֶם – This incident was also related in *Antiquities of the Jews* by Josephus Flavius (Book 17, Chapter 6). When a disqualification befell the High Priest Mattathias, his relative Yosef ben Elem was appointed in his stead for one day.

מִתְנַתֵּינן דְּלֹא כְּרַבִּי מְאִיר, דְּאִי רַבִּי מְאִיר, [הָא תַנְיָא]: מְרֻבָּה בְּגָדִים מְבִיא פֶר הַבָּא עַל כָּל הַמְצוֹת, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי מְאִיר. וְחֻכְמִים אוֹמְרִים: אֵינוּ מְבִיא.

The Gemara comments: **The mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, as if it were in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, it would be difficult. Isn't it taught in a baraita: A High Priest consecrated by donning the multiple garments unique to the High Priest brings the bull brought for the unwitting violation of any of the mitzvot; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Rabbis say: He does not bring that offering.**

מֵאִי טַעְמִיָּה דְּרַבִּי מְאִיר – דְּתַנְיָא: "מְשִׁיחִי", אֵין לִי אֵלֶּא מְשִׁיחַ בְּשִׁמְן הַמְּשִׁחָה, מְרֻבָּה בְּגָדִים מִזֵּן? תַלְמוּד לומר: "הַמְּשִׁיחִי".

The Gemara asks: **What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Meir? It is as it is taught in a baraita that it is written: "If the anointed priest shall sin" (Leviticus 4:3). From the word anointed, I have derived only that this halakha applies to a High Priest who was actually anointed with the oil of anointing. From where do I derive that even a High Priest consecrated by donning the multiple garments is also included in this halakha? The verse states: "The anointed," with the definite article, indicating that the halakha applies to every High Priest.**

בְּמֵאִי אוֹקִימָנָא – דְּלֹא כְּרַבִּי מְאִיר. אֵימָא סִיפָא: אֵין בֵּין כֹּהֵן מְשִׁיחַ לְכַהֵן שְׁעֵבֵר אֵלֶּא פֶר יוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים וְעִשְׂרִית הָאֵיפָה, הָא לְכָל דְּבָרֵיהֶן – זֶה וְזֶה שְׁוִין. אֲתָאן לְרַבִּי מְאִיר, דְּתַנְיָא: אִירַע בּוֹ פְּסוּל וּמֵינֵן כֹּהֵן אַחֵר תַּחֲתָיו – רֵאשׁוֹן חֲזוֹר לְעִבּוּדָתוֹ, שְׁנֵי – כָּל מְצוֹת כְּהוֹנָה גְּדוּלָה עֲלֵיו, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי מְאִיר. רַבִּי יוֹסֵי אוֹמֵר: רֵאשׁוֹן חֲזוֹר לְעִבּוּדָתוֹ, שְׁנֵי אֵינוּ רְאוּי לֹא לְכַהֵן גְּדוּל וְלֹא לְכַהֵן הֶדְיוּט.

The Gemara asks: **How did we establish the mishna? We established that it is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir. Say the latter clause of the mishna: The difference between a High Priest currently serving in that capacity and a former High Priest is only with regard to the bull brought on Yom Kippur, and the tenth of an ephah meal-offering. The Gemara infers that with regard to all other matters, both this, a High Priest currently serving, and that, a former High Priest, are equal.** If so we have arrived at the opinion of Rabbi Meir, as it is taught in a baraita: **If temporary disqualification befell the High Priest,^h and they appointed another priest in his stead, then after the cause of disqualification of the first priest passes, he returns to his service as High Priest. With regard to the second priest, all of the mitzvot of the High Priest are incumbent upon him; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yosei says: The first returns to his service; the second is fit to serve neither as a High Priest nor as a common priest.ⁿ**

וְאָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסֵי: מַעֲשֵׂה כְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵף בֶּן אֵלֶם מְצִיפּוּרֵי שְׁאִירַע בּוֹ פְּסוּל בְּכַהֵן גְּדוּל, וּמֵינֵהוּ תַּחֲתָיו, וּבָא מַעֲשֵׂה לְפָנֵי חֻכְמִים וְאָמְרוּ: רֵאשׁוֹן חֲזוֹר לְעִבּוּדָתוֹ, שְׁנֵי אֵינוּ רְאוּי לֹא לְכַהֵן גְּדוּל וְלֹא לְכַהֵן הֶדְיוּט.

And Rabbi Yosei said: **There was an incident involving the priest Rabbi Yosef ben Elem^p of Tzipori, who, when disqualification befell a High Priest, the priests appointed him in his stead. And after the cause of the disqualification was resolved, the incident came before the Sages for a ruling with regard to the status of Rabbi Yosef ben Elem. And the Sages said: The original High Priest returns to his service, while the second is fit to serve neither as High Priest nor as a common priest.**

כֹּהֵן גְּדוּל – מְשׁוּם אִיבָה, כֹּהֵן הֶדְיוּט – מְשׁוּם "מַעֲלִין בְּקוֹדֶשׁ וְלֹא מוֹרִידִין". רִישָׁא רַבְנָן וְסִיפָא רַבִּי מְאִיר!?

The Gemara explains: Neither as a **High Priest, due to hatred, jealousy, and bitterness** that would arise if there were two High Priests with equal standing in the Temple; nor as a **common priest, because the principle is: One elevates to a higher level in matters of sanctity and one does not downgrade.** Once he has served as a High Priest he cannot be restored to the position of a common priest. Is that to say that **the first clause** of the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of **the Rabbis**, who disagree with Rabbi Meir, **and the latter clause** is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Meir**?

אָמַר רַב חֲסִדָּא: אֵין, רִישָׁא רַבְנָן וְסִיפָא רַבִּי מְאִיר. רַב יוֹסֵף אָמַר: רַבִּי הִיא, וְנִסְיָב לָהּ אֲלִיפָא דְּתַנְיָא.

Rav Hisda said: **Indeed, the first clause of the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, and the latter clause is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir. Rav Yosef said: The entire mishna is according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, and he formulates it according to the opinions of different tanna'im, that is to say, resulting in a third opinion, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis with regard to a High Priest consecrated by donning multiple garments, and the opinion of Rabbi Meir with regard to a former High Priest.**

בְּמִה גְדוֹלָה – אֵין בֵּין בְּמִה גְדוֹלָה לְבְּמִה קְטַנָּה
וּבְמִה קְטַנָּה: The great altar is the copper altar that stood in the desert Tabernacle, in Nob, and in Gibeon. The reason that the altar there was called the great altar and not the altar of the Tabernacle or Temple is that the Ark of the Covenant was not there; it was at different times taken by the Philistines or stored in Kiriath-jearim. In tractate *Zevahim* several additional differences between a great and small altar are enumerated. However, as explained elsewhere, not all differences are cited in the mishna here.

Small altars were in use during the period when the great altars were functional. Anyone could establish a small altar and sacrifice burnt-offerings and peace-offerings. Service at these altars was not restricted to priests, and many of the other regulations governing the sacrifice of offerings did not apply.

בְּשִׁילֹה... בְּשִׁילֹה אֵין בֵּין בְּמִה גְדוֹלָה לְבְּמִה קְטַנָּה
בְּכָל הָרְוּאָה: The simple reason for this is because Shiloh was open and unwallled, and had no defined boundary. Its domain, similar to the camp of the Israelites in the desert, included all places from which Shiloh or the Tabernacle could be seen (see Jerusalem Talmud). In tractate *Zevahim* this is explained homiletically: Since Shiloh was in the tribal territory of Joseph, and because Joseph resisted sinning and did not let his eyes wander inappropriately such as with regard to Potiphar's wife, he was rewarded that in his tribal territory, offerings sacrificed in Shiloh may be eaten anywhere within eyeshot of the town.

HALAKHA

Offerings of lesser sanctity – קְדָשִׁים קְלִיִּם: Offerings of lesser sanctity and second tithe produce may be eaten only within the walls of Jerusalem (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 7:14).

Offerings of the most sacred order – קְדָשִׁי קְדָשִׁים: Offerings of the most sacred order are eaten in the Temple courtyard. One who eats an olive-bulk of those offerings outside the courtyard is flogged (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 11:5).

מִתְנִי' אֵין בֵּין בְּמִה גְדוֹלָה לְבְּמִה קְטַנָּה אֶלָּא פְּסָחִים. זֶה הַכֶּלֶל: כָּל שֶׁהוּא נִדְרָר וְנִדְרָב קָרֵב בְּבְמִה, וְכָל שֶׁאֵינוֹ לֹא נִדְרָר וְלֹא נִדְרָב – אֵינוֹ קָרֵב בְּבְמִה.

גַּמ' פְּסָחִים וְתוֹ לֹא? אֵימָא: כְּעִין פְּסָחִים.

מִמֵּי רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן הִיא. דְּתַנַּי, רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אָמַר: אִף עֲבוּר לֹא הִקְרִיבוּ אֶלָּא פְּסָחִים וְחֻבּוֹת שֶׁקְבוּעֵי לָהֶם וְמוֹ, אֲבָל חֻבּוֹת שֶׁאֵינוֹ קְבוּעֵי לָהֶם וְמוֹ – הִכָּא וְהִכָּא לֹא קָרֵב.

מִתְנִי' אֵין בֵּין שִׁילֹה לְיִרוּשָׁלַיִם אֶלָּא שְׁבִשִׁילֹה אוֹכְלִין קְדָשִׁים קְלִיִּים וּמַעֲשֵׂר שְׁנֵי בְּכָל הָרְוּאָה, וּבִירוּשָׁלַיִם לְפָנִים מִן הַחוּמָה.

וְכָאן וְכָאן קְדָשִׁי קְדָשִׁים נֹאכְלִין לְפָנִים מִן הַקְּלָעִים. קְדוּשַׁת שִׁילֹה

MISHNA The difference between a great, public altar, such as the altars established at Nob and Gibeon, which served as religious centers following the destruction of the Tabernacle in Shiloh, and a small, personal altarⁿ on which individuals would sacrifice their offerings, is only with regard to Paschal lambs, which may not be sacrificed on a small altar. **This is the principle: Any offering that is vowed or contributed voluntarily is sacrificed on a small altar, and any offering that is neither vowed nor contributed voluntarily, but rather is compulsory, e.g., a sin-offering, is not sacrificed on a small altar.**

GEMARA The Gemara asks: Is the difference only Paschal lambs and nothing more? The continuation of the mishna indicates that there are additional differences. The Gemara answers: **Say that the difference between them is only with regard to offerings that are similar to Paschal lambs.**

The Gemara asks: According to whose opinion is the mishna taught? The Gemara answers: **It is according to the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, as it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Shimon says: Even the public sacrificed only Paschal lambs and compulsory offerings for which there is a set time, like fixed communal offerings. However, compulsory offerings for which there is not a set time, e.g., sin-offerings brought for an unwitting transgression committed by the community, are sacrificed neither here on a small altar nor here on a great altar; they are sacrificed only in the Temple.**

MISHNA The difference between the Tabernacle in Shiloh^b and the Temple in Jerusalem is only that in Shiloh one eats offerings of lesser sanctity,^h e.g., individual peace-offerings, thanks-offerings, and the Paschal lamb, and also the second tithe,^b in any place that overlooks Shiloh,ⁿ as Shiloh was not a walled city and any place within its Shabbat boundary was regarded as part of the city. **And in Jerusalem one eats those consecrated items only within the walls.**

And here, in Shiloh, and there, in Jerusalem, offerings of the most sacred order^h are eaten only within the hangings. The Tabernacle courtyard in Shiloh was surrounded by hangings and the Temple courtyard in Jerusalem was surrounded by a wall. There is another difference: With regard to the sanctity of Shiloh,

BACKGROUND

Shiloh – שִׁילֹה: Other than the Temple in Jerusalem, the Divine Presence rested in three places in Eretz Yisrael: Shiloh, where the Tabernacle was erected after the Jewish people entered the land, and Nob and Gibeon, referred to here as great altars. According to the Gemara in tractate *Zevahim* (118b), the Tabernacle stood in Shiloh for 369 years and in Nob and Gibeon for a total of fifty-seven years.

The city of Shiloh, which was located in the tribal land of Ephraim (see Judges 21:19), is approximately 35 km north of Jerusalem on the ancient mountain ridge road that traverses the country from north to south, and a bit less than 16 km south of the city of Shechem. In the modern-day settlement of Shiloh, remnants of the Tabernacle were discovered, and a synagogue was built commemorating the Tabernacle.

Second tithe – מַעֲשֵׂר שְׁנֵי: This is the tithe separated after the *teruma* for the priests and the first tithe for the Levites

were separated. Second tithe was separated during the first, second, fourth, and fifth years of the Sabbatical cycle. After second tithe was designated, it had to be taken to Jerusalem to be eaten there by its owner. If the journey to Jerusalem was too long, and therefore it was difficult to take the second tithe there, or if the produce became ritually impure, it could be redeemed for an equivalent sum of money. If the owner redeemed his own produce, he was required to add one-fifth of its value. If he redeemed the second tithe produce by selling it to others, there is no need to add one-fifth of its value. The redemption money was then taken to Jerusalem, where it had to be spent on food. Second tithe could be redeemed only with minted coins bearing an imprint; unstamped coins and promissory notes could not be used. Today, second tithe is still redeemed, but for a nominal sum, as in the absence of the Temple it is no longer brought to Jerusalem. The *halakhot* of second tithe are discussed in tractate *Ma'aser Sheni*.