

# RECONCILING THE SACRIFICES OF EZEKIEL WITH THE TORAH

REUVEN CHAIM (RUDOLPH) KLEIN

The last chapters of the Book of Ezekiel envision and describe the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the Holy Temple. On closely examining the sacrifices that Ezekiel prescribes for festivals and "appointed times" (Ezek. 45:16-46:15), we note that his descriptions do not accord with the sacrifices that the Torah lays down for those occasions. In this article, we will point out various discrepancies between the two accounts and explore the approaches taken by Jewish scholars throughout the ages in reconciling them.

Regarding the animals to be sacrificed, Ezekiel prescribes a bull as a sin offering to be brought on the first, seventh and fourteenth of Nisan (in addition to the regular sacrifice made on the fourteenth). For the seven days of Passover he mandates seven bulls and seven rams as burnt offerings, and one goat as a sin offering. Ezekiel also states that the sacrifices of the seven days of Tabernacles (Sukkot) match the sacrifices of the seven days of Passover. He further prescribes burnt offerings of six lambs and one ram every Sabbath; a bull, six lambs and a ram every Rosh Hodesh (New Moon); and a lamb every morning. .

Regarding the meal offerings, Ezekiel notes several times that an ephah of flour is offered together with each bull and ram, and as much as one wishes or can afford with each lamb. He also prescribes the measure of one hin of oil to be brought with every ephah of flour. For the daily sacrifices, Ezekiel assigns a different meal-to-animal ratio: for the burnt offering of one lamb, a sixth of an ephah of flour is required together with a third of a hin of oil.

## CONTRADICTIONS BETWEEN THE TORAH AND EZEKIEL

There are many discrepancies between the sacrifices described by Ezekiel and those laid down in the Torah.

1. The sin offering of a bull, to be made on the first, seventh, and fourteenth of Nisan, is not recorded anywhere in the Torah.

*Rabbi Reuven Chaim (Rudolph) Klein is the author of Lashon HaKodesh: History, Holiness, & Hebrew (Mosaica Press, 2014). He received semikhah from several rabbinic figures in Jerusalem, where he is a Fellow at the Kollel of Yeshivat Mir. He lives with his family in Beitar Illit, Israel.*

2. While Ezekiel prescribes seven bulls and seven rams as burnt offerings on each day of Passover, the Torah ordains only two bulls and one ram, but seven lambs also, for the sacrifice (Num. 28:19;22). Furthermore, while Ezekiel equates the sacrifices of the Passover festival with those of Tabernacles, they are not identical in the Torah. The Torah in fact prescribes a varying number of bulls for each day of Tabernacles (thirteen on the first day, decreasing to seven on the seventh), plus two rams and fourteen lambs as burnt offerings (Num. 29:12-35).

3. The burnt offerings that Ezekiel prescribes for the Sabbath (six lambs and one ram) differ from those mentioned in the Torah (Num. 28:9-10) which consist of two lambs only as burnt offerings and nothing more. Similarly, the burnt offerings which Ezekiel prescribes for Rosh Hodesh (a bull, six lambs, and one ram) are also at odds with the Torah (Num. 28:11), which calls for two bulls, seven lambs, and one ram as burnt offerings.

4. In regard to the daily Temple sacrifices, Ezekiel requires that one lamb be brought each morning as a burnt offering, whereas the Torah ordains the sacrifice of two lambs every day, one in the morning and one in the evening (Ex. 29:38-39; Num. 28:3-4). Ezekiel only refers to the morning sacrifice and not to one in the evening.

5. Ezekiel makes no mention of the special sacrifices that the Torah ordains for the second day of Passover (Lev. 23:12-13), the Shavuot (Pentecost) festival (Lev. 23:15-21; Num. 28:26-31), Rosh Ha-Shanah (Num. 29:1-6), Yom Kippur (Lev. 16; Num. 29:7-11), and Shemini Atzeret (Num. 29:35-38).

6. The meal-to-animal ratios in Ezekiel do not correspond to those in the Torah. On all special days, Ezekiel requires that an ephah of fine flour be brought for each bull and each ram, but does not indicate how much is needed for each lamb. The Torah, on the other hand, always prescribes three-tenths of an ephah for each bull, two-tenths of an ephah for each ram, and one-tenth of an ephah for each lamb (Num. 28:12-13, 20-21, 28-29; 29:3-4, 9-10, 14-15). For the daily sacrifices, Ezekiel prescribes one-sixth of an ephah of fine flour, whereas the Torah requires one-tenth of an ephah (Ex. 29:40; Num. 28:5).

7. The quantity of libation accompanying each meal offering in Ezekiel also differs from that laid down in the Torah. For all special days, Ezekiel prescribes that a hin of oil to be brought with each ephah of flour; on Rosh

Hodesh, however, the Torah ordains half a hin of wine for each bull, a third of a hin for each ram, and a quarter of a hin for each lamb (Num. 28:14). For the daily sacrifices, Ezekiel prescribes a third of a hin of oil, while the Torah ordains a quarter of a hin only (Ex. 29:40; Num. 28:7). On other occasions, the Torah ordains a quarter of a hin of oil for a lamb, a third of a hin for a ram, and half a hin for a bull (Num. 15:1-13).

#### THE TALMUD OFFERS THREE EXPLANATIONS

Some of these discrepancies between Ezekiel and the Torah are discussed in the Talmud (TB *Menahot* 45a), which resolves them by offering exegetical reinterpretations of three of the passages in Ezekiel.

First, the Talmud mentions the differences between Ezekiel and Numbers regarding the animal sacrifices of Rosh Hodesh. The Talmud explains that although the Torah requires two bulls and seven lambs as burnt offerings, in a case where this amount is not feasible, just one bull and six lambs are acceptable, as the numbers given by Ezekiel suggest. In dire circumstances, even one lamb is acceptable on the basis of Ezekiel 46:7: *and as much as he can afford for the lambs* (although that verse deals with the ratio of meal to animals on Rosh Hodesh, not the number of animals).<sup>1</sup>

Second, the Talmud assumes that the bull which Ezekiel prescribes for the first of Nisan is identical with one of the bulls that the Torah ordains for Rosh Hodesh (the first of Nisan being Rosh Hodesh). Based on this assumption, the Talmud asks why Ezekiel calls the bull a sin offering if the bull of the Torah is a burnt offering. Here, the Talmud offers two approaches: R. Johanan maintained that, in time to come, Elijah the prophet will explicate the meaning of the passage in Ezekiel. Rav Ashi, however, declared that just as they offered special inauguration (*milu'im*) sacrifices in the time of Moses, they did so also in the days of Ezra. Rav Ashi meant that the bull prescribed by Ezekiel is not the bull of Rosh Hodesh but rather a special inaugural sin offering. Rashi explains in his commentary that just as the Torah required a special calf to be brought as a sin offering at the inauguration of the Tabernacle (Lev. 9:2), Ezekiel prescribes a special bull for a sin offering at the inauguration of the future Temple.<sup>2</sup> In accordance with this view, Radak (Kimhi) notes (on Ezek. 45:18) that the redemption will occur in such a way that the Temple will be rebuilt and fully operational on the first of Nisan, so that

the inauguration will begin on that day. Radak draws this idea from the Talmudic dictum (TB *Rosh Ha-Shanah* 11a), "In Nisan they were redeemed and in Nisan they are destined to be redeemed."

Thirdly, the Talmud quotes the verse, *You shall do the same on the seventh day of the month to purge the Temple from uncleanness caused by unwitting or ignorant persons* (Ezek. 45:20), and explains that it refers to the sacrifices offered by a mistaken court (see Num. 15:23-26). Here, according to the Talmud, *the seventh* does not allude to a day, but to the idea that this offering should be brought if seven of the twelve tribes commit a sin based on an erroneous court ruling, even if most of Israel were not guilty of that offense. (In other words, where this sacrifice is concerned, a majority of the tribes is considered a majority, not just a majority of the entire population). The Talmud also understands *of the month* (*ba-hodesh*) to mean the issue of a novel ruling (*hiddush*), through which the court led *unwitting or ignorant persons* to sin. The verse in Ezekiel is thus explained out of the context of time-based sacrifices.<sup>3</sup>

The Talmud concludes its discussion of the sacrifices in Ezekiel with a statement found in two other places (TB *Shabbat* 13b and *Hagigah* 13a): "R. Judah said in the name of Rav: The man named Hananiah ben Hezekiah [an early *tanna* said to have authored *Megillat Ta'anit*] deserves grateful remembrance: if not for him, the Book of Ezekiel would have been suppressed, since it contains things that conflict with the Torah. What did he do? He took three hundred barrels of oil [to burn brightly during the night], sat in his attic and expounded [the questionable verses in Ezekiel in such a way as not to contradict the Torah]." Rashi (to Ezek. 45:22) explains that "because of our sins, the explanations of Hananiah ben Hezekiah ben Garon are now lost to us."

However, there is one remnant of Hananiah's exegeses that is still preserved and quoted by *Sifrei* to answer another of the contradictions between Ezekiel and the Torah. As mentioned above, it concerns the meal-to-animal ratio of the sacrifices. The Talmud addresses this contradiction by explaining that Ezekiel does not literally mean to prescribe an ephah of fine flour for every bull and ram. Rather, he means to say that the ephah is so essential to the bulls and rams that if one is faced with a choice of offering the required number of bulls and rams but not the quantity of meal prescribed for them, or

of offering only some of the required bulls and rams with all of the meal prescribed, the second option is preferred. In the name of Hananiah ben Hezekiah, *Sifrei* (*Ki Tetze* 294) maintains that Ezekiel specified the identical amount of fine flour for bulls and rams<sup>4</sup> to teach us that both are to be measured in the same vessel, even though the actual amounts of flour to be used will differ.<sup>5</sup>

#### EZEKIEL DISCUSSES SPECIAL OCCASIONS

In regard to the first contradiction, Rashi (to Ezek. 45:18) adopts the approach of Rav Ashi in the Talmud, explaining that the bull Ezekiel prescribes for the first of Nisan is identical with the bull he mentioned earlier when describing the future inauguration of the Temple (Ezek. 43:19-21). Rashi further explains (45:20) that *You shall do the same on the seventh day of the month to purge the Temple* does not mean that the process is restricted to the seventh of the month: it should take place *daily, for seven days*, in accordance with Ezekiel's earlier prophecy that the inauguration of the Temple would last for a whole week (Ezek. 43:25-26). Rashi also mentions the Talmud's reinterpretation of that verse (45:20) as referring to a mistaken court.

Regarding the bull prescribed for the fourteenth of Nisan, Rashi (45:22) explains that this also refers to a special inaugural sacrifice which, in accordance with his understanding of the Talmud,<sup>6</sup> should be made on the eighth day of the Tabernacle's inauguration in fulfillment of the sin offering of a calf ordained by Moses. Rashi points out that Ezekiel refers to the sacrifice of this bull on the fourteenth of Nisan, not on the eighth, to teach us that if (for some reason) it was not offered on the eighth day of the inauguration, it could still be brought even a week later to insure that the altar was properly consecrated before the Passover sacrifices were made. Here, Rashi adopts the first approach of the Talmud, which indicates that Ezekiel was discussing abnormal circumstances. This is Rashi's general approach when he endeavors to reconcile conflicting verses.

In regard to the second contradiction, Rashi (45:23) seeks to clarify the text which reads: *During the seven days of the festival, he shall provide daily – for seven days – seven bulls and seven rams, without blemish, for a burnt offering to the LORD*. Rashi argues that this does not mean a daily offering of seven bulls and seven rams on Passover, but of one bull and one ram on each

of the seven days, making a total of seven bulls and seven rams. However, this still runs counter to the Torah's instruction that two bulls and one ram are to be brought each day of Passover. To resolve this problem, Rashi explains that ideally, in Ezekiel's view, two bulls should be sacrificed, but if for some reason this cannot be done, one bull will suffice. Rashi then notes that the Talmud offers a similar way of resolving the contradiction between Ezekiel and the Torah in respect of the Rosh Hodesh sacrifices (as mentioned above). This approach is also found in the commentary attributed to the *Rokeah*.<sup>7</sup>

In similar fashion, Rashi (46:4) reconciles the contradiction between Ezekiel and the Torah with regard to the Sabbath sacrifices. He explains that *the burnt offering which the prince presents to the Lord on the Sabbath day shall consist of six lambs without blemish and one ram without blemish* refers to the festivals, not the Sabbath. Rashi points out that the word *Shabbat*, literally "Day of Rest," sometimes means a Saturday and at other times a festival which is also a day of rest. He notes that while the Torah always ordains at least seven lambs and two rams for every festival, Ezekiel mentions a smaller number, thereby indicating that if only six lambs and one ram are available, they should still be brought, in line with the Talmud's explanation of the Rosh Hodesh sacrifices.

There are two major difficulties with this approach: First, Rashi does not specify which festival is meant by the word *Shabbat*. Second, R. Joseph Hayyun (d. 1497), an exegete and the last rabbi of Lisbon, raises an objection: if, in this context, *Shabbat* denotes a festival, why does Ezekiel mention the ratio of animal-to-meal offerings for this "Sabbath" in verse 5 and then again for all festivals and "special occasions" in verse 11?<sup>8</sup>

Rashi (45:24) resolves the contradiction between Ezekiel and the Torah regarding the meal-to-animal ratio of sacrifices as follows: Ezekiel was discussing the amount of unprocessed flour needed to yield the prescribed quantity of fine flour mentioned in the Torah. For example, Ezekiel states that on special days an ephah of fine flour should be brought for each bull, whereas the Torah lays down that three-tenths of an ephah is required. According to Rashi's approach, Ezekiel meant that the three-tenth of an ephah (prescribed by the Torah) should be sifted from a full ephah of unprocessed flour.<sup>9</sup> Alternatively, Rashi (to 46:14) explains that Ezekiel and the Torah refer to two different ways of measuring that actually mean the same amount. Rashi pro-

poses another solution, on the lines of his favored approach, suggesting (46:5) that the ambiguity over the amount of flour per lamb indicates that the prescribed amounts of flour can, if necessary, be flexible.

#### SACRIFICES WILL CHANGE

In his commentary to Ezekiel 43:25, Radak notes that the inaugural sacrifices mentioned by Ezekiel differ from those brought by Moses and Ezra because the order of sacrifices will change completely in the future. Radak (45:20) goes on to emphasize an innovative feature of Ezekiel's prophecy that is not found in any other description of the inaugural ceremonies. Ezekiel tells of an extra bull to be sacrificed as a sin offering on the seventh day of Nisan, which corresponds to the seventh day of the inauguration. Radak explains that widespread joy over the Temple's rededication might perhaps lead to unrestrained behavior and, as a result, people might unwittingly enter the Temple in a state of ritual impurity. To atone for such an offense, an extra bull is required as a sin offering on the seventh day of the inauguration.<sup>10</sup>

In accordance with this approach, Radak (45:22, 25) resolves some of the discrepancies between Ezekiel and the Torah. The extra bull that Ezekiel prescribes as a sin offering on the fourteenth of Nisan is one example of these innovative changes in the order of sacrifices. Similarly, Ezekiel's recommendation of seven bulls and seven rams as burnt offerings on each day of Passover and Sukkot, his description of the Sabbath and Rosh Hodesh sacrifices, and the change in the meal-to-animal ratio from that of the Torah are all explained as reflecting the general idea that future sacrifices will differ from those of the past.

#### EZEKIEL DISCUSSES THE EXTENDED INAUGURAL PERIOD OF THE TEMPLE

When discussing the meal-to-animal ratios, Maimonides (*Ma'aseh ha-Korbanot* 2:14) observes that all of the ratios that Ezekiel mentions – and, in fact, all of the sacrifices that he describes – are for inaugural purposes only and are not to be instituted for regular worship. Maimonides explains that Ezekiel, as a prophet, was relaying the divine commands as to how future inaugural services should be performed. This approach is essentially an extension of Rav Ashi's in the Talmud.

Don Isaac Abrabanel (in his commentary to Ezek. 45-46) follows Maimonides, explaining that the sacrifices mentioned by Ezekiel are all special offerings to be brought during the inaugural period of the future Temple.<sup>11</sup> According to Abrabanel, this inauguration will last from the first of Nisan until the end of the festival of Tabernacles about six months later. With this in mind, Abrabanel explains that Ezekiel does not mention the Shemini Atzeret sacrifices because he is only discussing special inaugural offerings, and the period of inauguration will end with the seven days of Tabernacles preceding Shemini Atzeret.

In his *Metzudat David* commentary to Ezekiel 45:22, R. David Altschuler (1687-1769) explains that just as the inauguration ceremonies of the First and Second Temples did not last for the same number of days as the inauguration of the Tabernacle, so will the Third Temple's inauguration be different from them and last longer. He points to a verse in Prophets, *The glory of this latter House shall be greater than that of the former one* (Haggai 2:9), which the Talmud (TB *Bava Batra* 3a) regards as a contrast between the Second Temple and the First, implying that the Third Temple's glory will exceed them both.

Commenting on Ezekiel 45:18, R. Meir Loeb Malbim (1809-1879) offers a fascinating way of justifying the future Temple's lengthy inauguration. He finds a pattern in the number of days that dedication ceremonies took throughout history: The Tabernacle's inauguration lasted for seven days (*milu'im*), the First Temple's for 14 days, and the Second Temple's for 21 days. Each successive period was a multiple of seven, indicating that the Third Temple's inauguration should take 28 days. Similarly, with regard to the consecration of the House (*hanukkat ha-bayit*), we find that there were 12 days of dedication for the Tabernacle, so the First Temple should have had 24 days and the Second Temple 36. On that basis, the Third Temple should have 48 days of dedication. Since both of the previous Temples were destroyed, new inauguration and dedication ceremonies will be required for the building of the Third Temple. Taken together, all of the inauguration and dedication periods add up to 190 days – exactly the same as the number of days from the first of Nisan until the culmination of the Tabernacles festival.



R. Eliezer of Beaugency (a twelfth-century French commentator) notes that all the offerings listed by Ezekiel are the responsibility of the "prince" mentioned in Ezekiel 45:16. Their purpose, he explains, is to accustom the king to worshipping God, and these extra sacrifices (added to those mentioned in the Torah) form part of the king's personal duty.<sup>12</sup> This approach was followed by the Spanish commentator and grammarian R. Judah ben Samuel Ibn Bal'am (1000-1070);<sup>13</sup> centuries later, R. Yitzhak Isaac Rabinovitz (1847-1914) offered the same explanation.<sup>14</sup> Hida (R. Hayyim Yosef David Azulai, 1734-1806) used this idea to explain why Ezekiel omitted the sacrifices of certain holidays: for these nothing new is prescribed in addition to the regular sacrifices of the Torah.<sup>15</sup>

Despite its widespread acceptance, this approach does not reconcile the contradictions, since, according to the Torah, only obligatory communal sacrifices may be offered on the Sabbath and festivals,<sup>16</sup> not voluntary or individual ones (except for the Passover offering). Accordingly, it should be forbidden for the prince to offer additional sacrifices on those days when work is prohibited. It was perhaps understood that sacrifices devolving on the "prince" are regarded as communal, not individual offerings, and therefore permitted.

#### EZEKIEL'S OMISSIONS

Radak explains each omission differently. In his commentary to Ezekiel 45:25, he notes that Ezekiel does not mention Shemini Atzeret because, in the Messianic era, the sacrifices of Shemini Atzeret will be the same as those of the Torah. However, on Ezekiel 46:13, Radak states that because Ezekiel only mentions the daily morning sacrifice, the regular evening sacrifice will apparently be cancelled in the future. Thus, according to Radak, if Ezekiel omits something mentioned in the Torah, this means at times that the law is unchanged and at other times that the law is abolished.<sup>17</sup>

Abrabanel surmises that Ezekiel does not refer to the sacrifices on Rosh HaShanah, Yom Kippur, and Shavu'ot because he only needs to mention those of Passover and Sukkot, when special offerings are made to commemorate the final redemption (on Passover) and victory in the war of Gog and Magog (on Sukkot). As mentioned earlier, Abrabanel explains that Ezekiel

did not mention Shemini Atzeret simply because the extended inaugural period will have ended by that time of the year.

R. Jonathan Eybeschütz (1690-1764), in his *Ahavat Yehonatan* commentary (to the *haftarah* of *Parashat ha-Hodesh*), writes that Ezekiel only felt the need to speak about the Passover and Sukkot sacrifices because those festivals commemorate the Exodus from Egypt. The Mishnah (*Berakhot* 1:45) teaches that, according to some opinions, there will no longer be any need in the Messianic era to commemorate the miracle of the Exodus, because it will be superseded and overshadowed by the miracle of the final Redemption. Ezekiel accordingly mentions the sacrifices on Passover and Tabernacles to explain that even though the miracle of the Redemption will overshadow the miracle of the Exodus, offerings should still be brought on those festivals. However, since Shavuot and Shemini Atzeret do not celebrate the Exodus from Egypt, Ezekiel felt no need to expressly declare that sacrifices will still be brought on those days in the Messianic era.

R. Yitzhak Isaac Halevi Epstein (an eighteenth-century German commentator) adopts a metaphysical approach when explaining why Ezekiel omitted certain holidays. Since the Talmud (TB *Sukkah* 55b) states that the seventy bulls offered on the seven days of Sukkot correspond to the seventy nations of the world, in the post-Messianic era they will no longer be needed: the offerings made on Sukkot and Passover will therefore be identical. Similarly, those made on Shemini Atzeret, representing the special bond between the Jews and God, will not be necessary in Messianic times. Sukkot itself will fulfil that purpose, which is why Ezekiel does not mention the Shemini Atzeret sacrifices. Shavuot (Pentecost), he explains, is not mentioned in Ezekiel's prophecy because it recalls how the Israelites cleansed themselves of Egyptian defilement before accepting the Torah at Mount Sinai. No reference is needed, because all such impurities will have vanished in the Messianic era. Epstein uses this approach to explain the differences between Rosh Hodesh sacrifices in the Torah and Ezekiel, and why Ezekiel omits the daily evening offerings.<sup>18</sup>

## CONCLUSION

To sum up, the commentators offer four different approaches to the discrepancies between the Torah and Ezekiel regarding sacrifices – three of

which are already found in the Talmud. Rashi, adopting the first talmudic approach, generally affirms that Ezekiel was discussing extenuating circumstances under which the Torah guidelines could not be properly followed. Radak, adopting the approach of R. Johanan in the Talmud, explains that the sacrificial laws will change in the Messianic era with Ezekiel's prophecies superseding Torah law. Maimonides, following a different (third) talmudic approach, explains that Ezekiel was discussing special inaugural sacrifices governed by rules that differ from those applying to the Torah's regular sacrifices. Other commentators adopt a viewpoint not found in the Talmud: they maintain that Ezekiel's sacrifices are to be offered in addition to those of the Torah.

All in all, these various interpretations make it clear that animal sacrifices will be restored in the future Temple, in accordance with the prophecies of Ezekiel.

#### NOTES

1. R. Meir Simḥah Ha-Kohen of Dvinsk (1843-1926), in his *Meshekh Hokhmah* commentary (to Num. 28:11), finds support for this idea in the Torah itself. He notes that when discussing the ratio of meal to lambs, the Torah always says *one-tenth of a measure for each of the seven lambs* (Num. 28:21, 29; 29:3, 10) and the same regarding the 14 lambs of 29:15. Concerning Rosh Ḥodesh, however, the Torah simply states *a tenth of a measure of fine flour mixed with oil as a meal offering for each lamb* (Num. 28:13), without noting that this is for each of the seven lambs. The Torah itself thus acknowledges the possibility of offering only one out of seven lambs on Rosh Ḥodesh.
2. Rashi evidently understood this prophecy to concern the Second Temple, but most commentators took it to mean the Third Temple. For example, in his commentary to the Talmud, Rabbenu Gershom explains Rav Ashi differently: just as inaugural sacrifices were made for the First and Second Temples, so will they be offered at the Third Temple's dedication. This approach is followed by Pseudo-Rashba and *Shitah Mekubbetzet* to TB *Menahot* 45a. In his *Sefer ha-Ikkarim* (*ma'amar* 4, chap. 42), R. Joseph Albo (1380-1444) writes that Ezekiel's prophecies were only partly fulfilled in the Second Temple; in the Third Temple they will be fully realized.
3. *Tosafot* observes that this contradicts the simple meaning of the passage.
4. A mistake crept into many editions of *Sifrei* where, when quoting the verse in Ezekiel, it states that an ephah should be offered for each bull, ram, and lamb. However, Ezekiel (46:5, 11) actually prescribes *as much as he wishes for the lambs*.
5. See the elaborated explanation by R. David Pardo (1718-1790), *Sifrei de-Vei Rav*, vol. 4 (Jerusalem: Makhon Lev Same'aḥ ed., 1990) pp. 179-180.
6. This point is rather problematic because the Talmud was discussing the bull of the first of Nisan, whereas Rashi is discussing here the bull of the fourteenth.

7. J. Klugmann, ed., *Perush ha-Roke'ah al ha-Torah*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 2009) p. 331. This work is customarily attributed to R. Eleazar ben Judah of Worms (c. 1165-1230), the author of *Sefer haRoke'ah*. However, others (including J. Gellis) ascribe it to R. Eliezer ben Isaac ha-Gadol and/or R. Judah ben Kalonymus of Speyer, followers of R. Judah ben Samuel he-Hasid (c. 1150-1217).
8. A. Shoshana & M. Zipor, eds., *The Book of Ezekiel with the Commentary of Rabbi Joseph Hayyun*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem: Ofeq Institute, 2006) p. 447.
9. *Shitah Mekubbetzet* (to TB *Menahot* 44b) also explains that the prescribed amount of fine flour should be produced from an ephah of unrefined meal. The same explanation is offered to reconcile the different quantities of flour in the daily meal offering.
10. See Mishnah *Shavu'ot* (chap. 1), which explains that various communal sacrifices serve to atone for precisely this kind of transgression. Radak also mentions the explanation (in TB *Menahot* 45a) that this sacrifice is connected to a mistaken court ruling.
11. See also the commentary of R. David ben Solomon Ibn Abi Zimra (Radbaz; 1479-1572) to Maimonides' work, printed in S. Frankel, ed., *Mishneh Torah, Sefer Avodah* (Jerusalem-Bene Brak: Hotza'at Shabse Frankel, 1993) p. 221.
12. S. Poznański, ed., *Perush al Yehezkel u-Terei Asar le-Rabbi Eliezer mi-Belganzi* (Warsaw: Mekitzei Nirdamim, 1913) p. 108. The exact identity of the *prince in Israel* referred to in this passage is subject to debate. Rashi (to Ezek. 42:2) states that the *nasi* is the high priest, but also writes that Menahem ibn Saruq maintained that it refers to the Messiah (an approach also taken by Rashi's grandson, Rashbam, in his commentary to TB *Bava Batra* 122a).
13. M. Perez, ed., *Perush Rabbi Yehudah Ibn Bal'am le-Sefer Yehezkel* (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 2000) pp. 152-3.
14. *Dorot HaRishonim*, Vol. 6 *Tekufat HaMikra* (Jerusalem, 1939), pp. 250-251.
15. *Hida* in *Homat Anah* (to the *haftarah* of *Parashat ha-Hodesh*).
16. Mishnah *Temurah* (2:1); see TB *Sanhedrin* 35b-36a, which applies this to festivals as well.
17. R. Joseph Hayyun explains that Ezekiel does not mention the daily evening sacrifice for the sake of brevity. However, he does not explain why Ezekiel omits Shemini Atzeret. See Shoshana & Zipor, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 451, 453.
18. *Be'er Yitzhak* (Offenbach, 1729) fols. 103b-104a.

---

**The American Friends of the Jewish Bible Association needs your support! By donating the sum of \$1,500 you can dedicate an entire issue of the *JEWISH BIBLE QUARTERLY* in honor of or in memory of a loved one. The American Friends of the Jewish Bible Association, Inc. is a not-for-profit corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York, and has tax exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Contributions are tax deductible to the extent permitted by law.**

**American Friends of the Jewish Bible Association**

**PO Box 29002**

**Jerusalem, Israel**