



house? Rabbi Akiva said to him: The difference is that with regard to one who sits in his house it would have been possible for him to hear of the court's reversal, but with regard to that person who went overseas, it would not have been possible for him to hear of the court's reversal.

1:3 The mishna explains for which type of unwitting transgression based on the ruling of the court there is liability to bring an offering. In a case where the judges of the court issued an erroneous ruling to abolish the entire essence of a mitzva, not only a detail thereof, e.g., they said: There is no prohibition against engaging in intercourse with a menstruating woman written in the Torah, or there is no prohibition against performing prohibited labor on Shabbat written in the Torah, or there is no prohibition against engaging in idol worship written in the Torah, these judges are exempt, as this is an error based on ignorance, not an erroneous ruling. If the judges issued a ruling to nullify part of a mitzva and to sustain part of that mitzva, these judges are liable. How so? An example of this is if the judges said: There is a prohibition against engaging in intercourse with a menstruating woman written in the Torah, but one who engages in intercourse with a woman who observes a clean day for a day she experiences a discharge is exempt. When the woman sees a discharge of blood for one or two days during the eleven days between the end of one menstrual period and the expected start of another, the blood is assumed to not be menstrual blood. If after the second day, the next day passes without any discharge of blood, she may immerse immediately and she is ritually pure. The judges ruled erroneously that it is permitted to engage in intercourse with her on the day that she is observing a clean day, even without the day having passed and her having immersed. Another example is if they said: There is a prohibition against performing prohibited labor on Shabbat written in the Torah, but one who carries out objects from the private domain to the public domain is exempt. Another example is if they said: There is a prohibition against engaging in idol worship written in the Torah, but one who bows to the idol but does not sacrifice an offering is exempt. In all of these cases, these judges are liable, as it is stated: "And the matter is hidden" (Leviticus 4:13), from which it is derived that there is liability only if a matter, a single detail, is hidden, but not if the entire essence of a mitzva is hidden.

1:4 If the court issued a ruling, and one of the judges knew that they erred and he said to them: You are mistaken; or if the most distinguished [mufla] member of the court was not there for that session of the Sanhedrin, or if one of the judges was disqualified from serving as a judge, e.g., because he was a convert, or a child born from an incestuous or adulterous relationship [mamzer], or a Gibeonite, or an old man no longer able to father children, this court is exempt, because they have not rendered a full-fledged ruling. This is derived by means of a verbal analogy, as "assembly" is stated here with regard to a court that issues an erroneous ruling: "And if the entire assembly of Israel shall act unwittingly" (Leviticus 4:13), and "assembly" is stated there with regard to the halakha of one who commits murder unwittingly: "And the assembly shall judge between the one who struck and the blood redeemer" (Numbers 35:24). Just as in the "assembly" stated there, with regard to the unwitting murderer, all the judges must be fit to

issue rulings, so too, in the “assembly” stated here, with regard to the court that issued an erroneous ruling; the court will not be liable unless all the judges will be fit to issue rulings. If the judges of the court issued an erroneous ruling unwittingly and the entire congregation performed a transgression unwittingly on the basis of their ruling, the court brings a bull, as it is stated in the Torah with regard to an unwitting communal sin-offering. If the court issued the erroneous ruling intentionally, as they knew that their ruling was incorrect, and the congregation performed a transgression unwittingly on the basis of the ruling of the court, each member of the congregation brings a female lamb or a female goat as an individual sin-offering. If the court issued the erroneous ruling unwittingly and the congregation performed a transgression intentionally, i.e., with the knowledge that the ruling of the court was erroneous, these people are exempt from bringing an offering.

1:5 If the judges of the court issued an erroneous ruling and the entire congregation or a majority thereof performed a transgression on the basis of their ruling, the judges bring a bull as an unwitting communal sin-offering. And if the erroneous ruling involved idol worship, the judges bring a bull and a goat, as it is written in the Torah (see Numbers 15:24); this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says: It is not the court that brings the offering, it is the people. Twelve tribes, each of which performed a transgression, bring twelve bulls, i.e., each tribe brings one, and for idol worship they bring twelve bulls and twelve goats, as each tribe is a congregation. Rabbi Shimon says: They bring thirteen bulls; and for idol worship they bring thirteen bulls and thirteen goats, a bull and a goat for each and every tribe and a bull and a goat for the court. The mishna continues: If the judges of the court issued a ruling, and at least seven tribes, or a majority of each of those tribes, performed a transgression on the basis of their ruling, the judges bring a bull; and for idol worship they bring a bull and a goat. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says: The seven tribes that sinned bring seven bulls, i.e., each tribe brings one bull, and each of the rest of the tribes, i.e., those that did not sin, brings one bull on the basis of the sin of the other tribes, as even those who did not sin bring an offering on the basis of the actions of the sinners. Rabbi Shimon says: When seven tribes sin eight bulls are brought as offerings, one bull for each and every tribe and one bull for the court. And for idol worship, eight bulls and eight goats are brought, one bull and one goat for each and every tribe and one bull and one goat for the court. If the court of one of the tribes issued a ruling and the majority of that tribe performed a transgression on the basis of its ruling, that tribe is liable to bring an offering and the rest of all the tribes are exempt; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. And the Rabbis say: One is liable to bring an offering for an unwitting communal sin only for rulings of the High Court alone, as it is stated: “And if the entire assembly of Israel shall act unwittingly” (Leviticus 4:13), from which it is derived that there is liability only for a ruling of the assembly, i.e., the court, of the entire people, but not for a ruling of the assembly of that particular tribe.

2:1 In a case where an anointed priest, i.e., the High Priest, issued an erroneous ruling for himself permitting performance of an action prohibited by Torah law, if he issued the ruling unwittingly and then unwittingly performed the transgression in accordance with his ruling, he is liable to bring a bull as a sin-offering for an unwitting transgression by the anointed priest. If he issued the ruling unwittingly, and performed the transgression intentionally, or if he issued the ruling intentionally and performed the transgression unwittingly, he is exempt from liability to bring any offering, as there is a principle: The legal status of the ruling of an anointed priest for himself is like that of the ruling of the court for the general public. Therefore, the High Priest is liable to bring the bull as a sin-offering for his unwitting transgression in a case when the court would be liable to bring the bull as a communal sin-offering for an unwitting transgression performed by the general public.

2:2 If the anointed priest issued a ruling by himself and performed a transgression by himself, he achieves atonement by himself by bringing a bull as his sin-offering. If he issued a ruling with the general public, i.e., the Sanhedrin, and performed a transgression with the general public, i.e., the Jewish people, he achieves atonement with the general public. As, the court is not liable unless the judges issue a ruling to nullify part of a commandment and to sustain part of that commandment, and likewise with regard to the ruling of the anointed priest. And the court and the priest are not liable for a ruling with regard to idol worship unless they issue a ruling to nullify part of that commandment and to sustain part of it.

2:3 The court is liable only for absence of awareness of the matter, leading to an erroneous ruling, together with unwitting performance of the action by the general public on the basis of that ruling. And likewise, the anointed priest is liable only for an erroneous ruling and his unwitting performance of an action on the basis of that ruling. And the court and the priest are liable for a ruling with regard to idol worship only for absence of awareness of the matter, leading to an erroneous ruling, together with unwitting performance of the action on the basis of that ruling. The court is not liable to bring an offering for absence of awareness of the matter unless they issue a ruling with regard to a matter for whose intentional violation one is liable to receive karet and for whose unwitting violation one is liable to bring a sin-offering. And likewise the anointed priest is liable only for such a ruling. Neither is the court liable to bring a sin-offering for idol worship unless the judges issue a ruling with regard to a matter for whose intentional violation one is liable to receive karet, and for whose unwitting violation one is liable to bring a sin-offering.

2:4 The court is not liable to bring a bull as an unwitting communal sin-offering for issuing a ruling with regard to a positive mitzva or a prohibition related to the defiling of the Temple by one being there while ritually impure, or the defiling of its sacrificial foods by one partaking of them while ritually impure. There is a positive mitzva to remove impure people from the Temple, and there is a prohibition against entering the Temple while in a state of ritual impurity. And one does not bring a provisional

guilt-offering for a positive mitzva or a prohibition related to the defiling of the Temple or its sacrificial foods. But the court is liable to bring a bull for a positive mitzva or for a prohibition that is related to a menstruating woman, and one brings a provisional guilt-offering for a positive mitzva or for a prohibition that is related to a menstruating woman. What is the positive mitzva that is related to a menstruating woman? Distance yourself from the menstruating woman. If a man engages in intercourse with a woman and she begins menstruating, he is required to separate from her. And what is the prohibition? Do not engage in intercourse with a woman whom you know is a menstruating woman.

2:5 The court is not liable for issuing a ruling with regard to hearing of a voice, i.e., a false oath of testimony taken by a witness who refuses to testify on behalf of a litigant who demands that he testify, or for an utterance of the lips, i.e., a false oath stated about some matter, or for the defiling of the Temple or its sacrificial foods. And the status of the king is like that of the court, and he is exempt from bringing an offering in those cases; this is the statement of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili. Rabbi Akiva says: The king is liable in all of those cases except for the case of hearing of a voice, and even in that case, his exemption is not intrinsic to the mitzva. Rather, it is for technical reasons, as the king neither judges others nor do others judge him; he does not testify nor do others testify against him. Therefore, a demand that he testify is not applicable.

2:6 In summation: For all mitzvot that are in the Torah for whose intentional violation one is liable to receive karet and for whose unwitting violation one is liable to bring a sin-offering, the individual brings a ewe or female goat for their unwitting transgression, and the king brings a male goat for their unwitting transgression, and an anointed priest and a court who issued an erroneous ruling bring a bull. And for unwittingly engaging in idol worship, the individual, and the king, and the anointed priest bring a female goat, and the court brings a bull and a goat: A bull for a burnt-offering and a goat for a sin-offering.

2:7 With regard to a provisional guilt-offering, the individual and the king are liable, and an anointed priest and a court are exempt. With regard to a definite guilt-offering, the individual, the king, and the anointed priest are liable, and a court is exempt. For hearing of a voice, i.e., a false oath of testimony, and for a false oath on an utterance of the lips, and for the defiling of the Temple or its sacrificial foods, a court is exempt, and the individual, the king, and the anointed priest are liable. But an anointed High Priest is not liable for the defiling of the Temple or its sacrificial foods; this is the statement of Rabbi Shimon. And what offering are they liable to bring? It is a sliding-scale offering based on their financial circumstances, as delineated in the Torah (see Leviticus 5:1–13). Rabbi Elazar says: The king brings a goat.

3:1 In the case of an anointed priest who sinned on the basis of his own erroneous halakhic ruling and thereafter moved on from his anointment, e.g., if he was disqualified due to a blemish that befell him before he brought his sin-offering, and likewise in the case of a king [nasi] who sinned and

thereafter moved on from his prominence before he had brought an offering, an anointed priest brings a bull despite the fact that he is no longer the High Priest, and the king brings a goat, as he would have done during his reign.

3:2 In the case of an anointed priest who moved on from his anointment and thereafter sinned, and likewise the king who moved on from his prominence and thereafter sinned, an anointed priest brings a bull, which he would have brought while he was High Priest, and the status of the king is like that of a commoner [kehedyot].

3:3 If a king or High Priest sinned before they were appointed, and thereafter they were appointed, the status of these people is like that of commoners; they bring the sin-offering of an individual. Rabbi Shimon says: If it became known to them, before they were appointed as king or High Priest, that they had sinned, they are liable to bring the sin-offering of an individual, but if it became known to them after they were appointed as king or High Priest they are completely exempt. Who is the nasi? This is a king, as it is stated: "When a nasi sins, and performs any one of all the mitzvot of the Lord his God that shall not be performed, unwittingly, and he is guilty" (Leviticus 4:22), referring to one who has only the Lord his God over him and no other authority. That is only the king.

3:4 And who is the anointed priest? It is the High Priest who is anointed with the anointing oil, not the High Priest consecrated by donning multiple garments, i.e., one who served after the anointing oil had been sequestered, toward the end of the First Temple period. The difference between a High Priest anointed with the anointing oil and one consecrated by donning multiple garments unique to the High Priest is only that the latter does not bring the bull that comes for the transgression of any of the mitzvot. And the difference between a High Priest currently serving in that capacity and a former High Priest who had temporarily filled that position while 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 by the High Priest daily. Each of these offerings is brought only by the current High Priest, and not by a former High Priest. Both this High Priest currently serving and that former High Priest are equal with regard to performing the rest of the Yom Kippur service, and they are both commanded with regard to marrying a virgin (see Leviticus 21:13), and it is prohibited for both to marry a widow (see Leviticus 21:14), and they may not render themselves impure with impurity imparted by a corpse even in the event that one of their relatives dies (see Leviticus 21:11), and they may not grow their hair long and they may not rend their garments as expressions of mourning (see Leviticus 21:10), and when they die they restore the unwitting murderer to his home from the city of refuge (see Numbers 35:25).

3:5 A High Priest rends his garments from below when he is in mourning, and an ordinary priest rends his garments from above like a non-priest. A High Priest sacrifices offerings as an acute mourner, i.e., on the day of the death of one of his close relatives, but he may not eat from those offerings. And an ordinary priest who is an acute mourner neither sacrifices offerings nor eats from those offerings.

3:6 Any mitzva that is more frequent than another mitzva precedes that other mitzva if the opportunity to fulfill one of them coincides with an opportunity to fulfill the other. And anyone who is more sanctified than another precedes that other person. If the bull of the anointed priest and the bull of the congregation, which are brought for absence of awareness of the matter, are pending, the bull of the anointed priest precedes the bull of the congregation in all its actions, i.e., its sacrificial rites.

3:7 The man precedes the woman when there is uncertainty with regard to which of them to rescue or to return a lost item to first. And the woman precedes the man with regard to which of them to provide with a garment first, because her humiliation is great, or to release from captivity first, due to the concern that she will be raped. When they are both subject to degradation, i.e., there is also concern that the man will be raped in captivity, the release of the man precedes the release of the woman.

3:8 A priest precedes a Levite. A Levite precedes an Israelite. An Israelite precedes a son born from an incestuous or adulterous relationship [mamzer], and a mamzer precedes a Gibeonite, and a Gibeonite precedes a convert, and a convert precedes an emancipated slave. When do these halakhot of precedence take effect? In circumstances when they are all equal in terms of wisdom. But if there were a mamzer who is a Torah scholar and a High Priest who is an ignoramus, a mamzer who is a Torah scholar precedes a High Priest who is an ignoramus, as Torah wisdom surpasses all else.