

Zera Shimshon

by Rabbi Shimshon Chaim Nachmani zt"l

Published Mantua 1778*

Chapter XXIV: Vayikra (Lev. 1:1–5:26)

Essay 4. Why the slaughter of an offering does not require a priest

בְּרִכּוֹת פָּרַק ה' "וַיִּשְׁחֲטוּ אֶת־הַפֶּהַר וַיָּבִאוּ אֶת־הַנֶּזֶר אֶל־עֲלֵי" מִשּׁוּם ד' "וַיִּשְׁחֲטוּ אֶת־הַפֶּהַר", "וַיָּבִאוּ אֶת־הַנֶּזֶר אֶל־עֲלֵי" וְכו'. אֵלָּא אָמַר לָהֶם עָלֵי קִרְאוּ פֶהַן לִיתִי וְלִשְׁחֹט. תּוֹיְנָהוּ שְׁמוּאֵל דְּקָא מְהַדְרֵי בְּתַר פֶּהַן לְמִשְׁחֲט אָמַר לָהֶם לָמָּה לָכוּ לְאַהֲדוּרֵי בְּתַר פֶּהַן שְׁחִיטָה בְּזַר כְּשֶׁרָה, אִיִּיתוּהָ לְקַמִּיָּה דְּעָלֵי אָמַר לִיָּה מָנָא לָךְ הָא, אָמַר לוֹ מִי כְּתִיב וְשָׁחַט הַפֶּהַן, "וַהֲקָרִיבוּ . . . הַפְּהָגִים" כְּתִיב, מִקְבְּלָה וְאֵילָף מִצּוֹת כְּהוּנָה מְכָאן שְׁהַשְׁחִיטָה בְּזַר כְּשִׁיָּה. אָמַר לוֹ שְׁפִיר קְאָמְרַת מִיָּהוּ מוֹרָה הִלְכָה וְכו', אֲתִיָּא חֲנָה קָא צְנֻחָה קַמִּיָּה "אֲנִי הָאִשָּׁה הַנּוֹצֵבֶת עִמָּכָה בְּזָה" וְכו' עכ"ל.

Tractate Berachot, chapter 5:

“And they slaughtered the bull and brought the boy to Eli.”¹ [What?] Because “they slaughtered the bull,” they “brought the boy to Eli”? [How are these two facts related?] **Rather, Eli said to [those who brought the offering]: Call a priest to come and slaughter [it]. Samuel saw them looking for a priest to slaughter [it]. He said to them: Why are you looking for a priest to slaughter it? Slaughtering by a non-priest is valid. They brought [Samuel] before Eli, who said to him: How do you know this? [Samuel] said to him: Is it written [in the Torah]: “And the priest shall slaughter”** [indicating that the offering may only be slaughtered by a priest]? **It is written:** “And he shall slaughter the bull before the L-rd; and Aaron’s sons, the priests, shall offer the blood.”² **From the receiving [of the blood] and onward, it is a priestly obligation. From here [we can derive the halacha that] slaughter by a non-priest is valid.**

[Eli] said to [Samuel]: You have spoken well. Nevertheless, you have issued a halachic ruling in the presence of your teacher, and anyone who issues a halachic ruling in the presence of his teacher is liable for death [at the hand of Heaven for ruling in his teacher’s presence]. **Hannah came and cried out before him: “I am the woman who stood here beside you** and prayed to the L-rd.”³ He said to her: Let me punish him, and I will pray [for mercy, that the Holy One, Blessed be He,] will grant you [a son who will be] greater than [this one]. She said to him: “For this youth I prayed”⁴ [and I want no other].

- Berachot 31b

* English translation: Copyright © 2026 by Charles S. Stein. Additional essays are available at <https://zstorah.com>

¹ I Sam. 1:25.

² Lev. 1:5.

³ I Sam. 1:26.

⁴ I Sam. 1:27.

וּבְכֹרֵי צִוּחוֹ בְּהֵאֱמָאֵי דְקַמְאֵי מָה רְאָתָה סָנָה לֹמַר לְעֵלֵי הַשְּׁמֵטָא [שְׁנֻצְבָּה] עֲמֹו בְּכָאן וּמָה עֲנִנָן זֶה לְזֶה. וְעוֹד צָרִיךְ עֵינֵינוּ מֵאִין בָּא הַטְּעוֹת לְעֵלֵי לֹמַר שֶׁהַשְּׁחִיטָה צָרִיכָה כְּהֵן, דְּזִיל קָרִי בִּי רַב הוּא דְלֹא כְּתִיב וְשָׁחַט הַכֹּהֵן. וְעוֹד מָהוּ מְצִנָּת כְּהוֹנָה הִנֵּה לֹ לֹמַר מִקְבְּלָה וְאֵילָף צָרִיכָה כְּהֵן.

Question 1: The earlier authorities among the earlier authorities have already cried out over this: What did Hannah see to say to Eli now that she [had stood] with him here, and what connection does this have with that?

Question 2: Furthermore, it requires investigation: from where did the error come to Eli to say that slaughtering requires a priest? For “this is something even a schoolchild could learn”⁵: It is not written “and the priest shall slaughter.”

Question 3: Furthermore, why did Samuel say “a priestly obligation”? He should have said: from the receiving [of the blood] and onward, a priest is required.

וְנִישׁ לֹמַר דְּאֵיתָא בְּרִישׁ פְּרָק ג' דְּזִבְחִים (דף ל"ב) שֶׁהַשְּׁחִיטָה כְּשֶׁרָה בְּזָרִים, אוֹ אִינוּ אֱלָא בַּכֹּהֲנִים, אֲמַרְתְּ וְכִי מֵאִין בָּאת מִכָּלל שְׁנֻצְמַר "וְאֵתָה וּבְנֵיהָ אֵתָה תִּשְׁמְרוּ אֶת־כֹּהֲנֻתְכֶם לְכָל־דְּבַר הַמִּצְוָה", יָכוֹל אִף בַּשְּׁחִיטָה, תִּלְמִיד לֹמַר "וְשָׁחַט אֶת־בֶּן הַבְּקָר לִפְנֵי ה' וְהִקְרִיבוּ" וְכוּ', מִקְבְּלָה וְאֵילָף מְצִנָּת כְּהוֹנָה לִימַד עַל הַשְּׁחִיטָה שְׁכַשְׁרִיהָ בְּכָל אָדָם.

It may be said that it is brought at the beginning of chapter 3 (page 32a) of tractate Zevachim:

[The verse states with regard to a burnt offering:] **“And he shall slaughter [the bull before the Lord].”** The **slaughter by a non-priest is valid.** [As stated in the Mishnah:] As the slaughter is valid by non-priests, by women, by [Canaanite] slaves, and by the ritually impure, and even with offerings of the most sacred order.⁶ **Or** [perhaps the term “and he shall slaughter” refers] **only [to slaughter] by priests?**

You say: From where did you come [to the idea that the verse is referring only to a priest]? From the fact that it is stated [to Aaron]: “And you and your sons with you shall guard your priesthood in everything that pertains to the altar.”⁷

Maybe [that’s so] even with slaughter. [Thus,] the verse states: “And he shall slaughter the bull before the L-rd, and Aaron’s sons, the priests, shall offer the blood,” [to teach that] from collection [of the blood] and onward it is a priestly obligation. [This] teaches about the slaughter, that it is valid by any person [, even from the outset, and contradicts the Mishnah’s suggestion that slaughter of an offering by a non-priest is valid only after-the-fact.]

- Zevachim 32a

⁵ A saying from Horayot 4a, Sanhedrin 33b, and Shevuot 14b.

⁶ Mishnah Zevachim 3:1.

⁷ Num. 18:7.

ולעיל פָּרַק ב' (דף י"ז) איתא מחוסר בגדים מַזְלוּ, דְאָמַר קָרָא "וְחִגְרַתְּ אֹתָם אֲבָגַט אֶהְרֹן וּבְנָיו וְחִבְשֹׁתָ לָהֶם מִגְבְּעַת וְהִיטָה לָהֶם כֹּהֵנָה לְחֻשֶׁת עוֹלָם", בְּזִמְנָן שְׁבִגְדֵיהֶם עָלֵיהֶם כְּהוֹנְתָם עָלֵיהֶם, אִין בְּגִדֵיהֶם עָלֵיהֶם אִין כְּהוֹנְתָם עָלֵיהֶם. וּפְרָשׁ רַש"י כְּהוֹנְתָם תְּלוּיָהּ בְּבִגְדֵיהֶם וְאִי לֹא הָווּ זָרִים וּבְזָר אֲשָׁפְחוּ דְמַחִיל עֲבוּדָה עַכ"ל.

Earlier in chapter 2 (page 17b) it is stated:

From where do we [know that a priest] lacking [priestly] garments [disqualifies the rites he performs]? . . . As the verse states: “And you shall gird them with a sash, Aaron and his sons, and bind mitres on them; and they shall have the priesthood by a perpetual statute.”⁸ When their garments are on them, their priesthood is upon them. When their garments are not on them, their priesthood is not upon them.

- Zevachim 17b

Rashi explained: their priesthood depends upon their garments, and if not they are non-priests; and with a non-priest we find that he invalidates the service.

ולעיל נְמִי (דף י"ג) איתא תנא "והקריבו" זו קבלת הדם, "בני אהרן הפהגים" שתהא בכהן פֶּשֶׁר ובכלי שֶׁרֶת דְּהִינּוּ רִיבּוּי בְּגָדִים. אָמַר רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא נֶאֱמַר כָּאֵן בְּנֵי אֶהְרֹן וְנֶאֱמַר לְהֵלֹן "אלה שמות בני אהרן הפהגים המשחים" מה להלן בכהן פֶּשֶׁר ובכלי שֶׁרֶת אֵף כָּאֵן בְּכֹהֵן פֶּשֶׁר ובכלי שֶׁרֶת.

Earlier as well (page 13a) it is stated: It was taught: “and they shall offer”—this is the receiving of the blood. “Aaron’s sons, the priests”—that it be with a valid priest and with a sacred vessel, which is, according to Tosafot, a number of priestly garments. Rabbi Akiva said: it is said here “Aaron’s sons,” and it is said there: “These are the names of the Aaron’s sons, the anointed priests.”⁹ Just as there with a valid priest and with a sacred vessel, so here with a valid priest and with a sacred vessel. That is, Rabbi Akiva is relying upon a *gezerah shavah*, a Talmudic technique connecting two seemingly unrelated Torah passages via identical words or phrases. Rabbis apply the laws or details of one passage to the other, creating new legal principles. Rabbi Akiva is connecting Lev. 1:5, that “Aaron’s sons, the priests, shall offer the blood,” with Num. 3:3, where “Aaron’s sons, the priests” are referred to as “anointed.” This builds on the teaching of Zevachim 17b cited above, that priests must be wearing priestly garments in order to be considered as priests. Thus, through the *gezerah shavah*, the text of “Aaron’s sons, the priests” in Lev. 1:5 must be understood in the full halachic sense of the priesthood, including the requirement of valid priests serving in priestly garments.”

⁸ Ex. 29:9.

⁹ Num. 3:3.

וְכַתְּבוּ שָׁם בַּתּוֹסְפוֹת, פִּירֵשׁ בַּקּוּנְטָרַס כְּלִי שֶׁרַת בְּגָדֵי כְּהוֹנֵה וְקִשָּׁה דְּהָא נִפְקָא לֹן לְקַמֵּן דְּרַי י"ז מִקְרָא דְּאִין בְּגָדֵיהֶם עָלֵיהֶם הוּוּ זָרִים, וַיֵּשׁ לֹמֵר דְּאִי לֹא גִזְרָה שְׁנֵה דְּהִקְא הֵנָּה אֲמַרִּינוּ מֵה שְׁהַקְפִּידָה תוֹרָה מִמְּחוּסָר בְּגָדִים הֵינּוּ הִיכָא דְּכַתְּבִי בְּגָדִים אָבֵל הִיכָא דְּלֹא כְּתִיבִי בְּגָדִים לֹא, וְגַבֵּי נְתִיבַת אֵשׁ וְסִידוּר אֵיבְרִים לֹא הֵנָּה בְּעֵינָא בְּגָדִים מִפְּהוּן בְּכִיחוּנָן, אֲלֵא מִדְּגַלֵּי רַחֲמָנָא גַבֵּי קַבְּלָה גִזְרָה שְׁנֵה יִלְפִינוּן כְּכֹל דּוּקְתָא דְּהַפְּהוּן הוּוּ בְּכִיחוּנּוּ עַכ"ל.

Tosafot write there: The commentary explained that “sacred vessels” means priestly garments, and this is difficult, for we derive later on page 17b from the verse that when their garments are not upon them, they are not viewed as priests. One may say that were it not for the *gezerah shavah* here,¹⁰ we would have said that the Torah’s strictness concerning one lacking garments is where garments are written, but where garments are not written, no. With regard to placing the fire and arranging the limbs, we would not have required garments from a priest in his priesthood; but since the Merciful One revealed with regard to receiving through a *gezerah shavah*, we learn in every place that the priest must be in his priesthood.

וּמִכָּל זֶה אָנּוּ לְמַדִּים שְׁקוּדָם שְׂבָא שְׂמוּאֵל הָיוּ סוֹבְרִים דְּקָרָא ד'לְכָל־דְּבַר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ' מִיִּירֵי נְמִי בְּשַׁחֲטָה דְּבְעֵינוּן פְּהוּן, דְּכַתְּבִי "תִּשְׁמְרוּ אֶת־כְּהֹנְתְּכֶם", עַד שְׂבָא שְׂמוּאֵל וְאָמַר דְּמִקְרָא ד'וְהִקְרִיבוּ בְּנֵי אֶהֱרֹן הַכֹּהֲנִים' אָנּוּ לֹמְדִים דְּמִקְבָּלָה וְאֵילָף מִצְּנוֹת כְּהוֹנֵה, דְּהֵינּוּ שְׂיָהָא בְּכֹהֵן כְּשֶׁר וּבְכֹלֵי שֶׁרַת, דְּהֵינּוּ בְּגָדֵי כְּהוֹנֵה, מִפְּסֵם גִּזְרָה שְׁנֵה הַנָּ"ל, וְהֵינּוּ נְמִי מִצְּנוֹת כְּהוֹנֵה דְּקָאָמַר שְׂמוּאֵל.

From all of the above, it follows that before Samuel came, they understood the verse “everything that pertains to the altar” to mean that even for slaughtering we require a priest, as it is written “guard your priesthood.” This answers Question 2 of how Eli could have erroneously believed that.

Question 3 asked why Samuel said “a priestly obligation,” instead of saying, from the receiving of the blood and onward, a priest is required. **Samuel came and said that from the verse “and Aaron’s sons, the priests, shall offer the blood” we learn that from the receiving of the blood and onward is a priestly obligation. Thus, [the service] must be performed by a valid priest, using a sacred vessel, that is, while wearing priestly garments, by the force of the *gezerah shavah* mentioned above, and this too is the “priestly obligation” that Samuel said.**

וְאִם תֹּאמַר מָנָא לִיה לְשְׂמוּאֵל הָא, וְהָא שְׁפִיר אֵיכָא לְמִימַר נְמִי אֵיפְכָא וְלַעֲשׂוֹת הַלִּימוּד הַפָּד הַסּוּגְיָא הַנָּ"ל שְׁל דְּרַי ל"ב, דְּהֵינּוּ דְּמִקְרָא ד'וְנִשְׁחַט . . . וְהִקְרִיבוּ' לֹא שְׂמַעֵינוּ דְּבְעֵינָא כְּהוֹנֵה אֲלֵא מִקְבָּלָה וְאֵילָף, וְהֵינּוּ אֹמַר שְׁשַׁחֲטָה כְּשֶׁרַה בְּזָר לְכָד כְּתִיב "תִּשְׁמְרוּ אֶת־כְּהֹנְתְּכֶם לְכָל־דְּבַר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ" לְרַבּוֹת אַף הַשַּׁחֲטָה. אֵי אֲפֹשֶׁר לֹמַר כּוּן, דְּאִם כּוּן תִּקְשָׁה אִמְאֵי כְּתִיב "פְּהוּן" בְּנְתִיבַת אֵשׁ וּבְסִידוּר אֵיבְרִים, וְהָא מִמִּילָא יִלְפִינוּן לִיה מ'לְכָל־דְּבַר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ'. אֲלֵא וְדֹאֵי מִדְּחֻזִּינוּ דְּכַתְּבִי קָרָא "פְּהוּן" בְּסִידוּר וּבְנְתִיבַת אֵשׁ שְׂמַע מִיָּה דְּקָרָא דְּלְכָל דְּבַר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לֹא אֵיִירֵי כְּלָל בְּעֵנָנוּן זֶה וְהַשַּׁחֲטָה כְּשֶׁרַה בְּזָר.

Perhaps you will say: from where did Samuel know this, for it would be quite possible to say the opposite and to make the derivation the opposite of the discussion above on page 32a. Namely, one might argue that from the verse “and he shall slaughter the bull before the

10

L-rd; and Aaron's sons, the priests, shall offer the blood," that we learn that it is only from the receiving and onward that priesthood is required. Thus, I could say that slaughtering is valid even when conducted by a non-priest. Therefore, it is written "you shall guard your priesthood for every matter of the altar" to include even slaughtering.

It is impossible to say so, for if so, it would be difficult why the verse writes "priest" regarding placing the fire and arranging the limbs, since we would learn it automatically from "every matter of the altar." Rather, since we see that the verse wrote "priest" regarding arranging and placing the fire, we infer that the verse "for every matter of the altar" does not deal with this matter at all, and slaughtering is valid by a non-priest.

וְעוֹד יֵשׁ לֵאמֹר דְּשִׁמוּאֵל הַכֹּרִים סִבְרָתוֹ עַל דֵּרֶךְ זֶה, דְּמִכְדֵּי "בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן" הָיוּ צָרִיכֵי בְּהַאי קָרָא כְּדֵי לְמִילֵף גְּזִירָה שְׁנִיָּה, וּמֵאֵי שְׁנָא דְכַתְּבִינְהוּ בְּתֵר וְהִקְרִיבוּ, אִם אֵיתָא דְאָף בְּשִׁחִיטָה בְּעֵינֵן פְּהוּ, הִנֵּה לֹא לֵאמֹר "וְשִׁחֲטוּ בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֲנִים" לְגִזְרָה שְׁנִיָּה וְהֵינּוּ יוֹדְעִים בְּמַכְל שְׁכֵן שֶׁהִתְקַרְבָּה שֶׁהִיא אַחַר הַשִּׁחִיטָה בְּנִדְאֵי פְּסוּלָה בְּזָרִים, אֲלֵא עַל כִּרְתוּף צָרִיךְ לֵאמֹר דְּמִשְׁכָּלָה וְאֵילָף דְּנֻקָּא הִיא מְצֻנֵת כְּהוֹנָה, וְאָמַר לֹא עָלֵי מִימָר שְׁפִיר קְאָמְרַת מִיָּהוּ מוֹרָה הַלְקָה וְכוּ'.

Furthermore, it may be said that Samuel compelled his reasoning in this way: since "Aaron's sons" were needed in that verse in order to derive the *gezerah shavah*, why were they written after "and they shall offer"? If it were so that even for slaughtering we require a priest, then instead of saying, "And he shall slaughter the bull before the L-rd; and Aaron's sons, the priests, shall offer the blood," it should have said "and Aaron's sons, the priests, shall slaughter" for the *gezerah shavah*, and we would know all the more so that the offering, which is after the slaughtering, would certainly be invalid by non-priests. In other words, the verse says "and he shall slaughter," in the singular tense, without explaining who "he" is. The priests are only explicitly mentioned afterward, with regard to offering the blood. **Rather, it must be that from the receiving and onward alone is a priestly obligation; and Eli said to him: The statement you have said is correct; however, one who renders a halachic ruling, etc.**

אַתְיָא אֵימִיָּה וְאָמְרָה "אֲנִי הָאִשָּׁה הַנִּצְצָת עִמָּכָה בְּזֵה", וּמִכָּאֵן אָנוּ לְמַדִּים שְׁאָסוּר לִישָׁב בְּתוֹךְ אַרְבַּע אַמּוֹת שֶׁל תְּפִלָּה כְּמוֹ שְׁכַתְּבוּ הַפּוֹסְקִים בְּטוֹר אוֹרַח חַיִּים (סימן ק"ב), וְכַתְּבֵי שֶׁם הַבַּיִת יוֹסֵף בְּפִירוּשׁ דְּבַרֵי הָרָא"שׁ, שְׁמִי שָׂבָא לְהַתְּפַלֵּל תּוֹךְ תְּחוּמוֹ שֶׁל תְּבִירוֹ אֵין תְּבִירוֹ חַיִּיב לְעֻמוֹד, אֲבָל אֵינּוּ עוֹשֶׂה כְּשׁוֹרָה זֶה שְׁנִכְנַס לְתוֹךְ תְּחוּמוֹ שֶׁל תְּבִירוֹ וְנִרְאָה שֶׁתְּבִירוֹ הוּא כּוֹפֵר כְּשֶׁאֵינּוּ מִתְּפַלֵּל, וּמִזֵּה הַצַּד הַיּוֹשֵׁב אִם הוּא מְדַקְדָּק מְצֻנֵה הִיא לְעֻמוֹד כְּדֵי שְׁלֵא יֵהָא בְּכָאן צַד גְּנוּת לְמִתְּפַלֵּל שְׁלֵא עֲשָׂה כְּשׁוֹרָה, וְגַם לֹא שְׁלֵא יִהְיֶה נִרְאָה בְּצַד מַה שְׁכּוֹפֵר, וּמִזֵּה הַצַּד עֻמֵּד עָלֵי שְׁהַרֵי לֵאִישׁ כְּמוֹהוּ הִנֵּה לֹא לְהַתְּמִיר עַכ"ל.

[Samuel's] mother came and said: "I am the woman who stood here beside you and prayed to the L-rd." Question 1 asked what led Hannah to tell that to Eli. The answer is that we learn from here that it is forbidden to sit within four cubits of prayer, as the decisors wrote in the Tur, Orach Chayim (siman 102). The Beit Yosef wrote there explaining the words of the Rosh that if one comes to pray within the boundary of his fellow, his fellow is not obligated to stand, but the one who entered into the boundary of his fellow did not act properly, as it makes his fellow appear to be a denier of G-d when he is not praying. From this viewpoint, if

the one sitting is stringent with regard to the halacha, it is a mitzvah for him to stand so that there should not be seen here any disgrace to the one praying who did not act properly by entering into his domain. It is also a mitzvah for himself so that he should not appear in some respect like a denier of G-d. From this consideration, Eli stood, for a man like him should have been stringent.

ואף סנה נתפוננה לומר כה לעלי הואיל שהקמרת עליה שם כפי שלא יתנה לא לה לא לי שום צד גנאי, אף כאן יש לה למחול ואדרבא לתלות ולומר דלית דין בר איגיש ורוח ה' דבר בו, כמו שלפי האמת לא היה לשמואל רק שתי שנים, שאם תעשה להפך ולומר ששמואל אמר כה מסברתו ולדוננו מורה הלכה וכו' ותייב מיתה, אז יתנה גנאי לשמואל שעשה שלא כהוגן וגם גנאי לה שלא ידעת ללמוד זה הדין מסברתה. ומשום הכי הוסיפה ואמרה "אל-הנער הזה התפללתי", כדאיתא במדרש שקודם שנולד שמואל היתה בת קול מכרזת ואומרת עתיד נער אחד להולד ושמו שמואל שיהיה נביא לה, והיו כל הנשים משיאות שם שמואל לבניהם הנולדים, ואחר כך היו אומרות לית דין שמואל. וזהו שסיימה "אל-הנער הזה" דוקא, והוא שאול לה' דהיינו כמו מלאך ולית דין בר איגיש. וענין עוד בנה לקמן בפרשת נשא באורף.

Hannah also intended to say thus to Eli: you were stringent upon yourself so that there should be no aspect of disgrace either for you or for me. Here too, you should forgive, and indeed attribute it and say that [Samuel's statement] was not the reasoning of a human being but that the spirit of G-d spoke through him, since in truth Samuel was only two years old. For if you do the opposite and say that Samuel said this from his own reasoning and judge him as one who renders a halachic ruling, etc., and is liable to death, then there will be disgrace for Samuel who acted improperly, and also disgrace for you that you did not know to learn this law from your own reasoning. Therefore, she also said: "For this boy I prayed."¹¹ As it is stated in the Midrash, before Samuel was born a Heavenly voice proclaimed and said that a boy would be born and his name would be Samuel and he would be a prophet to G-d.¹² All the women would give the name Samuel to their sons who were born, but afterward they would say: this is not that Samuel. This is why she concluded: "for this boy" specifically, and he is "asked of the Lord," meaning like an angel and not a human being. See further on this below, in Parashat Naso at length (Essay 9).

* * *

¹¹ I Sam. 1:27.

¹² Chaim Vital, Sha'ar haPesukim, Book of I Samuel, 3.