Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 2a

C H A P T E R I

MISHNAH. ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS[1] FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL WAS TAKEN UNDER ANY OTHER NAME THAN THEIR OWN,[2] ARE VALID, SAVE THAT THEY DO NOT DISCHARGE THE OBLIGATION OF THE OWNER,[3] WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING[4] AND THE MEAL-OFFERING OF JEALOUSY.[5] AS TO THE SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING AND THE MEAL-OFFERING OF JEALOUSY, IF THE HANDFUL WAS TAKEN THEREFROM UNDER ANY OTHER NAME THAN THEIR OWN, OR IF THEY WERE PUT INTO THE VESSEL, OR BROUGHT NIGH, OR BURNT UNDER ANY OTHER NAME THAN THEIR OWN, OR UNDER THEIR OWN AND ANOTHER NAME, OR UNDER ANOTHER NAME AND THEIR OWN, THEY ARE INVALID. HOW CAN THEY BE 'UNDER THEIR OWN AND ANOTHER NAME'? IF OFFERED AS A SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING AND AS A FREEWILL MEAL-OFFERING. AND HOW CAN THEY BE UNDER ANOTHER NAME AND THEIR OWN'? IF OFFERED AS A FREEWILL MEAL-OFFERING AND AS A SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING.

GEMARA. Why does the Mishnah state SAVE THAT? It could have simply stated, 'But they do not discharge the obligation of the owner'? — It teaches this: The owner's obligation is not thereby discharged, but the meal-offering itself is in each case valid, and it is therefore forbidden to make any further changes with regard to it.[6] This is in accordance with Raba, for Raba said, If a burnt-offering was slaughtered under any name other than its own, it is nevertheless forbidden to sprinkle its blood under any other name than its own. You may, if you wish, explain this by logical reasoning, or if you wish, by reference to a verse. 'You may, if, you wish, explain this by logical reasoning' — is it to be permitted, because a change has been made with regard to it, to go on making more and more changes? 'Or if you wish, by reference to a verse' — for it is written, That which is done out of thy lips thou shalt observe and do; according as thou hast vowed unto the Lord thy God, a freewill-offering.[7] 'A freewill-offering'? It is a vow, is it not? Hence the verse is to be explained thus: if thou hast done according as thou hast vowed, then it is a votive offering; and if not it shall be a freewill-offering.

---

(1) Cf. Lev. II, 2ff. The usual procedure in making a meal-offering consisted of the following four services: taking the handful out of the meal-offering, putting it into a vessel, bringing it nigh to the altar, and burning it. These services correspond respectively to the four main services in connection with animal sacrifices, viz., slaughtering, receiving the blood, bringing it nigh to the altar, and sprinkling it.

(2) Either declaring it to be a different offering, שינוי קדש e.g., while dealing with a meal-offering prepared on a griddle the officiating priest expressly declares that he is dealing with one prepared in a pan; or declaring it to be on behalf of a different person, שינוי בעלים e.g., while dealing with A's meal-offering the priest declares that he is dealing with it on behalf of B.

(3) And he must bring again the offering which he had undertaken to bring either by vow or of his free will.

(4) The meal-offering brought as a sin-offering by a person of poor means on the commission of any of the transgressions mentioned in Lev. V, 1-4.

(5) Brought by a woman suspected of adultery by her husband; cf. Num. V, 15. In these two cases the meal-offering, if brought under another name, is invalid.

(6) The expression 'SAVE THAT' in the Mishnah implies that in every other respect the meal-offering is a valid meal-offering.

(7) Deut. XXIII, 24.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 2b

And is it permitted to make any changes in respect of a freewill-offering?[1]

Must we say that our Mishnah is not in agreement with the view of R. Simeon? For it was taught: R. Simeon says, All meal-offerings, from which the handful was taken under any other name than their own, are valid, and they also discharge the obligation of the owner, since meal-offerings are unlike [animal] offerings. For if [the priest] takes the handful from a meal-offering prepared on a griddle[2] and expressly refers to it as one prepared in a pan.[2] [his intention is of no consequence]. for the preparation thereof clearly indicates that he is dealing with one prepared on a griddle. Or if he is dealing with a dry[3] [meal-offering] and expressly refers to it as mingled [with oil, his intention is of no consequence], for the preparation thereof clearly indicates that he is dealing with a dry [meal-offering]. But with [animal] offerings, it is not so; the same slaughtering is for all offerings, the same manner of receiving the blood for all, and the same manner of sprinkling for all.[4] This indeed presents no difficulty according to R. Ashi who said,[5] 'Here he took the handful from that which was prepared on a griddle and referred to it as prepared in a pan, there he took the handful from a meal-offering prepared on a griddle and referred to it as a meal-offering prepared in a pan',[6] for our Mishnah is a case where one meal-offering was referred to as another meal-offering. But what can be said according to the answers suggested by Rabbah and Raba? For should you accept the answer suggested by Rabbah namely, 'Here the change was as regards the offering, there as regards the owner',[7] [the difficulty of reconciling R. Simeon's view with that of our Mishnah remains, for] our Mishnah speaks of the change as regards the offering, since it reads, HOW CAN THEY BE UNDER THEIR OWN AND ANOTHER NAME'? IF OFFERED AS A SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING AND AS A FREEWILL MEAL-OFFERING! And should you accept the answer suggested by Raba namely, 'Here he took the handful out of a meal-offering and referred to it as [another] meal-offering, there he took the handful out of a meal-offering and referred to it as an animal-offering',[8] [the difficulty also remains, for] our Mishnah speaks of a meal-offering being referred to as [another] meal-offering, since it reads, AND HOW CAN THEY BE 'UNDER ANOTHER NAME AND THEIR OWN'? IF OFFERED AS A FREEWILL MEAL-OFFERING AND AS A SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING! — It is clear then that according to Rabbah and Raba our Mishnah is not in agreement with R. Simeon.

Now I can point out a contradiction between the words of R. Simeon here and the words of R. Simeon elsewhere. For it has been taught: R. Simeon says, It is written, It is most holy, as the sin-offering, and as the guilt-offering,[9] that is, some [meal-offerings] are like the sin-offering, and some like the guilt-offering. The sinner's meal-offering is like the sin-offering, so that if [the priest] took the handful therefrom under any other name than its own, it would be invalid, as is the sin-offering [in such circumstances]; the freewill meal-offering is like the guilt-offering, so that if he took the handful therefrom under any other name than its own, it would remain valid. 'And as the guilt-offering', that is, as the guilt-offering is valid [even when offered under any other name than its own], but does not satisfy [the obligation of the owner], so the freewill meal-offering is valid but does not satisfy [the obligation of the owner]![10] — Rabbah answered, It is no contradiction: here the change was as regards the offering, there as regards the owner.[11] Thereupon Abaye said to him, But consider, since it is established by analogy that, according to Divine Law, a wrongful intention renders the offering invalid,[12] what difference does it make whether the change was as regards the offering or as regards the owner? — He replied, The rule of R. Simeon that the preparation thereof clearly indicates [the true nature of the offering] is founded on reason (for R. Simeon generally expounds the reasons of Scriptural law); therefore a wrongful intention which is not manifestly [absurd] the Divine Law declares capable of rendering an offering invalid, but a wrongful intention which is manifestly [absurd][13] the Divine Law declares incapable of rendering invalid.

(Mnemonic: a burnt-offering; he nipped off a burnt-offering; he drained; a sin-offering of a bird; Most Holy sacrifices; Lesser Holy sacrifices.)

In that case it should follow that if [the priest] nipped off the head of a burnt-offering of a bird

above [the red line which went around the altar][14] under the name of a sin-offering of a bird, it discharges[15] [the owner], since the treatment thereof indicates plainly that it is a burnt-offering of a bird, for if it were a sin-offering of a bird he would have performed [the nipping] below [the red line]![16] — Do you think the sin-offering of a bird may not be performed above [the red line]? Surely a Master has stated that the nipping [of the sin-offering of a bird] may be performed at any place on the altar![17] Again, if he drained the blood of a burnt-offering of a bird above [the red line] under the name of a sin-offering of a bird, it should discharge [the owner], since the treatment thereof indicates plainly that it is a burnt-offering, for if it were a sin-offering he would have drained it below [the red line], and [would also have first] sprinkled [the blood upon the side of the altar]![18] —

---

(1) Certainly not! v. Sifra on Lev. I, 9. Hence even though the original sacrifice has been varied (as here from a votive to a freewill-offering) it is forbidden to make any further changes with regard to it, just as it is forbidden to vary the freewill-offering.

(2) V. Ibid. II, 5, 7; and infra 59a and 63a.

(3) I.e., one not mixed with oil, e.g., a sinner's meal-offering, or the meal-offering of jealousy.

(4) R. Simeon apparently disagrees with our Mishnah on two points: (a) He makes no exception for the sinner's meal-offering and the meal-offering of jealousy, and (b) he declares that even though the meal-offering was treated under another name the owner has discharged his obligation.

(5) In answer to the contradiction pointed out between the two statements of R. Simeon, infra.

(6) Where the officiating priest does not mention 'meal-offering' but merely the vessel in which it has been prepared, referring to one kind as another, it is clear that his words are meaningless and are to be ignored, since the very preparation of the meal-offering contradicts him; hence the offering is in no wise affected thereby and it discharges the owner's obligation. On the other hand, where he refers to one meal-offering as another, as is clearly the case in our Mishnah, the offering is affected thereby, since he has expressed a wrongful intention in connection with a meal-offering, and it therefore does not discharge the owner's obligation.

(7) Where the change was expressed in respect of the kind of offering, e.g., a meal-offering prepared on a griddle being referred to as one prepared in a pan, the offering is not thereby invalidated, for it is clear to all that it is the former and not that which he declares it to be, and therefore counts in fulfilment of the owner's obligation. Where, however, the change was expressed in respect of the owner of the offering, the offering cannot discharge the true owner's obligation.

(8) In the former case the owner's obligation is discharged in spite of the variation in the kind of meal-offering, in the latter case it is not discharged.

(9) Lev. VI, 10.

(10) This latter statement of R. Simeon wholly agrees with our Mishnah, so that it is in conflict with the former statement of R. Simeon on two points; v. supra p. 3 n. 2.

(11) V. Supra p. 3 n. 5.

(12) In Lev. VI, 10, the meal-offering is equated with the animal sacrifices of the sin-offering and guilt-offering, and as a wrongful intention with regard to these sacrifices, whether in respect of the kind of sacrifice or of the owner, renders them invalid, so it should be with regard to the meal-offering too.

(13) I.e., where the actions of the officiating priest belie his expressed intention. In such a case his words cannot be taken seriously.

(14) Cf. Mid. III, 1.

(15) Lit., 'render acceptable'.

(16) The rule is that the burnt-offering of a bird must be prepared above the red line (v. Zeb. 65a); the sin-offering of a bird, on the other hand, was usually prepared below the red line. Hence in spite of the priest's express intention to the contrary, the fact that he is nipping the bird above the red line clearly indicates that he is dealing with a burnt-offering, and the offering should count in fulfilment of the owner's obligation; nevertheless the established law is not so.

(17) Zeb. 63a. So that the treatment does not clearly mark the offering as a burnt-offering.

(18) The fixed routine in bird-offerings was (a) in the case of a burnt-offering: the head was nipped off but not severed from the body, the blood was drained at the side of the altar above the red line, then the whole bird was burnt on the altar; (b) in the case of a sin-offering: the head was nipped off and also not severed from the body, the blood was sprinkled upon the side of the altar, the rest of the blood was drained at the base of the altar, then the flesh was consumed by the priests.

It might be said that it is now being drained, the sprinkling having already taken place; and [as for its being drained above the red line], has not the Master stated that wherever upon the altar the blood was drained it is valid?

Again, if he sprinkled the blood of the sin-offering of a bird below [the red line] under the name of a burnt-offering of a bird, it should discharge [the owner], since the treatment thereof indicates plainly that it is a sin-offering of a bird, for if it were a burnt-offering of a bird he would have performed [the sprinkling] above [the red line], and would also have drained out the blood? — This is so.[1] But did he not say, 'Since meal-offerings are unlike [animal] offerings'? — Yes, unlike [animal] offerings, but not unlike bird-offerings.[2]

Again, if one slaughtered Most Holy sacrifices on the north side [of the altar] under the name of Lesser Holy sacrifices, they should discharge [the owners], since the treatment thereof indicates plainly that they are Most Holy sacrifices, for if they were Lesser Holy sacrifices, [the slaughtering] surely would have been performed on the south side! — No, the rule of the Divine Law is [that Lesser Holy sacrifices may be slaughtered] even on the south side, but not on the south side to the exclusion of the north.[3] For we have learnt: [The Lesser Holy sacrifices] may be slaughtered in any part of the Temple court.[4]

Again, if one slaughtered Lesser Holy sacrifices on the south side under the name of Most Holy sacrifices, they should discharge [the owners], since the treatment thereof indicates plainly that they are Lesser Holy sacrifices, for if they were Most Holy sacrifices, [the slaughtering] would surely have been performed on the north side! — It might be said that they really were Most Holy sacrifices but that [the slaughterer] had transgressed the law and slaughtered them on the south side. If so, in the case where a meal-offering prepared on a griddle was referred to as one prepared in a pan, it might also be said that the owner had vowed a meal-offering prepared in a pan and the priest when taking the handful therefrom [rightly] referred to it as prepared in a pan, for it was to be a meal-offering prepared in a pan, but he [the owner] had transgressed and brought one prepared on a griddle![5] — There, even though he had vowed a meal-offering prepared in a pan, if he brought it prepared on a griddle it must be treated as prepared on a griddle.[6] As we have learnt: If a man said, 'I take it upon myself to bring a meal-offering prepared on a griddle', and he brought one prepared in a pan; or if he said, 'a meal-offering prepared in a pan', and he brought one prepared on a griddle, what he has brought he has brought, but he has not discharged the obligation of his vow.[7] But perhaps he used the expression 'This';[8] as we have learnt: If he said, 'Let this [meal] be brought [as a meal-offering prepared] on a griddle', and he brought it [prepared] in a pan, or if he said, 'Let this [meal be brought as a meal-offering] prepared in a pan', and he brought it [prepared] on a griddle, it is invalid! —[9] According to the view of the Rabbis this would indeed be [a difficulty]; but we are arguing according to the view of R. Simeon, and R. Simeon holds that [in the first case] he has even discharged the obligation of his vow. Hence the description [of the meal-offering] by the particular vessel is of no consequence,[10] and it is immaterial whether he said 'Let this be' or 'I take it upon myself'.

Again, if one slaughtered a burnt-offering under the name of a sin-offering it should discharge [the owner], for the one[11] is a male animal and the other[12] a female![13] — Since there is the goat of the sin-offering of a ruler, which must be a male,[14] it is not so evident.[15] Then what can be said if he referred to it as a sin-offering of an individual?[16] Moreover, if one slaughtered the sin-offering of an individual under the name of a burnt-offering, it should discharge [the owner], since a sin-offering must be a female animal, and a burnt-offering a male! — It is covered by the tail.[17] This holds good in the case where one brought a ewe, but what can be said where one brought a she-goat?[18] — In

truth people don't usually think of distinguishing between male and female animals.

Again, if one slaughtered the passover-offering under the name of a guilt-offering it should discharge [the owner], since the former must be in its first year whereas the latter must be in its second year! — Since there is the guilt-offering of the Nazirite and of the leper,[19] it is then not so certain. Then what can be said if he expressly referred to it as the guilt-offering for robbery or for sacrilege?[20] Moreover, if one slaughtered the guilt-offering for robbery or for sacrilege under the name of the passover-offering it should discharge [the owner], since the passover-lamb must be in its first year whereas the others must be in their second year! — In truth people don't usually distinguish between an animal in its first year and one in its second year, for an animal in its first year may sometimes look like one in its second year, and one in its second year may look like one in its first year.

Again. if one slaughtered a he-goat[21] under the name of a guilt-offering it should discharge [the owner], since the one[22] has wool and the other hair! — people might think that it[23] is a black ram.

Again, if one slaughtered a calf or a bullock under the name of the passover-offering or a guilt-offering it should discharge [the owner], since a calf or a bullock cannot serve as the passover-offering or as a guilt-offering![24] — This is indeed so;

---

(1) That according to R. Simeon in such a case the owner counts the offering as the fulfilment of his obligation.

(2) I.e., a bird-offering like a meal-offering, although offered under a different name, discharges the obligation of the owner, for the treatment thereof clearly indicates the true nature of the sacrifice.

(3) Lit., 'did it say, On the south side and not on the north?' In contradistinction from the Most Holy sacrifices — the burnt-offering, the sin-offering, and the guilt-offering, which must be slaughtered on the north side of the altar only (v. Lev. I, 11; VI, 18; VII, 2). — Scripture does not specify any particular place for the slaughtering of the Lesser Holy sacrifices, and the implication clearly is that it may be slaughtered in any part of the Temple court.

(4) Zeb. 55a.

(5) And why does R. Simeon hold that in such a case the express intention is to be ignored? The text in cur. edd. is somewhat involved, and the reading of Sh. Mek. is followed.

(6) And therefore to refer to it as a meal-offering prepared in a pan is mere empty words.

(7) Infra 102b.

(8) So Sh. Mek, omitting the words, 'to be brought prepared on a griddle and he brought it prepared in a pan'.

(9) Infra 102b. Consequently where the expression 'this' was used it cannot be offered as anything else. Now in the present case it might be thought that the priest when taking the handful therefrom and referring to it as a meal-offering prepared in a pan, refers actually to its true character, so that his expressed intention cannot be said to be idle talk.

(10) But it is the vessel in which the meal is actually put that decides the kind of meal-offering it is to be; so that what is put on a griddle cannot be anything else, and the priest's reference to it as something else is idle talk.

(11) Sc. the burnt-offering.

(12) Sc. the sin-offering.

(13) And it is evident to all that to refer to this animal as a sin-offering is idle talk, for it is a male animal.

(14) V. Lev. IV, 22f.

(15) For the burnt-offering that he is slaughtering might reasonably be taken to be the goat of the sin-offering of a ruler, particularly since he refers to it as a sin-offering.

(16) Which every one knows must be a female animal. The fact therefore that he is dealing with a male animal indicates clearly that his words are meaningless.

(17) So that the sex of the animal is not noticeable.

(18) Which has no tail, i.e., its tail does not cover fully its hind quarters. like a sheep, and its sex is easily noticeable.

(19) Which must also be in the first year, for כבש is prescribed, and the term כבש, sheep, signifies a lamb not more than one year old, whereas the term איל, ram, signifies a sheep in its second year and not more than two years old (v. Parah I, 3). V. Num. VI, 12; and Lev. XIV, 12.

(20) Which must be a sheep in its second year; v. Lev. V, 25 and 15.

(21) The he-goat of the sin-offering of a ruler.

(22) Sc. the sheep for the guilt-offering.

(23) Sc. the he-goat; since goats are usually dark in colour (cf. Rashi and Tosaf.).

(24) For these must be of the flock.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 3b

and by the term 'animal offerings'[1] he meant the majority of animal-offerings. Raba answered:[2] It is no contradiction: here he took the handful out of a meal-offering and referred to it as [another] meal-offering, there he took the handful out of a meal-offering and referred to it as an animal-offering. Where one meal-offering was referred to as [another] meal-offering [it discharges the owner's obligation, for it is written,] And this is the law of the meal-offering:[3] there is but one law for all meal-offerings;[4] where a meal-offering was referred to as an animal-offering, [it does not discharge the owner's obligation, for it is written.] 'And this is the law of the meal-offering'; but it is not written 'of the animal-offering'. But did not the Tanna [R. Simeon] say, 'For the preparation thereof clearly indicates [the true nature of the offering]'?[5] — He meant thus: Although the expressed statement[6] clearly does not [correspond with the actual offering] and consequently it should be invalid,[7] [yet it is not so, for it is written,] 'And this is the law of the meal-offering': there is but one law for all meal-offerings.[4] Then what is the meaning of the statement, 'But with animal-offerings it is not so'?[8] — It means, in spite of the fact that the same manner of slaughtering is for all offerings, it is written, 'And this is the law of the meal-offering', and not 'of the animal-offering'.

In that case, if one slaughtered a sin-offering brought on account of [eating] forbidden fat under the name of a sin-offering brought on account of [eating] blood, or under the name of a sin-offering brought on account of idolatry, or under the name of the sinoffering of the Nazirite or of the leper, it should be valid and also discharge [the owner], for the Divine Law says, This is the law of the sin-offering:[9] there is but one law for all sin-offerings![10] According to R. Simeon it is indeed so; and[11] as for the view of the Rabbis,[12] Raba said, If one slaughtered a sin-offering brought on account of [eating] forbidden fat under the name of a sin-offering brought on account of [eating] blood, or under the name of a sin-offering brought on account of idolatry, it is valid;[13] if [he slaughtered it] under the name of the sin-offering of the Nazirite or of the leper it is invalid, because with each of these there is a burnt-offering too.[14] R. Aha the son of Raba reports that it is invalid in every case, for it is written, And he shall slaughter it for a sin-offering.[15] that is, for that [particular] sin.[16]

R. Ashi answered, It is no contradiction: Here he took the handful out of that which was prepared on a griddle and referred to it as prepared in a pan, there he took the handful out of a meal-offering prepared on a griddle and referred to it as a meal-offering prepared in a pan.[17] Where what is prepared on a griddle is referred to as prepared in a pan, [it discharges the owner's obligation, for] the wrongful intention is in respect of the vessel used, and a wrongful intention in respect of the vessel used does not invalidate the offering. Where a meal-offering prepared on a griddle is referred to as a meal-offering prepared in a pan, [it does not discharge the owner's obligation, for] the wrongful intention is in respect of a meal-offering, and it is thereby rendered invalid. But did not the Tanna [R. Simeon] say, 'For the preparation thereof clearly indicates [the true nature of the offering]'?[18] — He meant thus: Although the expressed statement clearly does not [correspond with the actual offering], and consequently it should be invalid,[19] [yet it is not so, for] the intention is in respect of the vessel and any wrongful intention in respect of the vessel does not invalidate the offering.[20] Then what is the meaning of the statement, 'But with animal-offerings it is not so'?[21] — It means, in spite of the fact that the same manner of slaughtering is for all offerings, and the same manner of receiving the blood and sprinkling it for all offerings, the wrongful intention is in respect of the slaughtering and it is thereby rendered invalid.

R. Aha the son of Raba asked R. Ashi, Then why does R. Simeon say [that it discharges the owner's obligation] where a dry [meal-offering] was referred to as one mingled [with oil]?[22] He replied, [The intention was] for anything that is mingled.[23] If so, when referring [to a burnt-offering] as a peace-offering it might also be taken to mean anything that brings about peace![24] — There is no comparison at all! There the actual sacrifice is termed shelamim [peace-offering],[25] as it is written, He that offereth the blood of the shelamim,[26] which means, he that sprinkles the blood of the peace-offering;[27] but here, is the meal-offering ever referred to simply as belulah [mingled]?[28] It is written, And every meal-offering, mingled with oil [belulah ba-shemen] or dry;[29] it is indeed referred to as 'mingled with oil', but never as 'mingled' by itself.[30]

Now they all[31] do not adopt Rabbah's answer, for [they say], on the contrary, an intention which is manifestly [absurd] the Divine Law declares capable of rendering an offering invalid.[32] They also do not adopt Raba's answer, for they do not accept his interpretation of the verse, 'And this is the law of the meal-offering'.[33] And they do not all adopt R. Ashi's answer because of the difficulty raised by R. Aha the son of Raba.[34]

That which is clear to Rabbah in one way[35] and is clear to Raba in the opposite way,[36] is a matter of doubt to R. Hoshaia. For R. Hoshaia put the question (others say, R. Hoshaia put the question to R. Assi): Where one referred to a meal-offering as an animal-offering

---

(1) V. supra 2b: 'Since meal-offerings are not like animal offerings'. In some cases, however, as in the last case stated, the express variation of the sacrifice is so absurd as to be absolutely ignored; and therefore the sacrifice serves to discharge the obligation of the owner.

(2) To reconcile the contradiction cited between the statements of R. Simeon, v. supra p. 4.

(3) Lev. VI, 7.

(4) I.e., all meal-offerings are regarded as one form of offering, and therefore when dealing with one kind of meal-offering to refer to it as another is of no consequence.

(5) Accordingly a meal-offering referred to as an animal-offering should be valid since the reference is apparently absurd.

(6) In the case where the priest expressly refers to a meal-offering prepared on a griddle as one prepared in a pan.

(7) For the view now held is that where the expressed intention is absurd on the face of it it most certainly renders the offering invalid, for otherwise it may be said that it is permitted to vary offerings.

(8) This statement originally was taken to mean that any variation in an animal-offering affects the owner in that his obligation is not discharged. Now, however, according to the interpretation suggested, the contrast with meal-offerings must give the result that any variation in animal-offerings discharges the owner's obligation since, after all, there is but one manner of slaughtering and one manner of sprinkling for all offerings.

(9) Lev. VI, 18.

(10) Consequently any variation regarding the kind of sin-offering should be of no consequence; wherefore then have we learnt that the sin-offering is thereby rendered invalid (Zeb. opening Mishnah)?

(11) The text is extremely doubtful and the suggested emendations are various each with different interpretations. The translation follows the text as suggested by Sh. Mek. in the margin, which is supported by MS.M. V. also commentaries of Birkath Hazebah (B.H.) and Z. Kodoshim (Z.K.)

(12) Who do not adopt the interpretation of And this is the law of the sin-offering.

(13) Although it does not count for the fulfilment of the owner's obligation (Rashi). It is valid, however, because each offering mentioned bears the name and true characteristic of the sin-offering.

(14) And it might be said that a sin-offering offered under the name of a burnt-offering is also valid, which is certainly not the law. According to another reading, the word בהדיהו is omitted, and the translation would be: 'these are (sc. have the characteristics of) burnt-offerings'; i.e., the sin-offering of the Nazirite and of the leper do not, like all other sin-offerings, bring about atonement, but only serve to render the person fit to partake of that which he was forbidden heretofore, namely, to permit the Nazirite to drink wine, and the leper to enter the Temple and to partake of sacred food.

(15) Ibid. IV, 33.

(16) Heb. אותה translated 'it' is often interpreted by the Rabbis as the demonstrative pronoun 'that'; i.e., he shall

slaughter the offering for that particular sin.

(17) V. supra p. 3, n. 4.

(18) Accordingly a meal-offering prepared on a griddle and referred to as a meal-offering prepared in a pan should also be valid since the expressed intention is apparently absurd.

(19) V. supra p. 10, n. 5.

(20) So in MS. M. and Sh. Mek.

(21) V. supra p. 10, n. 6.

(22) The variation here is clearly not in respect of the vessel in which the meal-offering is put, but rather in respect of the meal-offering itself, and therefore the wrongful intention should invalidate the offering.

(23) But not necessarily a meal-offering; such an intention therefore could in no wise affect the offering.

(24) And not necessarily a peace-offering; such an intention therefore should not invalidate the sacrifice, nevertheless it is admitted by R. Simeon that with regard to animal offerings a wrongful intention does invalidate the sacrifice.

(25) שלמים. And nowhere in the Bible has this word any other connotation.

(26) Lev. VII, 33.

(27) V. Zeb. 98b.

(28) בלולה.

(29) Lev. VII, 10. בלולה בשמן.

(30) So that to refer to a dry meal-offering as mingled does not necessarily mean that it is intended to be a meal-offering mingled with oil, for this would have been expressly stated; it is regarded as empty words and the offering is not affected thereby.

(31) The Gemara, having argued fully upon the suggested answers of Rabbah, Raba and R. Ashi in reconciling the conflicting views of R. Simeon, now proceeds to explain why these three Rabbis cannot agree upon one answer.

(32) For otherwise it may be said that one may vary the services of the sacrifices.

(33) Ibid. VI, 7. For if they accepted this interpretation, they would also have to accept the similar interpretation of the verse in connection with the sin-offering, and there is no evidence to show that R. Simeon ever held such a view with regard to the sin-offering, namely, that if one slaughtered a sin-offering brought on account of eating forbidden fat under the name of the sin-offering of the Nazarite, it discharges the owner's obligation.

(34) For the answer given is not quite satisfactory, since the term ‘belulah’ by itself generally refers to a meal-offering mingled with oil.

(35) That a statement which is manifestly absurd with regard to the offering, as when the actions of the officiating priest belie his expressed intention, does not render the offering invalid; v. supra p. 5.

(36) That a statement which is manifestly absurd does render the offering invalid; v. supra p. 9, n.7.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 4a

, what would be R. Simeon's view? Is this the reason for R. Simeon's opinion, namely, that a wrongful intention which is manifestly [absurd] does not invalidate the offering, and here also the intention is manifestly [absurd]; or is it this, namely, it is written. And this is the law of the meal-offering,[1] but it is not written ‘of the animal-offering’? — He replied, We cannot fathom R. Simeon's mind, He[2] would not give Rabbah's answer because of Abaye's objection to it;[3] nor Raba's answer because of the objection from the verse, And this is the law of the sin-offering;[4] nor R. Ashi's answer because of the objection raised by R. Aha the son of Raba.

WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING AND THE MEAL-OFFERING OF JEALOUSY. It is indeed clear with regard to the sinner's meal-offering, for the Divine Law terms it a sin-offering, as it is written, He shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put any frankincense thereon; for it is a sin-offering.[5] But whence do we know it with regard to the meal-offering of jealousy? From the following which a Tanna recited before R. Nahman: The surplus of the meal-offering of jealousy was used for [public] freewill-offerings.[6] Whereupon he [R. Nahman] said to him, Well spoken, indeed! For the expression ‘iniquity’ is used with regard to it as well as with regard to the sin-offering;[7] and as the surplus of the sin-offering goes for [public] freewill-offerings,[8] so the surplus of the meal-offering of jealousy goes for [public]

freewill-offerings. And again like the sin-offering; as the sin-offering Is invalid if offered under any other name than its own, so the meal-offering of jealousy is also invalid if offered under any other name than its own. In that case the guilt-offering should also be invalid if offered under any name other than its own, since one can infer it from the sin-offering by means of the common expression 'iniquity'![9] — We may infer 'iniquity' from 'iniquity', but we may not infer 'iniquity' from 'his iniquity'. But what does this [slight variation] matter? Was it not taught in the School of R. Ishmael that in the verses, And the priest shall come again,[10] and And the priest shall come in,[10] 'coming again' and 'coming in' have the same import [for purposes of deduction]? Moreover, one can infer 'his iniquity' [stated in connection with the guilt-offering] from 'his iniquity' stated in connection with 'the hearing of the voice of adjuration', where it is written, if he do not utter it, then he shall bear his iniquity.[11] — Indeed the inference [from the sin-offering] relates only to the surplus [that it shall go] for freewill-offerings. Should you, however, retort, Surely an inference cannot be restricted to one point![12] [I answer that] the Divine Law has expressly stated 'it' with regard to the sin-offering, as it is written, And he shall slaughter it for a sin-offering;[13] 'it' [namely, the sin-offering, if slaughtered] under its own name is valid but under any name other than its own is invalid, whereas all other offerings are valid whether offered under their own or under any other name. Then whence do we know that the sinner's meal-offering and the meal-offering of jealousy are invalid [if offered] under any name other than their own? — Why is it [that this is so][14] regarding the sin-offering? Because there is written, It is [a sin-offering].[15] With these, too, there is written, 'It is'.[16] Then, with the guilt-offering we also find 'It is'?[17] — That is stated after the burning of the sacrificial parts; as it was taught: But with regard to the guilt-offering the expression 'It is' is stated after the burning of the sacrificial parts. And if the sacrificial parts thereof were not burnt at all, it is valid[18] . Then what is the purpose of the expression 'It is' [in the case of the guilt-offering]? — It is required for the teaching of R. Huna in the name of Rab, viz., If a guilt-offering that was assigned to pasture[19] was slaughtered without any specified purpose, it is valid as a burnt-offering. That is so only if it was assigned to pasture, but if it was not so assigned it is not [valid], for the verse reads. It is [a guilt-offering],[17] that is it retains its status.[20] Rab said, If [the priest] took the handful from the meal-offering of the 'Omer[21] under any name other than its own it is invalid,[22] for it is brought in order to render permitted [the new harvest] and it has not done so.[23] In like manner you may say with regard to the guilt-offering of the Nazirite

---

(1) Lev. VI, 7.

(2) R. Hoshaia who put this question.

(3) V. supra p. 4.

(4) Ibid. VI, 18; v. supra p. 11.

(5) Ibid. V, 11. And as the sin-offering if offered under any other name than its own is invalid (v. Zeb. 2a). So it is also with the sinner's meal-offering.

(6) I.e., if a sum of money was set aside for the purpose of acquiring barley for the meal-offering of jealousy, and if in the meantime barley fell in price, the surplus money was to be put into the special collecting boxes in the Temple (v. Shek. VI, 1, 5). The accumulated money was expended in the purchase of animals for sacrifices which were offered as public freewill-offerings whenever the altar was 'vacant'.

(7) So according to the text of MS.M. and Sh. Mek. In connection with the sin-offering it is written (Ibid. X, 17). And he hath given it to you to bear the iniquity of the congregation; and in connection with the meal-offering of jealousy it is written (Num. V, 15). Bringing iniquity to remembrance.

(8) V. Tem. 23b.

(9) For in connection with the guilt-offering there is also used the expression 'iniquity': Yet is he guilty and shall bear his iniquity (Lev. V, 17). Nevertheless it is established law that a guilt-offering offered under any other name than its own is valid.

(10) Ibid. XIV, 39 and 44. The reference is to the treatment of a leprous spot in the walls of a house. (v. Sifra a.l.).

(11) Ibid. V, 1, where a sin-offering is prescribed for the atonement.

(12) Lit., 'there is no inference by halves; i.e., an inference cannot be drawn in respect of one law and not in respect of another law.

(13) Ibid IV, 33.
(14) Sc. that if offered under any other name than its own it is invalid.
(15) Ibid. 24.
(16) For the sinner's meal-offering v. Lev. V, 11 and for the meal-offering of jealousy v. Num. V, 15.
(17) Lev. VII, 5: And the priest shall burn them upon the altar . . . it is a guilt-offering. Accordingly if the guilt-offering was offered under another name it should be invalid.
(18) V. Pes. 59b, and Zeb. 5b. As the expression 'it is' refers only to the burning of the sacrificial parts it follows that the other services are valid even though performed under another name. Moreover to suggest that the burning of the sacrificial parts is invalid if performed under another name is out of the question, for the offering is valid without it.
(19) This was the usual course whenever an animal having once been set aside for a guilt-offering was no longer required for that purpose. e.g., where the owner who was to bring this guilt-offering died, or where the animal was lost and another was used in its stead and was later found. This animal was assigned to the care of a shepherd and put out in the field to pasture until it became blemished, when it might be redeemed and the money used for freewill burnt-offerings (Rashi).
(20) Sc. that of a guilt-offering until it is expressly assigned to pasture when it is destined for a burnt-offering.
(21) V. Ibid. II, 14 and XXIII, 10ff. Only after the offering of the 'Omer on the sixteenth day of Nisan was it permitted to eat of the new harvest.
(22) I.e., the handful may not be burnt upon the altar, nor may the rest be eaten by the priests.
(23) Since it was offered under another name.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 4b

and the guilt-offering of the leper, viz., if one slaughtered them under any name other than their own they are invalid, for they are brought in order to render [the person] fit[1] and they have not done so. [An objection was raised:] We have learnt: ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL WAS TAKEN UNDER ANY OTHER NAME THAN THEIR OWN ARE VALID, SAVE THAT THEY DO NOT DISCHARGE THE OBLIGATION OF THE OWNER, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING AND THE MEAL-OFFERING OF JEALOUSY. Now if the [above ruling of Rab] were correct, then it should have also stated 'with the exception of the meal-offering of the 'Omer'! — It only states those [meal-offerings] which are brought by an individual and not that which is brought by the whole community;[2] furthermore, it only states those which are brought by themselves and not that which accompanies an animal-offering;[2] furthermore, it only states those which are brought at no fixed time and not that which is brought at a fixed time.[2]

'In like manner you may say with regard to the guilt-offering of the Nazirite and the guilt-offering of the leper, viz., if one slaughtered them under any name other than their own they are invalid, for they are brought in order to render [the person] fit and they have not done so'. [An objection was raised:] We have learnt: All animal-offerings that were slaughtered under any name other than their own are valid, save that they do not discharge the obligation of the owner, with the exception of the passover-offering and the sin-offering.[3] Now if [the above ruling of Rab] were correct, then it should have also stated with the exception of the guilt-offering of the Nazirite and the guilt-offering of the leper', for they are brought in order to render [the person] fit and they have not done so! — Since there is also the guilt-offering for robbery and the guilt-offering for sacrilege which are brought for atonement,[4] [the Tanna] therefore could not have stated it absolutely.[5] Why is it that the guilt-offering of the Nazirite and the guilt-offering of the leper [if slaughtered under another name are invalid]? It is, is it not, because they are brought in order to render [the person] fit and they have not done so? Then with the other [guilt-offerings] too, it might be said, they are brought to make atonement and they have not done so! — R. Jeremiah answered, It is because we find that Scripture distinguishes between sacrifices that bring about atonement and those that render [the person] fit; those that bring about atonement are sometimes brought after death;[6] whereas those that render [the person] fit are never brought after death. As we have learnt:[7] If a woman had brought her

sin-offering and then died, her heirs must bring her burnt-offering; but if she had first brought her burnt-offering and then died, her heirs need not bring her sin-offering.[8] R. Judah the son of R. Simeon b. Pazzi demurred: But are not sacrifices that render the person fit also brought after death? Surely we have learnt: If a man set apart money for his Nazirite offerings,[9] it is forbidden to make any other use of it, yet there would be no infringement of the law of sacrilege, since it may all be used for the purchase of peace-offerings.[10] If he died and the money was not yet apportioned [for the respective offerings], it all goes for freewill-offerings;[11] if it was apportioned, the price of the sin-offering must be cast into the Dead Sea[12] — no use may be made of it; yet [if one did] there would be no infringement of the law of sacrilege;[13] with the price of the burnt-offering a burnt-offering must be brought and the law of sacrilege applies to it; with the price of the peace-offering a peace-offering must be brought which must be eaten the same day[14] , but it does not require the Bread-offering.[15] Now are not the burnt-offering and the peace-offering of the Nazirite brought in order to render him fit and yet are brought after death? — Said R. Papa. This is what R. Jeremiah meant: We do not find an absolute offering,[16] serving to render the person fit, that can be brought after death, for as regards the Nazirite, the offering which serves to render him fit is not absolute,

---

(1) The guilt-offering of a Nazirite, which was brought if during the period of his vow the Nazirite contracted uncleanness, rendered him fit to resume his Nazirite mode of life; cf. Num. VI, 12. The guilt-offering of the leper rendered him fit to partake of consecrated food.

(2) As is the case with the meal-offering of the ‘Omer; v. Lev. XXIII, 12.

(3) Which are invalid if slaughtered under any other name; Zeb. 2a.

(4) And from the above rule of Rab it is to be inferred that whatsoever is brought for atonement, even if offered under another name, is valid; v. infra.

(5) I.e., the Tanna could not have stated absolutely in the Mishnah ‘with the exception of the passover-offering, the sin-offering and the guilt-offering’, for the rule in the latter case is not general but varies according to the kind of guilt-offering.

(6) Sc. of the person for whom the atonement was to be made.

(7) Kin. II, 5; Kid. 13b.

(8) A woman after childbirth was enjoined to bring these two offerings: the burnt-offering for atonement, and the sin-offering in order to render her fit to partake of consecrated food; cf. Lev. XII, 6. It is clear from this Mishnah that only the sacrifice which brings atonement is brought after death.

(9) Viz., the burnt-offering, the sin-offering and the peace-offering; cf. Num. VI, 14.

(10) And peace-offerings are not subject to the law of sacrilege (except the sacrificial portions thereof after the sprinkling of the blood) since they are not regarded as consecrated property.

(11) This is a traditional ruling, referred to as a halachah given to Moses from Sinai, v. Nazir 25a.

(12) I.e., it must be disposed of so that no benefit whatsoever be derived from it by anybody, this being in accordance with the established law that a sin-offering whose owner had died must be left to die.

(13) Since the money is to be destroyed it cannot be said to be consecrated property and therefore cannot be subject to the law of sacrilege; cf. Me'il, 3a.

(14) I.e., not as the ordinary peace-offering which may be eaten during two days and one night, but as the Nazirite peace-offering which is limited to one day.

(15) Cf. Num. VI, 19. Since the Nazirite is dead the requirement regarding the Bread-offering, And he shall put them (sc. the loaves) upon the hands of the Nazirite, cannot be fulfilled; Me'il, 11a. Nazir 24b.

(16) I.e., an offering which is indispensable in every one of its parts and rites.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 5a

for a Master has said, If [the Nazirite] shaved [his head] after [the sacrifice of] any one of the three offerings, he has fulfilled his obligation.[1]

An objection was raised: If the guilt-offering of a leper was slaughtered under any name other

than its own, or if the blood thereof was not put upon the thumb and great toe[2] [of the one to be cleansed], it may nevertheless be offered upon the altar, and it requires the drink-offerings;[3] but another guilt-offering is necessary in order to render him fit. This is indeed a refutation of Rab's view.[4]

R. Simeon b. Lakish said, If [the priest] took the handful from the meal-offering of the 'Omer under any name other than its own, it is valid,[5] but the rest of it may not be eaten until another 'Omer meal-offering has been brought and rendered it permitted. But surely, if the rest of it may not be eaten, how may it [the handful] be offered? It is written, From the liquor of Israel,[6] that is, from that which is permitted to Israel! — R. Adda b. Ahabah said, Resh Lakish is of the opinion that the prohibition of 'out of time' does not apply to the same day.[7]

R. Adda the son of R. Isaac raised an objection: Some conditions apply to bird-offerings which do not apply to meal-offerings, and some conditions apply to meal-offerings which do not apply to bird-offerings. Some conditions apply to bird-offerings: a bird-offering may be brought as a voluntary offering by two people jointly,[8] it is brought by those that lack atonement,[9] and an exception to the general prohibition is made for consecrated birds;[10] these, however, do not apply to meal-offerings. And some conditions apply to meal-offerings: a meal-offering requires a vessel,[11] it requires waving and bringing nigh,[12] it may be the offering of the community or of the individual;[13] these, however, do not apply to bird-offerings. Now if [the aforesaid view] were correct,[14] then with regard to meal-offerings it can also be said that an exception to the general prohibition was made for that which is consecrated, namely, in the case of the meal-offering of the 'Omer![15] — Since the prohibition of 'out of time' does not apply to the same day, it is not regarded as a prohibition at all.[16]

R. Shesheth raised an objection: If the application of the oil[17] was performed before the application of the blood, he [the priest] must fill up the log of oil and must again apply the oil after applying the blood. If [the oil] was applied on the thumb and great toe before it was sprinkled seven times before the Lord, he must fill up the log of oil and must again apply it on the thumb and great toe after the oil has been sprinkled seven times. Now if you are right in saying that the prohibition of 'out of time' does not apply to the same day, why must [the priest] do it again? After all, what is done is done![18] — R. Papa answered, It is different with the rites of the leper since the expression 'shall be' is written with regard to them, as it is written, This shall be the law of the leper;[19] 'shall be' implies that it shall always be so.[20] R. Papa raised an objection: If his[21] sin-offering was [slaughtered] before his guilt-offering, one should not be appointed to keep stirring the blood[22] [until the guilt-offering had been brought], but the appearance [of the flesh] must be allowed to pass away and it must be taken away to the place of burning![23] But why does R. Papa raise this objection? Did not R. Papa say that the law is different with regard to the rites of a leper, since the expression 'shall be' is used with regard to them? — R. Papa had felt this difficulty: perhaps this law only affected what was a 'service', but slaughtering is no 'service';[24] now if [it is correct to say that] the prohibition of 'out of time' does not apply to the same day, then some one might keep stirring the blood [of the sin-offering] whilst the guilt-offering is being offered and then the sin-offering can be offered! — Rather said R. Papa, This is the reason for Resh Lakish's view: he is of the opinion that the daybreak[25] [of the sixteenth day of Nisan] renders [the new harvest] permitted. For both R. Johanan and Resh Lakish said, Even when the Temple was in existence

---

(1) Nazir 45a.

(2) Cf. Lev. XIV, 17.

(3) V. infra 90b.

(4) For according to Rab whatsoever is brought to render the person fit, if offered under any other name than its own, is invalid, i.e., one may not proceed to burn it upon the altar.

(5) I. e., it may be offered upon the altar.

(6) Ezek. XLV, 15; referring especially to drink-offerings, but the Rabbis have inferred from this expression that

whatsoever is forbidden to Israel may not be offered upon the altar.
(7) The prohibition of 'out of time', i.e., that the time has not yet arrived when the matter may be offered upon the altar, does not apply where this same matter will later on this very day be permitted to all Israel. Here, after the offering of another 'Omer, the new harvest will be permitted to all.
(8) But a meal-offering cannot be brought by two persons jointly, for the expression 'a soul' (Lev. II, 1) i.e., an individual, is used in connection with it; v. infra 104b. In cur. edd. this reason is, expressly stated in the text.
(9) I.e., those who had suffered uncleanness, viz., a man or woman that had an issue, a woman after childbirth, and a leper, and who had done all that was necessary for their purification except to present their offering. The offering in each case was a bird-offering.
(10) Generally to nip off the head of a bird would render the whole bird nebelah, I.e. carrion, and forbidden to be eaten. Nevertheless this was the prescribed method for 'killing bird-offerings, and the flesh was eaten by the priests.
(11) I.e., the handful taken out by the priest had to be put into a sacred vessel, whereas the nipping of the head of a bird had to be done with the priest's finger-nail.
(12) V. infra 60a.
(13) The meal-offering of the 'Omer was brought on behalf of the whole community; bird-offerings, however, were brought only by individuals and never by the community.
(14) That if the meal-offering of the 'Omer was offered under another name, the offering may be proceeded with, although the new harvest was still under the prohibition.
(15) For it is offered upon the altar although the new harvest is still forbidden. Consequently meal-offerings are similar to bird-offerings in that in each case there is an exception to a general prohibition.
(16) Hence one cannot speak of the offering of the 'Omer, even though it was offered under another name, as an exception to a general prohibition, as there is really no prohibition at all.
(17) In the purification rites of a leper the following duties, inter alia, had to be strictly observed: first, the officiating priest must apply the blood of the guilt-offering on the tip of the right ear, the thumb of the right hand and the great toe of the right foot of the one to be cleansed; secondly, from the log (v. Glos.) of oil the priest must sprinkle seven times before the Lord; thirdly, he must apply oil on those parts on which the blood was previously applied. V. Lev. XIV, 14-19.
(18) For the priority of services is not vital and the fact that one service was performed out of its time should not matter in the least.
(19) Ibid. XIV, 2.
(20) Without any variation in the routine.
(21) Sc. the leper's.
(22) That it should not become congealed.
(23) I.e., the flesh of the sin-offering must be allowed to remain overnight, when the freshness would be gone, and then burnt. The fact that it must be burnt proves that whatever is offered 'out of time' is invalid, thus in conflict with Resh Lakish's view.
(24) Since it does not require the services of a priest but a layman may slaughter the sacrifice. V. Tosaf. s.v. שחיטה 1.
(25) Lit., 'when the eastern sky has lit up'.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 5b

it was the daybreak that rendered [the new harvest] permitted.[1]

This view of Resh Lakish[2] was not expressly stated but was inferred from the following: We have learnt:[3] One may not offer[4] meal-offerings, first-fruits, or meal-offerings that accompany animal-offerings, before the 'Omer;[5] and if one did so it is invalid. Neither may one offer these before the Two Loaves;[6] but if one did so it is valid. And R. Isaac said in the name of Resh Lakish. This rule[7] applies only [if the offering was brought] on the fourteenth or fifteenth day [of Nisan], but if brought on the sixteenth day[8] it would be valid. It is thus clear that he is of the opinion that the daybreak [of the sixteenth day of Nisan] renders [the new harvest] permitted.

Raba said, If [the priest] took the handful from the meal-offering of the ‘Omer under any name other than its own, it is valid, and the rest of it may be eaten; moreover there is no need of another ‘Omer meal-offering [to be brought in order] to render [the new harvest] permitted. For [Raba is of the opinion that] a wrongful intention does not affect the offering unless expressed by one fit for service, in respect of what is fit for service, and in the place that is fit for service. ‘By one fit for service’ — this excludes a priest with a physical-blemish; ‘in respect of what is fit for service’ — this excludes the ‘Omer meal-offering which is not fit for any other offering, for it is exceptional;[9] ‘and in the place that is fit for service — this excludes an altar which has become chipped.[10]

Our Rabbis taught: When it says in the next verse Of the herd[11] — which is unnecessary — it does so only to exclude a trefah[12] animal. But surely this can be arrived at by an a fortiori argument:[13] if a blemished animal which is permitted to man is forbidden to the Most High,[14] how much more is a trefah animal which is forbidden to man forbidden to the Most High! The fat and the blood [of the animal], however, can prove otherwise; for these are forbidden to man yet are permitted to the Most High. [And if you retort,] This is so of the fat and the blood since they emanate from that which is permitted,[15] but will you say the same of a trefah animal which is wholly forbidden? [I reply,] The rite of nipping off [the head of a bird-offering] which [would render the bird] wholly forbidden [to man] could prove otherwise: for it is forbidden to man yet is permitted to the Most High. [But you might retort,] This is so of the nipping since it is only rendered forbidden [to man] by this act which renders it consecrated;[16] the same, however, cannot be said of a trefah animal for it is not rendered forbidden by any act which renders it consecrated.[17] And if you reply to this, then [I say that] when it reads in the next verse ‘Of the herd’ — which is unnecessary-it does so only to exclude the trefah animal.

What was meant by ‘If you reply to this’?[18] — Rab said, Because one could reply that the ‘Omer meal-offering can prove otherwise: for it is forbidden to man yet permitted to the Most High. But this is so of the ‘Omer meal-offering as it renders the new produce permitted![19] — The [‘Omer meal-offering of the] Sabbatical year was meant.[20] But that surely renders the aftergrowth permitted? — [It is indeed the ‘Omer meal-offering of] the Sabbatical year [that is meant], but the view is in accordance with that of R. Akiba who said that the aftergrowth is forbidden in the Sabbatical year.[21] R. Aha b. Abba said to R. Ashi, Even according to R. Akiba's view one could refute the argument thus: This is so of the ‘Omer meal-offering since it renders permitted the new produce [of the Sabbatical year grown] outside the Land [of Israel][22] And even according to him who maintains that outside the Land [of Israel] the new produce is not forbidden by the law of the Torah, [one can refute the argument thus: This is so of the ‘Omer meal-offering,] since it serves to raise the prohibition that lies upon it.[23] R. Aha of Difti thereupon said to Rabina, If so, should not a trefah animal also be permitted to be offered as a sacrifice and so it would raise the prohibition [of trefah] that lies upon it?[24] -One could, however, refute the argument thus: This is so of the ‘Omer meal-offering since there is an express command that it shall be so.[25]

Resh Lakish said, One could reply that the case of the compounder of the incense can prove otherwise: for he is forbidden to man yet permitted to the Most High.[26] But the compounder is a person![27] — Say, rather, The compound forming the incense can prove otherwise: for it is forbidden to man[28] yet permitted to the Most High[28] But this is so of the compound forming the incense since there is an express command that it shall be so![29] Mar the son of Rabina said, One could reply that the Sabbath can prove otherwise: for it is forbidden to man yet permitted to the Most High.[30] But this is so of the Sabbath since an exception to the general prohibition is allowed to the layman in the case of circumcision![31] — Surely circumcision is not for the sake of the layman. It is a precept [of the Law]! — One could therefore say, This is so of the Sabbath since there is an express command that it shall be so![32]

R. Adda b. Abba said, One could reply that a garment of diverse kinds [of stuff][33] can prove

otherwise: for it is forbidden to the layman yet permitted to the Most High.[34] But this is so of diverse kinds since an exception to the general prohibition is allowed to the layman in the case of the zizith![35] — Surely the zizith is not for the sake of the layman, it is a precept [of the Law]! — One could therefore say,

---

(1) V. infra 68a. The restriction against partaking of the new harvest is lifted at the dawn of the sixteenth day of Nisan, before the offering of the ‘Omer. Consequently the handful, even though taken under another name, may be burnt upon the altar, for the new harvest is already permitted to all.

(2) That the daybreak of the sixteenth day of Nisan renders the new harvest permitted, even before the offering of the ‘Omer.

(3) Infra 68b.

(4) Of the new harvest.

(5) For only that which is permitted to Israel may be offered upon the altar; cf. Ezek. XLV, 15, and supra p. 20.

(6) Which were offered on Shabuoth, the Feast of Weeks. These are referred to as ‘a new meal-offering’. I.e., the first (wheaten) meal-offering of the new harvest; v. Lev. XXIII, 16, 17.

(7) That whatsoever is offered before the ‘Omer is invalid.

(8) Although the ‘Omer meal-offering had not yet been brought.

(9) In that it was brought of barley (and of bruised grain in contradistinction from the meal-offering of jealousy which was of barley meal) whereas all other meal-offerings consisted of wheat.

(10) Cf. Ex. XX, 21: And thou shalt slaughter upon it, implying that the altar shall be whole at the time of the service and not chipped. V. Zeb. 59a, and Hul. 18a.

(11) Lev. I, 3. In the preceding verse 2, the particle ‘of’ that precedes each of the classes of animals mentioned is utilized to exclude from sacrifices such animals as were used for irreligious or immoral purposes.

(12) V. Glos.

(13) And no verse therefore is required to teach that a trefah animal is unfit for a sacrifice.

(14) Sc. to be offered upon the altar.

(15) I.e., the whole of the animal is permitted to be eaten except for these parts.

(16) Sc. the nipping. It is with the rite of nipping that the bird becomes consecrated and so forbidden to a layman; before that it was permitted.

(17) For without consecration a trefah animal is forbidden to man. And so no verse is really necessary to exclude a trefah animal from being offered as a sacrifice.

(18) What reasoning could be adduced to refute the foregoing argument derived from the rite of nipping that it was found necessary to resort to the verse to exclude a trefah animal?

(19) Whereas a trefah animal does not render anything permitted.

(20) When there is no new produce to be rendered permitted, for in this year the fields were to rest and lie fallow (cf. Ex. XXIII, 10, 11). Hence the ‘Omer meal-offering of this year is on the same footing as any trefah animal in that neither can render anything else permitted; consequently by analogy with the ‘Omer meal-offering a trefah animal should be permitted as a sacrifice, and therefore the verse is necessary to exclude the trefah animal.

(21) V. Pes. 51b. The ‘Omer of this year therefore does not render anything permitted and is on all fours with a trefah animal.

(22) And so it is not on a par with a trefah animal which renders naught permitted.

(23) Sc. the prohibition of the new produce. If in the Sabbatical year a man were to eat of the remnants of the ‘Omer meal-offering, he would not be liable for eating of the new produce, for this prohibition has been raised by the offering of the ‘Omer, but would only incur guilt for eating of the produce of the Sabbatical year. V., however, Tosaf. s.v. שכן.

(24) And whosoever ate thereof would not be liable for eating what was trefah.

(25) The ‘Omer meal-offering must be brought from the new produce of the year, for that is the very essence of the precept; on the other hand, it is not essential that only a trefah animal shall be offered, any other animal would serve just as well.

(26) Cf. Ex. XXX, 34ff. Likewise it would be said that a trefah animal, though forbidden to man, is permitted to the Most High. Hence a verse is necessary to exclude a trefah animal.

(27) And how can it be said that he is permitted to the Most High?

(28) Cf. ibid. 37.

(29) But there is no express command to offer a trefah animal!

(30) I.e., work on the Sabbath is forbidden to the layman, yet it is permitted to offer thereon the prescribed sacrifices.

(31) Which may be performed on the Sabbath. On the other hand there are no exceptions to the general prohibition of trefah!

(32) For the Sabbath sacrifices can only be offered on the Sabbath.

(33) I.e., a texture blended of wool and linen; v. Lev. XIX, 19; Deut. XXII, 11.

(34) The High Priest whilst officiating in the Temple wore a girdle that was blended of wool and linen.

(35) Sc. the fringes; cf. Num. XV, 38ff; Deut. XXII, 12. It is permitted to attach fringes of wool to a linen garment, for the prohibition of diverse kinds of stuff does not apply to the precept of zizith.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 6a

This is so of the law of diverse kinds since there is an express command that it shall be so.[1] R. Shisha the son of R. Idi said, One could reply, Let the argument revolve and the inference be made from what is common to both. Thus, the argument, 'This is so of the nipping since it is only rendered forbidden to man by this act which renders it consecrated',[2] can be refuted by the argument, 'The fat and the blood can prove otherwise'. And the argument, 'This is so of the fat and the blood since they emanate from what is permitted',[2] can be refuted by the argument, 'The rite of nipping can prove otherwise'. And so the argument goes round; the characteristic feature of this case is not that of the other, and the characteristic feature of the other is not that of this case; but what they have in common is that each is forbidden to man yet permitted to the Most High. So I might have inferred that trefah, too, although it is forbidden to man, is permitted to the Most High.[3] But they have this also in common, have they not, that in each case there is an express command that it shall be so?[4] — R. Ashi therefore said, One could reply that the first proposition of the argument is unsound. Whence did you infer it[5] at the outset? From the case of a blemished animal. But the case of a blemish is different, since in that case [the priest] who offers [the sacrifice] is on the same footing as the [animal] offered.[6] Whereupon R. Aha the Elder said to R. Ashi, That which was extracted from the side of the mother's womb can prove otherwise: for in that case [the priest] who offers [the sacrifice] is not on the same footing as the [animal] offered,[7] nevertheless such an animal is permitted to man and forbidden to the Most High.[8] [And if the objection is raised:] But this is so only of that which was extracted from the side of the mother's womb since it is not holy as a firstling;[9] [I reply,] The case of an animal with a physical blemish can prove otherwise.[10] [And if this objection is raised:] But this is so only in the case of a blemish since in that respect [the priest] who offers [the sacrifice] is on the same footing as the [animal] offered, [I reply,] That which was extracted from the side of the mother's womb can prove otherwise. And so the argument goes round; the characteristic feature of this case is not that of the other, and the characteristic feature of the other is not that of this case; but what they have in common is that each is permitted to man yet forbidden to the Most High, then surely trefah, which is forbidden to man, is all the more forbidden to the Most High. But the others have this also in common, that in each case there is no exception to the general [prohibition]; will you say the same of the case of trefah seeing that it admits of an exception to the general [prohibition]?[11] Thereupon R. Aha the son of Raba said to R. Ashi, What is meant by saying that trefah admits of an exception to the general [prohibition]? Should you say that it refers to the rite of nipping off the head of the burnt-offering of a bird, [in which case the bird, although rendered trefah thereby,] is nevertheless permitted [to be offered] to the Most High; but this is also the case with physical blemishes, for a bird with a physical blemish is certainly permitted to be offered to the Most High, [for it has been said,][12] The unblemished state and the male sex are prerequisites only to sacrifices of cattle but not of birds! You would say then that it refers to the rite of nipping off the head of a sin-offering of a bird, [in which case the bird is] permitted to [be eaten by] priests; but surely the priests receive it from the table of the Most High![13] — Indeed the argument could be refuted thus, The others[14] have this further in common, for in each case the defect thereof is perceptible;[15] will you then say the same of the case of trefah seeing that its defect is not perceptible? The verse is therefore necessary [to exclude trefah].

And is the case of trefah[16] derived from here?[17] Surely it is derived from the verse, From the liquor of Israel,[18] that is, from that which is permitted to Israel; or from the verse, Whatsoever passeth under the rod,[19] which excludes a trefah animal since it cannot pass under![20] — All [three verses] are necessary; for from the verse, 'From the liquor of Israel', I should have excluded only those that were at no time fit[21] [for a sacrifice], just as 'orlah[22] or diverse kinds in the vineyard;[23] but where it was at one time fit I would say that it is permitted [to be offered]. Scripture therefore states, 'Whatsoever passeth under the rod'. And had Scripture only stated the verse, 'Whatsoever passeth under the rod', I should have excluded only those animals that were first rendered trefah and subsequently consecrated, as in the case of the Cattle Tithe;[24] but where it was consecrated first and subsequently it became trefah, since at the time when it was consecrated it was fit [for a sacrifice], I would say that it is permitted [to be offered], therefore all [three verses] are necessary. MISHNAH. WHETHER IT IS A SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING OR ANY OTHER MEAL-OFFERING, IF A NON-PRIEST, OR [A PRIEST] THAT WAS IN MOURNING.[25] OR HAD IMMERSED HIMSELF DURING THE DAY.[26] OR WAS NOT WEARING THE [OFFICIAL PRIESTLY] ROBES,[27] OR WHOSE ATONEMENT WAS NOT YET COMPLETE.[28] OR THAT HAD NOT WASHED HIS HANDS AND FEET,[29] OR THAT WAS UNCIRCUMCISED[30] OR UNCLEAN, OR THAT MINISTERED SITTING,[31] OR STANDING UPON VESSELS OR UPON A BEAST OR UPON ANOTHER'S FEET,[32] HAD TAKEN THE HANDFUL THEREFROM IT IS INVALID. IF [A PRIEST] REMOVED THE HANDFUL WITH HIS LEFT HAND IT IS INVALID. BEN BATHYRA SAYS, HE MUST PUT [THE HANDFUL] BACK AND TAKE IT OUT AGAIN WITH THE RIGHT HAND. IF ON TAKING THE HANDFUL THERE CAME INTO HIS HAND A SMALL STONE OR A GRAIN OF SALT OR A DROP OF FRANKINCENSE IT IS INVALID;[33] FOR THEY HAVE RULED: IF THE HANDFUL WAS TOO MUCH OR TOO LITTLE IT IS INVALID. WHAT IS MEANT BY TOO MUCH? IF HE TOOK AN OVERFLOWING HANDFUL. AND 'TOO LITTLE'? IF HE TOOK THE HANDFUL WITH THE TIPS OF HIS FINGERS ONLY.[34]

GEMARA. Why does the Mishnah state: 'WHETHER IT IS A SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING OR ANY OTHER MEAL-OFFERING'? Surely it should state, 'Every meal-offering from which the handful was taken by a non-priest or a priest that was in mourning [etc.]'. — It was necessary [to state it so] according to R. Simeon's view. For it was taught: R. Simeon said, By right the sinner's meal-offering should require oil and frankincense, so that the sinner should have no advantage;[35] why then does it not require them? In order that his offering be not sumptuous. Also, by right an ordinary sin-offering[36] should require drink-offerings.[37]

---

(1) That the High Priest's girdle shall be of wool and linen; cf. Ex. XXVIII.

(2) V. supra p. 24, nn. 1 and 2.

(3) Consequently the verse of Lev. I, 3 is necessary in order to exclude the trefah animal from sacrifice.

(4) But this is not the case with trefah; so that it would not have been possible to infer the trefah animal from the common features of the other two (sc. the fat and the blood and the rite of nipping), and therefore the verse is rendered superfluous.

(5) That a trefah animal might not be offered upon the altar.

(6) But this is not so with trefah, for a priest with a physical blemish is disqualified from offering sacrifices (cf Lev. XXI, 17ff). whereas a priest who is trefah, i.e., who suffers from a serious organic disease, is still qualified to officiate in the Temple; cf. Bek. 45b.

(7) A priest who at birth was extracted by a Caesarean operation from his mother's womb is considered fit to serve in the Temple, whereas an animal so extracted from the dam's womb is not fit for a sacrifice. V. Lev. XXII, 27 and Sifra thereon.

(8) And a trefah animal would a fortiori be forbidden to the Most High, since it is even forbidden to man; hence the verse excluding trefah is superfluous.

(9) Whereas an animal that was born a trefah is nevertheless holy as a firstling.

(10) For an animal that was born with a physical blemish, although holy as a firstling, is nevertheless not permitted to the Most High. The same therefore would be said of trefah, that although it is holy as a firstling it is forbidden to be offered.
(11) Accordingly it could be held that a trefah animal may be offered as a sacrifice.
(12) V. Kid. 24b.
(13) And with regard to the Most High it has been shown that there is also an exception to the general prohibition of physical blemishes in the case of birds.
(14) Sc. the animal that is blemished and that which has been extracted from the womb.
(15) For only an animal with a blemish exposed to the full view is declared to be unfit for sacrifice. Likewise an animal extracted from the side of its dam would be regarded as an object of curiosity, and so its peculiarity would soon be known to all. Trefah, on the other hand, is not always a perceptible taint, for it may be that only an internal organ has become affected.
(16) That it is not fit to be offered as a sacrifice.
(17) I.e., from Lev. I, 3; v. supra p. 23.
(18) Ezek. XLV, 15; v. supra p. 20.
(19) Lev. XXVII, 32, with reference to the Cattle Tithe, but the rule that is here derived is applied to all sacrifices; cf. Bek. 57a.
(20) A trefah animal, inasmuch as it cannot continue to live for more than twelve months (cf. Hul. 42a), is not deemed to possess vitality, and therefore cannot be said to pass of its own volition under the rod. Cf. however Rashi on Hul 136b where the suggestion is made that a trefah animal, e.g., one whose hind-legs were cut off above the knee-joint (v. l.c. 76a). on account of its defect cannot physically pass under the rod.
(21) E.g., an animal that was born trefah. According to Rabbinic interpretation the verse in Ezek. contains an allusion to ‘orlah and to diverse kinds in the vineyard, and these were at no time ever allowed for any purpose.
(22) Lit., ‘uncircumcised’. The fruit of newly-planted trees is during the first three years forbidden for all purposes. Cf. Lev. XIX, 23.
(23) V. Deut. XXII, 9.
(24) For the verse merely implies that a trefah animal, since it cannot pass under the rod, is not subject to the law of Cattle Tithe; but an animal consecrated as the tithe always remains consecrated even though it subsequently becomes trefah.
(25) Heb. אונן, a mourner while his dead relative is awaiting burial. Such a priest is forbidden to minister in the Temple, cf. Zeb. 16a.
(26) Heb. טבול יום; one who having suffered uncleanness has taken the ritual bath during the day but must now await sunset before he is deemed fully clean. He may not enter the Temple or minister therein.
(27) V. Zeb. 17b.
(28) One who, having suffered the uncleanness of leprosy or of an issue, has performed all the rites of purification but is not deemed fully clean until he has brought an offering as an atonement. V. Zeb. 19b.
(29) Every priest was obliged to wash his hands and feet from the Temple laver daily before taking part in the service. Cf. Ex. XXX, 19, 20.
(30) Whose brothers had died by reason of their circumcision.
(31) For it is written, To stand to minister (Deut. XVIII, 5.).
(32) The priest must stand on the floor and nothing should interpose between his feet and the floor of the Temple. V. Zeb. 24a.
(33) For the handful is not quite full since there is lacking flour to the extent of the volume of the stone or other substance that came up with it.
(34) Instead of extending his fingers over the palm of his hand, v. infra 11a.
(35) By being spared the cost of these ingredients.
(36) Lit., ‘a sin-offering (to be brought on account) of (eating forbidden) fat’. This is the usual example of a transgression involving a sin-offering.
(37) V. Num. XV, where are prescribed the quantities of flour and oil for the meal-offering and wine for the drink-offering which must accompany the burnt-offering and the peace-offering.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 6b

so that the sinner should have no advantage; why then are they not required? In order that his offering be not sumptuous. Now I might have thought that, since R. Simeon laid down the principle 'So that his offering be not sumptuous', it should be valid even where an unfit person took out the handful, we are therefore informed [that even according to R. Simeon it is invalid]. If so, there[1] too the Mishnah should have stated: 'Whether it is an ordinary sin-offering or any other offering, if a non-priest or a priest that was in mourning received the blood . . . [it is invalid]', and we would have explained that it was necessary [to be so stated] according to R. Simeon's view. But it is clear that the expression 'all' stated in that [Mishnah], since it is not followed by the term 'except', includes every offering;[2] then in our [Mishnah] too, had it stated 'all', inasmuch as it is not followed by the term except', it would have included every offering![3] — It was indeed necessary [to be so stated]; for I might have thought that since we had established that the first Mishnah was not in accordance with the view of R. Simeon,[4] the second Mishnah also was not in accordance with the view of R. Simeon, we are therefore informed [that even according to R. Simeon it is invalid].

Rab said, If a non-priest took the handful [from the meal-offering], he should put it back again [and it is valid]. But have we not learnt, IT IS INVALID? — 'IT IS INVALID means, it is invalid so long as he had not put it back again. If so, is not this identical with Ben Bathyra's view? — In the case where the handful is still here the Rabbis do not differ with Ben Bathyra at all;[5] they differ only where the handful is no longer here, the Rabbis maintaining that one may not bring other flour from one's house to make up [the tenth],[6] while Ben Bathyra maintains that one may bring other flour from one's house to make up [the tenth].[7] But then, how can Ben Bathyra say, HE MUST PUT THE HANDFUL BACK AND TAKE IT OUT AGAIN WITH THE RIGHT HAND?[8] He surely should have said, He should bring other flour from his house to make up [the tenth] and then take out the handful with the right hand! — Rather we must say that Rab said so according to Ben Bathyra.[9] But is not this obvious? — [No, for] one might have thought that Ben Bathyra declared it valid only [in the case where the handful was taken out] with the left hand, but not where it was taken out by any of the persons that are unfit;[10] he [Rab] therefore teaches us [that according to Ben Bathyra it is valid in all the cases]. But why [would the offering be valid where the handful was taken out] with the left hand? It is, is it not, because we find it[11] allowed in the service of the Day of Atonement? Then in the case of a non-priest too, we find that he was allowed to perform a service, namely, the slaughtering! — The slaughtering is not regarded as a service.[12] But is it not? Has not R. Zera said in the name of Rab: If a non-priest slaughtered the Red Cow it is invalid; and Rab had explained the reason for it, namely, because the expressions 'Eleazar' and 'statute' are used in connection with it?[13] — The case of the Red Cow is different, for it is in the category of things consecrated to the Temple treasury.[14] But is it not all the more so here? For if in regard to things consecrated to the Temple treasury the priest is essential, how much more so in regard to things consecrated to the altar![15] — R. Shisha the son of R. Idi said, It might be compared with the inspection of leprosy plagues, which is certainly not a Temple service, and yet requires a priest.[16] Why do we not prove [that a non-priest may perform a service] from the case of the high place?[17] Should you say, however, that we cannot prove it from the case of the high place;[18] but surely it has been taught: Whence do we know that [sacrificial portions] which had been taken out [of the Sanctuary], if brought up upon the altar must not come down again?[19] From the fact that at the high place what had been taken out was still valid to be offered![20] — The Tanna [there] really relies upon the verse, This is the law of the burnt-offering.[21]

Now we know this[22] only because Rab informed us of it, but otherwise we should have said that [where the handful was taken out] by one of those that are unfit, Ben Bathyra declares it to be invalid; but surely it has been taught: R. Jose son of R. Judah and R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon said, Ben Bathyra declares it valid even [where the handful was taken out] by one of those that are unfit! Moreover it has been taught: It is written, And he shall take his handful from there,[23] that is, from the place where the feet of the non-priest may stand.[24] Ben Bathyra says, Whence do we know that if he took the handful with the left hand, he should put it back again and then take it out with the right

hand? Because the verse says, 'And he shall take his handful from there', that is, from the place from which he has already taken a handful.[25] Now since the verse does not specify [the causes why the handful should have been returned], then it is all the same whether [it was originally taken] with the left hand or [taken] by any one of those that were unfit? — Rather it is this that Rab teaches us, that if he had taken out the handful and had even hallowed it [by putting it into the vessel of ministry, it may nevertheless be put back again].[26] Rab thus rejects the view of the following Tannaim; for it was taught: R. Jose b. Yasian[27] and R. Judah the baker said, This[28] is so only where he had taken out the handful and had not yet hallowed it, but where he had also hallowed it it is invalid.

Others report [that this is what Rab teaches us], that only if he had taken out the handful it is [valid], but if he had also hallowed it, it is not [valid] — Rab thus agrees with the view of those Tannaim and rejects the view of the first Tanna.[29]

R. Nahman demurred: What is the view of those Tannaim? If they hold that the taking of the handful by persons unfit is regarded as a service, [then it should be invalid] even though it had not been put into a vessel?[30] And if they hold that the taking of the handful by persons unfit is not regarded as a service, then what does it matter even if it had been put into a vessel?[31] — Later, however, R. Nahman said, It is indeed regarded as a service, but the service is not complete until [the handful] has been put into a vessel.[32]

---

(1) In Zeb., at the opening of Chap. II, 15b, the Mishnah states: 'All offerings are invalid if a non-priest . . . received the blood'. That Mishnah, following the example of our Mishnah, should surely have specified the case of the sin-offering, thereby indicating that it was also in accordance with R. Simeon's view.

(2) Even the sin-offering and with this R. Simeon does in no wise disagree.

(3) Even the sinner's meal-offering. And so the original question stands: Why does not our Mishnah state 'All meal-offerings . . . '?

(4) V. supra p. 4.

(5) All hold that the handful should be put back and taken out again by the proper person.

(6) The vessel, which held a tenth part of an ephah, in which, according to the view of the Rabbis, the meal-offering was consecrated. If after the consecration in this vessel the flour of the meal-offering had been diminished it at once becomes invalid.

(7) For he is of the opinion that it is the taking of the handful that renders the meal-offering consecrated and not merely the putting of the flour into the vessel.

(8) Since it is assumed that the handful is no longer here, how can Ben Bathyra say, 'He must put it back'?

(9) I.e., Rab interpreted Ben Bathyra's ruling to apply not only to the case where the handful was taken out with the left hand but also to all the preceding cases enumerated in the Mishnah where the handful was taken out by a person unfit.

(10) Lit., 'the other (cases of) unfit persons'.

(11) Sc. the left hand. On the Day of Atonement the High Priest used both hands in the course of the day's service; cf. M. Yoma 47a.

(12) For in no instance do we find that it was essential that the priest shall perform the slaughtering; v. Tosaf. supra 5a, s.v. שחיטה, 1.

(13) Cf. Num. XIX, 2, 3. Thus showing that the slaughtering must be performed by Eleazar i.e., by a priest and by none else, for the expression 'statute' indicates that that requirement is indispensable. Hence it is obvious that the slaughtering is considered a service of importance.

(14) The reason why the slaughtering of the Red Cow must not be performed by a non-priest is not that the slaughtering is a service, for there are no 'services' in regard to things consecrated to the Temple treasury; but it is an express decree of the Torah that it shall be performed by a priest.

(15) Nevertheless it is established that animals consecrated to the altar may be slaughtered by a non-priest. Hence we find that a service performed by a non-priest is allowed just in the same way as a service performed with the left hand; and the same equality should be upheld in the case of the handful taken from the meal-offering.

(16) Cf. Lev. XIII. And so it is with the slaughtering of the Red Cow: it is not a Temple service, nevertheless it requires a priest.

(17) For whenever the high places (i.e., private altars) were allowed-which was before the Tabernacle had been set up in the wilderness-non-priests were allowed to perform the services there (v. Zeb. 118a), so that Rab's statement is superfluous.
(18) Since at that time Aaron and his sons had not yet been consecrated for service; so that one cannot infer from the conditions prevailing at the high places that a non-priest may perform a service.
(19) V. Zeb. 84a.
(20) For there were no restrictions as to place in connection with a sacrifice offered at a high place. It is seen however, that a rule of law is actually inferred from the case of the high place.
(21) Lev. VI, 2. זאת תורת העולה i.e., there is one law for all offerings that are brought up upon the altar, for even though they have been rendered unfit, once they have been brought up upon the altar they must not come down again. The Heb, עולה, rendered 'burnt-offering', is from the root עלה, meaning 'to come up'. The Tanna of the Baraitha certainly did not intend to draw the authority for the law stated from the case of the high place; he merely used it as a support for that law.
(22) That, according to Ben Bathyra, where an unfit person took the handful from the meal-offering, he should put it back again and the offering remains valid.
(23) Ibid. II, 2.
(24) I.e., the rite of taking the handful from the meal-offering may be performed anywhere in the Temple court, even in the space of eleven cubits, on the east side of the court, where laymen were allowed to stand (cf. Yoma 16b).
(25) But which was put back again, as it was not in accordance with the law.
(26) And it is valid according to Ben Bathyra.
(27) In cur. edd. 'R. Jose b. Jose b. Yasian'. The repetition 'Jose b.' is no doubt due to a scribal error; it is not found in MS.M. nor in Rashi.
(28) That according to Ben Bathyra the handful may be put back again and another taken out.
(29) Who disagrees with R. Jose and R. Judah and who presumably holds that Ben Bathyra declares it valid even though it had already been put into a vessel of ministry.
(30) For it has already been rendered invalid by the service performed by the unfit person, and this can in no wise be remedied.
(31) Since what was performed by persons unfit is not regarded as a service, then even if it was put into a vessel of ministry by such persons it would still be of no consequence; it should therefore be put back again, and once again taken out by the proper person.
(32) So that the act of an unfit person will render invalid only if he performed a complete service; in this case by putting the handful which he had taken out into a vessel of ministry.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 7a

But[1] surely when he puts the handful back again into its place it thus becomes holy, consequently it should be invalid![2] — R. Johanan said, This proves that vessels of ministry hallow only [what has been put into them] intentionally.[3] It follows, however, that they do hallow [what has been put into them] intentionally.[4] But did not Resh Lakish enquire of R. Johanan, 'Can unfit persons hallow what they [intentionally] put into vessels of ministry so that it should be permitted to offer it [upon the altar] in the first instance?' and he replied. 'They cannot hallow it'? — [He meant,] They cannot hallow it so that it should be permitted to be offered up, but they can hallow it so that [through their act] it is rendered invalid.[5]

R. Amram said,[6] We must suppose here that he put it back into a heaped up bowl.[7] Then how could he have taken out the handful originally [from this vessel]?[8] — Rather [say] he put it back into a brimful bowl. But surely when he took out the handful he left a hollow, so that when he puts it back again he puts it into the vessel, does he not? — He put it back on to the sides of the vessel and he then shook it so that it fell back of its own into the vessel; and it is the same as though it were put back by a monkey.[9]

R. Jeremiah said to R. Zera, Why not suggest that he put it back into a vessel which was upon the

ground?[10] We can then infer from this[11] that one may take out the handful from a vessel which is upon the ground![12] — He replied, You are now touching upon a question that was raised by our [colleagues]. For Abimi was studying the Tractate Menahoth under R. Hisda. (But did Abimi even study under R. Hisda? Did not R. Hisda say, 'Many were the blows that I received from Abimi upon the following subject: If [the Court] intend to announce [the sale of the property] daily, it must be done during thirty days; if only on Mondays and Thursdays, it must be done during sixty days'?[13] Abimi had forgotten this Tractate and so he went to R. Hisda that he might be reminded of it. Why did he not send for him, that he [R. Hisda] should come to him?[14] — He thought that in this way[15] he would make better progress.) R. Nahman once met him [Abimi] and asked him, 'How does one take out the handful?' He replied. 'Out of this vessel'.[16] Said the other, 'And may one take the handful out of a vessel that is upon the ground?' He replied, 'A priest has to lift it up'. 'And how does one hallow the handful taken from the meal-offering?' [asked R. Nahman]. He replied, 'One should put it into this vessel'. 'But may one hallow it by putting it into a vessel that is upon the ground?' He replied. 'A priest has to lift it up'. Said R. Nahman, 'Then you require three priests'[17] He replied, '[I don't mind] if thirteen are required as with the Daily Sacrifice'.[18] He raised the following objection: [We have learnt:] This is the general rule: if one took out the handful or put it into the vessel or brought it nigh or burnt it, [intending] to eat a thing that it is usual to eat [outside its proper place] etc.[19] Now there is no mention here of lifting up [the vessel]! — The Tanna merely teaches the order of the various services.[20]

The question was put to R. Shesheth: May one take the handful from a vessel that is upon the ground? He answered, Go and see what is done within [the Temple]:[21] Four priests entered in, two having in their hands the two rows [of Shewbread] and two the two dishes [of frankincense]; and four priests went in before them, two to take away the two rows and two to take away the two dishes.

---

(1) The words 'if so even though he had not hallowed it', inserted here in cur. edd., are obviously superfluous and are omitted by MS.M., and Sh. Mek.

(2) For when the non-priest puts back the handful he thereby completes the service, for it surely does not matter into which particular vessel of ministry he returns the handful, whether into another vessel or into the same vessel from which it was taken.

(3) In order to become hallowed. In this case, however, the unfit person puts the handful back again into the vessel out of which it was taken without intending it to become holy thereby.

(4) Even though it had been put in by a non-priest or by any other person that was unfit.

(5) Since it was intentionally put into a vessel of ministry by an unfit person for the purpose of hallowing it, the service has been completed by an unfit person, and so it is invalid and there can be no remedy. But is it quite different in-the case where the handful was put back into the vessel but not for the purpose of hallowing it thereby.

(6) This is the reason why the handful is not hallowed when put back into the vessel from which it was taken.

(7) For only that which is in the vessel of ministry is hallowed by the vessel and not that which is above it.

(8) Since he must take the handful from that which is in the vessel.

(9) I.e., it was put back into the vessel not directly by the act of man; it is therefore not hallowed. Cf. infra 100b.

(10) And that is the reason why it does not become hallowed.

(11) Since this suggestion is not made.

(12) And that likewise one may put the handful into a vessel of ministry that is upon the ground. (Z. Kod.).

(13) When the Court have valued the property of orphans and are proposing to sell it in order to meet the father's debts, they must announce the sale either daily for a period of thirty days, or on Mondays and Thursdays (these being the days when the Courts sat) for a period of sixty days. V. 'Ar. 22a.

(14) Since R. Hisda was the pupil.

(15) By Abimi putting himself out so as to go to R. Hisda to study. Cf. Meg. 6b.

(16) At that moment there happened to be a vessel lying before them on the ground.

(17) One to hold the vessel containing the meal-offering, a second to hold the vessel into which the handful is to be put, and a third to take the handful out of the one and put it into the other. This number of priests was necessary as, it must be remembered, only the right hand was to be used in any service, and therefore one priest could not hold the two vessels,

one in each hand. It was, however, possible for the one priest to hold both vessels, one after the other, so that only two priests would be necessary. V. Sh. Mek.

(18) V. Yoma 25a.

(19) Infra 12a.

(20) Which can all be performed by the same priest; the Tanna, however, did not intend to give the number of priests employed in each service. The words 'but not the order of the priests', found in cur. edd., are obviously a gloss, and are omitted in MS.M. and also in Sh. Mek.

(21) V. Infra 99b.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 7b

Now there is no mention here of lifting up [the table].[1] But was not the answer given in the former case that the Tanna merely stated the order of the services? Then in this case too [we can say that] he only states the order of the services![2] — Surely there is no comparison; there the Tanna does not state the number of priests, but here he does state the number of the priests. Now if [your contention were] right,[3] he certainly should have mentioned [the priest] who lifts up [the table]! This proves that one may take the handful from a vessel that is upon the ground. This indeed proves it.

Raba said, I am certain that one may take the handful from a vessel that is upon the ground, for we find that this was so at the taking away of the dishes [of frankincense].[4] Also that one may hallow the meal-offering by putting [the meal] into a vessel that is upon the ground, for we find that this was so at the setting down the dishes.[4] Raba however was in doubt, What is the law with regard to the hallowing of the handful? Are we to derive it from the meal-offering itself,[5] or from the [receiving of the] blood?[6] Later Raba decided that we must derive it from the [receiving of the] blood. But could Raba have said so? Surely it has been stated: If the handful was divided [and put] into two vessels, R. Nahman says, It is not hallowed; and Raba says, It is hallowed. Now if [the above decision] were right, then this too he should derive from the blood,[7] should he not? — Raba retracted from that opinion.[8]

Whence do we know that if the blood was divided [in separate vessels] it is not hallowed? — From the following which R. Tahlifa b. Saul learnt: If one mixed[9] less than the quantity required for sprinkling in one vessel and again less than the quantity required for sprinkling in another vessel, the mixing is not valid.[10] And the question was raised, How is it with regard to the blood?[11] Is that[12] a traditional law, and from a traditional law one may not draw any inferences; or is it so there[12] because it is written, And he shall dip it in the water,[13] then here also it is written, And he shall dip [his finger] in the blood?[14] And it was stated: R. Zerika said in the name of R. Eleazar, Even in the case of the blood it is not hallowed.[15]

Raba said, There has been taught [a Baraitha] also to this effect: It is written, And he shall dip,[16] but not wipe up;[17] in the blood,[16] that is, there must be at the very beginning sufficient blood [in the one vessel] for dipping; [and shall sprinkle] of the blood,[16] that is, of the blood spoken of in the context. And the expressions 'and he shall dip' and 'in the blood' are both necessary. For had the Divine Law only stated, 'And he shall dip'. I might have said that [it was valid] even though [the priest] had not received at the very beginning sufficient blood [in the one vessel] for dipping; it therefore stated, 'In the blood'. And had the Divine Law only stated, 'In the blood', I might have said that he may even wipe up [the blood]; it therefore stated, 'And he shall dip'. '[Of the blood], that is, of the blood spoken of in the context'. What does this exclude? — Raba said, It excludes the blood that is still clinging to the finger.[18] This supports R. Eleazar who said, The blood that is still clinging[19] to the finger is not valid [for sprinkling].

Rabin son of R. Adda said to Raba, Your pupils report that R. 'Amram raised [an objection from the following]: It was taught: If, while sprinkling, some blood dripped from his hand [on to a

garment], if this happened[20] before he had made the sprinkling it must be washed,[21] but if after he had made the sprinkling it need not be washed. Presumably the meaning is: before he had finished the sprinkling, and after he had finished the sprinkling.[22] — No, the meaning is: if it happened before the blood had left his hand in an act of sprinkling it must be washed, but if after the blood had left his hand[23] it need not be washed.

Abaye raised an objection: [We have learnt:] When he had finished sprinkling[24] he wiped his hand on the cow's body. [Now] only when he had finished then did he [wipe his hand], but before he had finished he did not![25] — He replied. When he had finished he wiped his hand, before he had finished he wiped his finger only.[26] It is well [to say] 'When he had finished he wiped his hand on the cow's body', for it is written, And the cow shall be burnt in his sight;[27] but [to say] 'Before he had finished he wiped his finger' [is difficult], for on what would he wipe it?[28] — Abaye answered, On the edge of the basin, as it is written, Bowls of gold.[29]

But could R. Eleazar have said that?[30] Behold it has been stated: The meal-offering of the High Priest[31] R. Johanan says, is not hallowed [if brought] a half at a time. R. Eleazar says. Since it is offered a half at a time it is hallowed [if brought] a half at a time.

---

(1) So as to avoid taking away the frankincense from a table that is standing upon the ground. Obviously then this does not matter at all. And it is to be observed that the services touching the frankincense and the Shewbread correspond with the services relating to the handful and the meal-offering in the following respects: the frankincense was taken away each week from the table, the handful was taken from of the meal-offering; frankincense was put upon the table each week, the meal for the meal-offering was put into a vessel of ministry. And just as the burning of the frankincense rendered the Shewbread permitted to be eaten, so the burning of the handful rendered the rest of the meal-offering permitted to be eaten, for each is described in the Torah as 'a memorial', cf. Lev. II, 2, and XXIV, 7.

(2) I.e., the main services; whereas lifting up is a service of little significance.

(3) That whatsoever is put into a vessel of ministry that is upon the ground is not thereby hallowed.

(4) v. p. 38, n. 5.

(5) And just as the other services in connection with the meal-offering may be performed in a vessel that is upon the ground, so the handful would be hallowed if put into a vessel that is on the ground.

(6) It has already been stated that the four main services in the procedure of a meal-offering, viz., taking out the handful, hallowing it by putting it into a vessel, bringing it nigh to the altar and burning it, correspond respectively to the four main services of animal sacrifices, viz., slaughtering, receiving the blood, bringing it nigh to the altar and sprinkling it. Now just as the blood of an animal-offering may not be received in a vessel that is on the ground (v. Lev. I, 5: And Aaron's sons, the priests, shall present the blood, and Sifra thereon), so the handful of the meal-offering may not be hallowed by putting it into a vessel that is upon the ground.

(7) And the blood of an animal-offering may not be received in two separate vessels (v. infra).

(8) And he subsequently accepted R. Nahman's view, namely that if the handful was divided and put into two vessels it is not hallowed.

(9) Lit., 'sanctified'. The reference is to the mixing of the ashes of the Red Cow with water; cf. Num. XIX, 17.

(10) Even though subsequently the two quantities when combined in one vessel amounted to the required quantity. For the required quantity v. Parah XII, 5: 'Sufficient for the tips of the hyssop stalks to be dipped therein and water sufficient to be sprinkled.'

(11) Sc. the blood of offerings which had to be sprinkled seven times within, i.e., upon the golden altar and towards the veil. The question is: May the priest receive the blood, say sufficient for four sprinklings in one vessel and sufficient for three in another vessel?

(12) Sc. the ruling in connection with the mixing of the ashes of the Red Cow.

(13) Num. XIX, 18. The use of the definite article, 'in the water', indicates that all the water must be in one vessel.

(14) Lev. IV, 6. Here too the definite article is used, 'in the blood'.

(15) If the blood was received half in one vessel and half in another.

(16) Lev. ibid.

(17) The priest must dip his finger in the blood and not scrape up the blood from the sides of the bowl with his finger.

(18) The priest must dip his finger in the bowl of blood for each sprinkling and not sprinkle twice with one dipping. He must sprinkle each time of the blood that is mentioned in the context, that is of the blood in the bowl and not of the blood that is on his finger.
(19) Lit., 'the remnant'.
(20) Sc., the splashing of the blood on to the garment.
(21) Cf. Lev. VI, 20.
(22) I.e., if some blood had splashed on the garment at any time during the course of the seven sprinklings. e.g., after the second sprinkling but before the priest had dipped his finger into the bowl a third time, it must be washed, for the blood that fell upon the garment might well have been used for a further sprinkling; hence it is evident that blood still clinging to the finger is valid for sprinkling, contra R. Eleazar and Raba. On the other hand, if the blood fell on to the garment after the seven sprinklings had been performed, it does not require to be washed, for the blood could not have been used for sprinkling.
(23) I.e., after an act of sprinkling some blood that was still clinging to his finger fell upon the garment.
(24) Sc. the blood of the Red Cow seven times towards the Holy of Holies. V. Parah III, 9.
(25) For presumably the blood still clinging to his finger is valid for sprinkling, and therefore he need not wipe it away; contra R. Eleazar and Raba.
(26) I.e., between each sprinkling.
(27) Num. XIX, 5. After sprinkling the blood towards the Holy of Holies the priest would come down from the Temple mount, wipe his hand on the cow's body, and then the cow would be burnt in his presence.
(28) It surely cannot be suggested that after each of the seven sprinklings the priest must come down from the Temple mount and wipe his finger on the cow's body. Indeed if he did so the sprinkling that followed might be invalid, for some hairs of the cow's body might adhere to his finger. In cur. edd. there is an obvious gloss added in the text, but it has been struck out by all commentators. It is not found in MS.M.
(29) Ezra I, 10. The sprinkling bowls are here designated כפורי, which word is derived from the root כפר 'to wipe'; i.e., bowls on whose rim the priests used to wipe away the blood from their fingers.
(30) That if the blood was received half in one vessel and half in another, it is not hallowed thereby.
(31) V. Lev. VI, 13, 14. This meal-offering prepared on a griddle (hence חביתים from מחבת). consisting of a tenth part of an ephah of fine flour, was offered by the High Priest daily; half of it in the morning and half in the evening.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 8a

Now if he held that view, he would surely derive [the ruling in the case of the High Priest's meal-offering] from the blood![1] And should you say that R. Eleazar does not derive one case from another, but R. Eleazar has actually ruled: If the taking of the handful from the meal-offering was performed in the Temple,[2] it is valid, since we find that the taking away of the dishes [of frankincense was regularly performed there]![3] — He derives [the rules of] one meal-offering from another meal-offering,[4] but he does not derive [the rules of] a meal-offering from the blood.

But does he derive one meal-offering from another meal-offering? Surely it has been taught: If a loaf was broken before it[5] had been removed, the Shewbread is invalid, and [the priest] may not burn on account of it the dishes of frankincense; if a loaf was broken after it[5] had been removed, the Shewbread is invalid, but he may burn on account of it the dishes of frankincense. Whereupon R. Eleazar had said, [The expression 'after it had been removed'] does not mean that it[5] had actually been removed, but rather that the time for removing it had come about,[6] and although it had not yet been removed it is regarded as already removed. But why is this so?[7] Surely it ought to be regarded as a meal-offering which was found to be lacking before the handful had been taken therefrom![8] — That is really no difficulty, for in a meal-offering the handful is not separate,[9] whereas here [in the Shewbread] the handful[10] is separate. But this is a difficulty: surely this case ought to be on a par with the remainder of a meal-offering which was found to be lacking after the handful had been taken therefrom but before it had been burnt, in which case the handful may not be burnt! — There is, is there not, a difference of opinion about this?[11] R. Eleazar is of the same opinion as him who

says that where the remainder of the meal-offering was found to be lacking after the handful had been taken therefrom but before it had been burnt, the handful may indeed be burnt.

The text [above] stated: 'The meal-offering of the High Priest, R. Johanan says, is not hallowed [if brought] a half at a time. R. Eleazar says, Since it is offered a half at a time it is hallowed [if brought] a half at a time'. R. Aha said, What is R. Johanan's reason? Because the verse reads, For a meal-offering . . . half of it in the morning;[12] that is to say, he must bring a meal-offering[13] and then he shall divide it in halves.

An objection was raised: [We have learnt:] The meal-offering of the High Priest may not be brought in [two separate] halves, but he must bring a whole tenth and then divide it. And it has been taught: Had Scripture stated, 'For a meal-offering a half', I should then have said that he must bring a half tenth from his house in the morning and offer it, and a half tenth from his house in the evening and offer it; but Scripture states, 'Half of it in the morning', that is, he must offer half of the whole tenth![14] — This is only a recommendation.[15] Thereupon R. Gebiha of Bekathil said to R. Ashi, But is not the term 'statute'[16] used in connection with it? — He replied: That merely indicates that he must bring the whole [tenth] from his house.[17]

But did R. Johanan actually say that?[18] Behold it has been stated: If a man set aside [in a vessel of ministry] a half tenth [of flour for his meal-offering][19] intending to add to it [to make up the tenth], Rab says, It is not hallowed; R. Johanan says, It is hallowed. Now if he held that view,[18] he would surely derive [the ruling in this case] from that of the High Priest's meal-offering.[20] Should you say, however, that R. Johanan does not derive one case from another, but R. Johanan has actually ruled: If a peace-offering was slaughtered in the Temple it is valid, for it is written, And he shall slaughter it at the door of the tent of meeting,[21] and surely the accessory cannot be more important than the principal![22] — It is different where he intended to add to it.[23] For it has been taught: It is written Full;[24] and full means nothing else but the whole amount. And R. Jose said, When is this so?[25] Only when there is no intention to make up [the full amount], but when there is an intention to make up [the full amount], then each part[26] [as it is put into the vessel of ministry] is hallowed.

Whose view does Rab[27] accept with regard to the High Priest's meal-offering? If you say R. Eleazar's, then he should surely derive [the ruling in the case of an ordinary meal-offering] from the High Priest's meal-offering.[28] And should you say that Rab does not derive one case from another, but Rab has actually said, A meal-offering is hallowed [even though it was put into the vessel of ministry] without oil, since we find it so in the case of the Shewbread;[29] without frankincense, since we find it so in the case of the drink-offerings;[30] without oil and without frankincense, since we find this in the case of the sinner's meal-offering?[31] — We must therefore say that Rab accepts R. Johanan's view.[32]

The text [above] stated: 'Rab said, A meal-offering is hallowed [even though it was put into the vessel of ministry] without oil, since we find it so in the case of the Shewbread; without frankincense, since we find it so in the case of the drink-offerings; without oil and without frankincense, since we find it so in the case of the sinner's meal-offering'. Moreover the oil and the frankincense are hallowed [in the vessel of ministry] alone, one without the other: the oil [without the flour and the frankincense], since we find it so in the case of the log of oil of the leper;[33] and the frankincense [without the flour and oil], since we find it so in the case of the dishes of frankincense. But R. Hanina said,

---

(1) And he would declare the meal-offering of the High Priest invalid if it was brought a half tenth at a time, just as it is invalid, according to R. Eleazar, if the blood of an animal offering was received in two vessels.

(2) The taking of the handful from the meal-offering was usually performed in the Temple court and not in the Temple proper.

(3) And the taking away of the dishes of frankincense was considered equal to the taking of the handful from the meal-offering (v. supra p. 38, n. 5).
(4) I.e., from the Shewbread which is regarded as a meal-offering.
(5) Sc. the two rows of loaves and the dishes of frankincense.
(6) I.e., at the seventh hour of the day (that is an hour after mid-day) on the Sabbath; v. Pes. 58a.
(7) That the frankincense may be burnt when a loaf was broken after the time for the removal of the Shewbread from the table had arrived.
(8) In which case the handful may not be burnt upon the altar; and here the Shewbread has not in fact been removed from the table. Since, however, the ruling is that the frankincense may be offered, it is evident that R. Eleazar does not derive one meal-offering from the other.
(9) I.e., the handful is not separate from the rest of the meal-offering, and until it has actually been taken out one cannot consider it as a handful.
(10) Sc. the dishes of frankincense. These stand apart from the bread, so that when the time for their removal has arrived one can well consider them as already having been removed.
(11) V. infra 9a.
(12) Lev. VI, 13.
(13) I.e., a whole meal-offering which must consist of a tenth part of an ephah of flour.
(14) Hence an objection against R. Eleazar.
(15) Lit., 'for a precept'. I.e., it should be performed in this manner; nevertheless it is hallowed even though brought a half tenth at a time.
(16) lbid. VI, 15. The term 'statute' implies that there must be no infringement or variation of the prescribed rites.
(17) But as for hallowing in a vessel of ministry this may be done a half tenth at a time.
(18) That the High Priest's meal-offering is not hallowed if brought half at a time.
(19) The minimum quantity of flour for a meal-offering is one tenth part of an ephah.
(20) And as the High Priest's meal-offering is not hallowed, according to R. Johanan, if brought a half at a time, so it should be also with every meal-offering.
(21) Lev. III, 2.
(22) If the slaughtering may take place in the Temple court, how much more so in the Temple itself! Thus R. Johanan derives the slaughtering in the Temple from the slaughtering in the Temple court.
(23) In that case each part as it is put into the vessel of ministry is hallowed.
(24) Num. VII, 13: Both of them full of fine flour.
(25) That anything less than the whole amount is not hallowed.
(26) Lit., 'the first, the first'.
(27) Who in the case of an ordinary meal-offering ruled that if only part of it was put into a vessel of ministry it was not hallowed.
(28) And just as the High Priest's meal-offering is hallowed in part (so according to R. Eleazar) so it should be with an ordinary meal-offering too. Nevertheless in the latter case Rab expressly said that it was not hallowed in part.
(29) Which is deemed to be a meal-offering and yet no oil went with it.
(30) Which accompanied most sacrifices, consisting of quantities of flour and oil for a meal-offering and wine for a libation, but no frankincense went with it. V. Ibid. XV, 1ff.
(31) V. Lev. V, 11, We thus see that Rab derives one case from the other by analogy.
(32) That the High Priest's meal-offering may not be hallowed a half at a time, just as Rab himself expressly ruled in connection with an ordinary meal-offering.
(33) Which was not accompanied by flour and frankincense; V. Lev. XIV, 10ff.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 8b

The one is not hallowed without the other.[1] Then according to R. Hanina why was the tenth measure anointed?[2] — To measure the sinner's meal-offering.[3] And why was the log measure anointed? — To measure the log of oil of the leper.

Samuel, too, is of the same opinion as Rab.[4] For we have learnt:[5] The vessels for liquids hallow

liquids, and the measuring vessels for dry stuffs hallow dry stuffs; the vessels for liquids cannot hallow dry stuffs neither can the measuring vessels for dry stuffs hallow liquids. And Samuel had said, This applies only to the measuring vessels [for liquids], but the sprinkling bowls hallow also dry stuffs, for it is written, Both of them full of fine flour mingled with oil for a meal-offering.[6] R. Aha of Difti said to Rabina, But this meal-offering is moist![7] — He replied. It refers particularly to the dry parts of the flour.[8] Alternatively,[9] I may say, In comparison with blood a meal-offering [though mingled with oil] is regarded as dry stuff.

The text [above] stated: 'R. Eleazar said, If the taking of the handful from the meal-offering was performed in the Temple it is valid, since we find that the taking away of the dishes [of frankincense was regularly performed there]'.[10] R. Jeremiah raised an objection: It is written, And he shall take his handful from there,[11] that is, from the place where the feet of the non-priest may stand.[12] Ben Bathyra says, Whence do we know that if he took the handful with the left hand he should put it back again and then take it with his right hand? Because the verse says, 'And he shall take his handful from there', that is, from the place from which he has already taken a handful! — Some say that he [R. Jeremiah] raised the objection and he himself answered it [as stated below]. Others report that R. Jacob said to R. Jeremiah b. Tahlifa, I will explain it to you: That [verse] merely serves to teach us that [the rite of taking the handful] may be performed in any part of the Temple court; and you should not argue that since the burnt-offering is most holy and the meal-offering is most holy, therefore as the burnt-offering must be [slaughtered] on the north side [of the Temple court][13] so the meal-offering must be [attended to] on the north side. But surely the case of the burnt-offering is different, since it is wholly burnt![14] — Then [one could argue in the same way] from the sin-offering.[15] But surely the case of the sin-offering is different, since it atones for those [who committed an act inadvertently which, had they committed it wilfully, would have made them] liable to kareth![16] — Then [one could argue in the same way] from the guilt-offering.[15] Again the case of the guilt-offering is different, since it effects atonement by blood![17] Nor [could one argue in the same way] from all these [sacrifices taken together].[18] since all these [are different from the meal-offering since they] effect atonement by blood! — That [verse] is indeed necessary, for I might have thought that since it is written, And it shall be presented unto the priest, and he shall bring it unto the altar,[19] and [then it says] 'and he shall take out the handful',[20] therefore just as the meal-offering was brought unto the south-west corner of the altar[21] so the handful was to be taken out at the south-west corner of the altar; we are therefore taught[22] [that it may be performed in any part of the Temple court].

The text [above] stated: 'R. Johanan said, If a peace-offering was slaughtered in the Temple it is valid, for it is written, And he shall slaughter it at the door of the tent of meeting,[23] and surely the accessory cannot be more important than the principal!' An objection was raised: R. Judah b. Bathyra said, Whence do we know that, if the Temple court was surrounded by gentiles,[24] the priests may enter the Temple and eat there the most holy meat and the remainder of the meal-offerings? Because the verse says,

---

(1) I.e., all the ingredients of the meal-offering must be put in together into the vessel of ministry.

(2) To render it consecrated as a vessel of ministry. The tenth measure was a vessel of ministry holding the tenth part of an ephah which was used for measuring the flour of a meal-offering. But as the flour by itself, without oil and without frankincense, is not hallowed when put into this measuring vessel, then it was obviously unnecessary to have anointed this vessel as a sacred vessel. The same argument applies to the log, a vessel of ministry used for measuring oil only.

(3) Which consisted of flour only, without oil and frankincense; v. Lev. V, 11.

(4) That the vessel of ministry hallows the flour alone without the other ingredients.

(5) Zeb. 88a.

(6) Num. VII, 13. It is evident that the sprinkling bowl (mentioned previously in this verse) hallowed the flour that was put into it.

(7) For it is mingled with oil. Hence there is no proof from this verse that the sprinkling bowl can hallow dry goods.

(8) Although the flour was mingled with oil, it is inconceivable that every particle of the flour was moistened; nevertheless all the flour was hallowed in this bowl, obviously because the sprinkling bowl can hallow dry goods.
(9) In cur. edd. there is found here a passage of several lines enclosed within brackets. It is not found in any MS., and has been struck out by all commentators as a gloss.
(10) V. p. 42, nn. 7 and 8.
(11) Lev. II, 2.
(12) V. supra p. 34, n. 7. It is, however, evident from this that the rite of taking the handful must be performed in the Temple court only, and not in the Temple, contra R. Eleazar. The teaching of Ben Bathyra which follows is merely the continuation of the Baraitha quoted but it does not affect the argument at all.
(13) Ibid I, 11.
(14) How then could one apply the same to the meal-offering?
(15) Which is also a most holy offering and must be slaughtered in the north.
(16) V. Glos.
(17) Cf. Lev. XVII, 11. The meal-offering, however, does not effect atonement by blood.
(18) By arriving at the points they all have in common, viz., they are all most holy, and all must be slaughtered on the north side of the Temple court. Similarly it would be said of the meal-offering, that the rite of taking the handful must be performed at the north side of the Temple court only!
(19) Ibid II, 8.
(20) This is the purport of verse (9) which follows: And the priest shall take off from the meal-offering the memorial thereof.
(21) V. infra 19b.
(22) By the verse And he shall take the handful from there (ibid 2).
(23) Lev. III, 2. V. supra 45, n. 2.
(24) And so it became dangerous to remain in the Temple court or to eat there consecrated meat.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 9a

In the most holy place shalt thou eat thereof.[1] Now why is the verse necessary to teach this? One could say, it is sufficient that it is written, In the court of the tent of meeting they shall eat it,[2] and the accessory surely cannot be more important than the principal![3] — With regard to acts of service, since a man would perform services in the presence of his master, we apply the principle 'Surely the accessory cannot be more important than the principal'. But with regard to eating, since a man would not eat in the presence of his master, [it is permitted][4] only because the verse expressly says so, but had not the verse said so we would not have applied the principle 'Surely the accessory cannot be more important than the principal'.

It was stated: If the meal-offering was mingled[5] outside the walls of the Temple court, R. Johanan says, It is invalid; Resh Lakish says, It is valid. 'Resh Lakish says, it is valid', for it is written, And he shall pour oil upon it, and put frankincense thereon, and then, And he shall bring it to Aaron's sons the priests; and he shall take thereout his handful;[6] hence from the taking of the handful begins the duty of the priesthood. This therefore teaches us that the pouring [of the oil upon the meal-offering] and the mingling [of the oil with the flour] are valid [even if done] by non-priests. Now since [the mingling] does not require the services of the priesthood, it likewise need not be performed within [the Temple court]. 'R. Johanan says, it is invalid', for since it must be prepared in a vessel [of ministry],[7] even though it does not require the services of the priesthood, it must nevertheless be performed within [the Temple court]. There is a Baraitha in support of R. Johanan's view; for it has been taught: If a non-priest mingled it it is valid; if it was mingled outside the walls of the Temple court it is invalid.

It was stated: If the meal-offering had diminished before the handful was taken from it, R. Johanan says, He may bring [flour] from his house to fill up the measure; Resh Lakish says, He may not bring [flour] from his house to fill up the measure. R. Johanan says, He may bring [flour] from his house to

fill up the measure, for it is the taking of the handful that determines it [for a meal-offering].[8] 'Resh Lakish says, He may not bring [flour] from his house to fill up the measure', for it is the hallowing of the vessel that determines it [for a meal-offering].[9] R. Johanan then raised this objection against Resh Lakish: We have learnt: If the [oil in the] log was found to be lacking before it was poured out,[10] he may fill up the measure.[11] This is indeed a refutation.

It was stated: If the remainder of the meal-offering was found to be lacking between the taking of the handful and the burning thereof, R. Johanan says, He may burn the handful on account of it; Resh Lakish says, He may not burn the handful on account of it. According to R. Eliezer's view there can be no difference of opinion;[12] they differ only according to R. Joshua's view. For we have learnt:[13] If the remainder of the meal-offering became unclean or was burnt or lost, according to the rule of R. Eliezer[14] it is lawful [to burn the handful], but according to the rule of R. Joshua[15] It is unlawful. Now he who says it is unlawful [to burn the handful], clearly agrees with R. Joshua; but he who says it is lawful, [distinguishes the cases thus]: only in that case did R. Joshua say [that it was unlawful], since nothing [of the meat] remained available, but here where some [of the meal-offering] remained available, even R. Joshua admits [that it is lawful to burn the handful]. For it has been so taught: R. Joshua says, If of any animal-offering mentioned in the Torah there remained an olive's bulk of flesh or an olive's bulk of fat, one may sprinkle the blood; if there remained a half-olive's bulk of flesh and a half-olive's bulk of fat, one may not sprinkle the blood.[16] In the case of a burnt-offering, however, even if there remained a half-olive's bulk of flesh and a half-olive's bulk of fat, one may sprinkle the blood, since it is wholly burnt.[17] And in the case of a meal-offering, even though all of it remains, one may not sprinkle the blood.

---

(1) Num. XVIII, 10.

(2) Lev. VI, 9.

(3) And if the most holy meat may be eaten in the Temple court, how much more so on the argument of R. Johanan in the Temple proper! Surely then no verse is necessary to permit this.

(4) To eat in the Temple proper.

(5) With the oil.

(6) Ibid. II, 1, 2.

(7) Or, according to the reading of MS.M and Sh. Mek., 'since it is hallowed (by being put) in a vessel of ministry'.

(8) And so long as the handful has not been taken one may add to the flour of the meal-offering.

(9) And once it has been determined for a meal-offering, if it had diminished there is no remedy for it, and it is invalid.

(10) I.e., before the priest had poured the oil into the palm of his own left hand for the purification of the leper. cf. Lev. XIV, 15.

(11) V. Neg. XIV, 10. We thus see that the defective measure may be filled up even though it had already been hallowed in a vessel of ministry, contra Resh Lakish.

(12) For if where the remainder was lost entirely the handful may still be burnt, how much more so where only a part of the remainder was lacking!

(13) V. infra 26a, Pes. 77b.

(14) Who held (Pes. 77a) that the blood of the sacrifice may be sprinkled even though the meat is not available (either because it was rendered unclean or was burnt or lost); likewise with the meal-offering, he would hold that the handful may be burnt upon the altar even though the remainder is no longer available, and needless to say where only a portion of the remainder was wanting.

(15) Who held that where the meat of the sacrifice was not available it is not lawful to sprinkle the blood.

(16) For in order to sprinkle the blood there must remain a whole olive's bulk either of what may be eaten by man (i.e., the flesh) or of what may be consumed by the altar; (i.e., the fat).

(17) And both the flesh and the fat are burnt upon the altar; hence a half-olive's bulk of the one may be joined with a half-olive's bulk of the other.

How does the meal-offering come in here?[1] Said R. Papa, It refers to the meal-offering offered with drink-offerings.[2] For I might have said that, since it accompanies the animal-offering, it is deemed to be part of the animal-offering;[3] we are therefore taught [that it is not so]. And he who says it is unlawful [to burn the handful, what can he say to this]?[4] — Here [in the case of the meal-offering] it is different, for the verse says, And the priest shall offer up from the meal-offering the memorial thereof, and shall burn it upon the altar;[5] and the expression 'the meal-offering' implies that the meal-offering must be there in its entirety.[6] And [what does] the other[7] [say to this]? — He would say that the expression 'from the meal-offering' implies only that the meal-offering was once whole.[8] R. Johanan raised this objection against Resh Lakish. It was taught:[9] If a loaf was broken before it[10] had been removed, the Shewbread is invalid, and [the priest] may not burn on account of it[11] the dishes of frankincense; if a loaf was broken after it[10] had been removed, the Shewbread is invalid, but he may nevertheless burn on account of it the dishes of frankincense.[12] Whereupon R. Eleazar had said, [The expression 'after it had been removed'] does not mean that it had actually been removed, but rather that the time for its removal had arrived, even though it had not yet been removed![13] — He replied, The author of that Baraitha is R. Eliezer.[14] He [R. Johanan] then said to him, I quote you an undisputed[15] Mishnah,[16] and you merely say that the author is R. Eliezer! If it is R. Eliezer, why does [the Baraitha] speak of only part [of the Shewbread] being broken, even if it were entirely burnt or lost he would also permit [the burning of the frankincense], would he not? — The other remained silent. And why did he remain silent? Surely he could have replied that it is different with the offering of the community,[17] for just as uncleanness is permitted for the community[18] so the diminution [of an offering] is also permitted for it! R. Adda b. Abaha said, This[19] proves that diminution is on a par with a physical blemish, and no [animal with a] physical blemish is permitted [even] for the community.

R. Papa was sitting reciting the above teaching[20] when R. Joseph b. Shemaiah said to him, Is it not the case that the dispute between R. Johanan and Resh Lakish refers also to the 'Omer meal-offering which is a communal offering?[21]

R. Malkio said, One [Baraitha] teaches: The expression 'of the fine flour thereof'[22] implies that if it had diminished, however little, it is invalid; and 'of the oil thereof'.[22] implies that if it had diminished, however little, it is invalid. And another [Baraitha] teaches: The expression 'of the meal-offering'[23] excludes the case where the meal-offering or the handful had diminished, or where nothing at all of the frankincense was burnt.[24] Now why are two verses necessary to exclude any diminution? Surely it must be that one refers to the case where the meal-offering had diminished before the handful was taken,[25] and the other to the case where the remainder had diminished between the taking of the handful and the burning thereof.[26] This then is a refutation of both views of R. Johanan, is it not? — No, one verse refers to the case where the meal-offering had diminished before the taking of the handful, in which case if he brings more [flour] from his house and makes up the measure it is [valid], otherwise it is not [valid]. The other refers to the case where the remainder had diminished between the taking of the handful and the burning thereof, in which case the remainder is forbidden to be eaten although he may burn the handful on account of it. For the question was raised: According to him who says that where the remainder had diminished between the taking of the handful and the burning thereof he may burn the handful on account of it, what is the position with regard to the eating of the remainder? — Ze'iri said, It is written, And that which is left [of the meal-offering],' but not that which is left of the remainder. R. Jannai said, It is written, of the meal-offering,[27] that is, the meal-offering which was once whole.[28]

IF [THE PRIEST] TOOK THE HANDFUL WITH HIS LEFT HAND [IT IS INVALID]. Whence do we know this? — R. Zera said, The verse states, And he presented the meal-offering, and filled his hand therefrom.[29] Now I do not know which hand was meant, but when another verse states, And the priest shall take of the log of oil, and pour it into the palm of his own left hand,[30] [I know that] only here ['hand' means] the left hand, but elsewhere wherever 'hand' is stated it means the right.

But is not this expression required for its own purpose?[31] — 'The left hand' is mentioned once again.[32] But should I not apply here the principle: 'a limitation followed by a limitation extends the scope of the law'?[33] — 'The left hand' is mentioned yet once again;[34] so that we may say that only here ['hand' means] the left hand, whereas elsewhere ['hand'] cannot mean the left hand. perhaps I should say quite the contrary: just as here ['hand' means] the left hand so elsewhere ['hand' means] the left hand! — 'The left hand' is in fact stated four times: twice in the case of the poor man and twice in the case of the rich man.[35]

R. Jeremiah said to R. Zera. For what purpose is it written, Upon the thumb of his right hand and upon the great toe of his right foot?[36] —

---

(1) How can one speak of the sprinkling of blood in connection with a meal-offering?

(2) Which accompanied most animal-offerings; cf. Num. XV, 4-10.

(3) And the blood of the offering may be sprinkled, even though all the flesh and the fat had gone, since the whole of the meal-offering that belongs to the animal-offering remains.

(4) Surely Resh Lakish admits this distinction in R. Joshua made by R. Johanan, for R. Joshua himself expressly differentiates so in the Baraitha quoted.

(5) Lev. II, 9.

(6) At the time of the burning of the handful; otherwise it may not be burnt.

(7) R. Johanan.

(8) I.e., at the time of the taking of the handful.

(9) V. supra p. 43.

(10) Sc. the dishes of frankincense.

(11) I.e., on behalf of the Shewbread that remained.

(12) Hence it is evident that if the remainder of the meal-offering had diminished between the taking and the burning of the handful — which corresponds to the diminution of the Shewbread between the taking away and the burning of the frankincense — one may nevertheless burn the handful; contra Resh Lakish.

(13) This is mentioned only incidentally as the continuation of the cited passage.

(14) According to whom the diminution, and even the entire destruction, of the remainder of the meal-offering does not prevent the burning of the handful upon the altar; v. supra.

(15) Lit. 'whole'.

(16) [This is really a Baraitha but is nevertheless, as is frequently the case, designated Mishnah, v. Higger אוצר הברייתות I, p. 37ff].

(17) The Shewbread and the burning of the frankincense was a regular weekly service on behalf of the community. Cf. Lev. XXIV, 4-9.

(18) If the whole community of Israel or the greater part thereof became unclean it is then permitted to offer the communal sacrifices, e.g., the Daily sacrifice, in uncleanness. V. Pes. 77a.

(19) The fact that Resh Lakish remained silent and did not put forward the suggested answer.

(20) That Resh Lakish remained silent and did not distinguish between communal and private offerings.

(21) MS.M., Rashi and Sh. Mek. omit the word "Omer', and the sense of R. Joseph's remark is that the dispute between R. Johanan and Resh Lakish related also to the Shewbread which is a communal meal-offering.

(22) Lev. II, 2. The amount of the flour of a meal-offering is fixed at a minimum of one tenth part of an ephah, and of oil at one log.

(23) Ibid. 3.

(24) But where some of the frankincense had been burnt upon the altar and then it was found to be wanting, the meal-offering is valid.

(25) In which case the meal-offering is invalid, for the deficiency cannot be made up by bringing more flour, contra R. Johanan.

(26) In which case the handful may not be burnt, again contra R. Johanan.

(27) Lev. II. 3.

(28) I.e., if at the time of the taking of the handful the remainder was intact, it is immaterial if later it was found to have diminished, and it may be eaten; R. Jannai accordingly is in conflict with Ze'iri. Rashi, however, gives another

interpretation according to which R. Jannai is in agreement with Ze'iri: the meal-offering was once whole, i.e., at the time of the burning of the handful.

(29) Ibid. IX, 17.

(30) Ibid. XIV, 15, in reference to the purificatory rites of a leper.

(31) That only the left hand shall be employed and not the right, and one therefore cannot draw any conclusion or inference from this expression.

(32) Ibid. 16.

(33) Since 'the left hand' is stated twice, and inasmuch as each by itself serves as a limitation to exclude the right hand, the result is that the successive limitations actually amplify the law and include the right hand, that it, too, may be used in the purificatory rites of the leper.

(34) Ibid. 26. This third expression precludes the suggestion stated that the first two are to be regarded as limitation following limitation resulting in amplification, for if that were so this third expression would be superfluous.

(35) Lev. XIV, 14, 16, 26 and 27; the first two referring to the rites of a rich man that is being cleansed of his leprosy, and the latter two to those of a poor man. The result is therefore thus: the first expression 'the left hand' is required for its own purpose, the second to indicate that only here 'hand' means the left hand but not elsewhere, the third to preclude the suggestion that the first two are to be regarded as limitation following limitation, and the fourth to preclude the inference, suggested last, that wherever 'hand' is stated the left hand is meant.

(36) Ibid 17 and 28, with reference to the application of oil upon these parts, the former verse dealing with the case of the rich man and the latter with the poor man. In both cases, however, the passage is superfluous for in each verse appears the direction that the oil shall be applied on the place where the blood of the guilt-offering had been applied, and the latter, as expressly stated both in the case of the rich man and of the poor man (v. ibid. 14 and 25 respectively), was applied upon the thumb of the right hand and the great toe of the right leg. It must be observed that the thumb and the great toe are expressed in the Heb. by the same word בהן; thus the expression תעל בהן stated twice in this verse, is redundant.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 10a

One serves to permit [the application of the oil] upon the sides;[1] and the other to forbid it on the sides of the side.[2] And for what purpose are stated, Upon the blood of the guilt-offering, and, Upon the place of the blood of the guilt-offering?[3] — They are both necessary; for had the Divine Law only stated, upon the blood of the guilt-offering, I should have said that only if [the blood] was still there it is [valid], but if it had been wiped off it is not [valid]; the Divine Law therefore stated, 'Upon the place of the blood of the guilt-offering'. And had the Divine Law only stated, 'Upon the place etc.', I should have said that it [the blood] must first be wiped off, but if it was still there it would be regarded as an interposition;[4] the Divine Law therefore stated, 'Upon the blood of the guilt-offering'.

Raba said, Since there have been stated [with regard to the application of the oil] the expressions 'Upon the blood of the guilt-offering' and 'Upon the place of the blood of the guilt-offering', and moreover since with regard to the application of the blood the term 'right' is used, for what purpose then does the verse state, concerning the application of the oil upon the leper. 'Upon the thumb of his right hand and upon the great toe of his right leg', both in the case of the rich man and of the poor man?[5] — Raba therefore said,[6] The term 'hand' [is required for purposes of analogy] with 'hand' in respect of the taking out of the handful,[7] the term 'leg' with 'leg' in respect of halizah,[8] the term 'ear' with 'ear' in respect of 'boring of the ear'.[9] Wherefore is 'the left' stated?[10] — R. Shisha the son of R. Idi answered, In order to rule out the use of the priest's right hand in the case of the leper; lest you argue as follows: if in the case where the left hand is not allowed the right hand nevertheless is, in the case where the left hand is allowed surely the right hand is allowed too.[11] And wherefore is 'the left' stated again?[12] — For the reason taught at the school of R. Ishmael: Any Biblical passage that was stated once, and then repeated, was repeated only for the sake of some new point contained therein.[13]

Rabbah b. Bar Hannah said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish, Wherever the words 'priest' and

'finger' are stated [in connection with a service of the Temple] they signify the right [hand] only. Now it was assumed that both these terms 'priest' and 'finger' were necessary [to signify this], as in the verse, And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger,[14] and [there the finger of the right hand is meant for] it is inferred from the case of the leper where it is written, And the priest shall dip his right finger.[15] But there is the case of the taking of the handful, with regard to which only the word 'priest' is written, and yet we have learnt: IF [THE PRIEST] TOOK THE HANDFUL WITH HIS LEFT HAND IT IS INVALID! — Raba answered, It is either the word 'priest' or the word 'finger' [that is meant].[16] Thereupon Abaye said to him, Take the case of the bringing of the limbs [of the sacrifice] to the [altar] ascent, with regard to which the word 'priest' is written, as it is said, And the priest shall present the whole and burn it upon the altar,[17] and a Master said, This refers to the bringing of the limbs to the [altar] ascent,[18] and yet we have learnt:[19] The right [hind-]leg was carried in the left hand with the part covered with the skin outermost![20] — The rule [that the word] 'priest' or 'finger' [implies the right hand] we apply only to such services as would invalidate the atonement [by their omission].[21] Then take the case of receiving [of the blood in a vessel]; it is surely a service that would invalidate the atonement [by its omission], and yet we have learnt:[22] If [the priest] received the blood in his left hand, It is invalid; but R. Simeon declares it valid![23] — You raised this [difficulty] according to R. Simeon's view, did you not? But R. Simeon requires both terms.[24] Does then R. Simeon require both terms? Surely it has been taught: R. Simeon says. Wherever the term 'hand' is stated it signifies the right hand only, likewise the term 'finger' signifies the right finger only! — The term 'finger' does not require with it the term 'priest',[25] but the term 'priest' requires with it the term 'finger'.[25] Why then is the term 'priest' stated at all?[26] [That he shall be clad] in the priestly robes.

---

(1) Sc. of the thumb and of the great toe; for the Hebrew particle עַל may mean 'close to' as well as 'upon'.

(2) I.e., the inner side of the thumb (facing the palm), and the lower side of the great toe (facing the ground).

(3) Ibid. 17 and 28. Surely one of them is superfluous (Rashi). According to Tosaf, the question is, Why the variation in the expressions; why in the second verse is 'the place of' added?

(4) For the oil must touch the body of the leper on the parts specified directly without any other substance interposing.

(5) The question is concerning the superfluous word 'right' stated with regard to the hand and the leg; for even if Scripture had omitted the word in each case we should still have known that the right hand and right leg were intended, either because the application of the blood was upon these limbs and the oil was to be applied upon the blood, or because of the original opinion expressed by R. Zera that 'hand' generally means the right hand. V. Tosaf. s.v. אמר.

(6) Raba on account of this last question abandons the conclusions of R. Zera that were derived from the expression 'the left hand' being stated four times, whereby the rule was established that 'hand' generally means the right hand and therefore the taking of the handful must be performed with the right hand, but proceeds to interpret anew all the expressions employed in this passage dealing with the purificatory rites of the leper.

(7) The word 'hand' is stated here in connection with the rites of a rich man (Lev. XIV, 17) and also in connection with the taking of the handful from the meal-offering (ibid IX, 17): as in the former case the right hand is meant for it is expressly stated so, so in the latter case, too, the right hand is meant.

(8) The word 'leg' is stated here in connection with the rites of the rich man (ibid. XIV, 17) and also in connection with the ceremony of halizah (the drawing off of the shoe, v. Deut. XXV, 5-10): as here the right leg is meant, so there too the right leg is meant.

(9) The word 'ear' is stated here in connection with the rites of the rich man (Lev. ibid.) and also in connection with the boring of the ear of an Israelite slave who desired to continue in servitude (v. Ex. XXI, 5, 6): as here the right ear is meant, so there too the right ear is meant.

(10) In Lev. Xlv, 16, in connection with the rites of the rich man: And the priest shall dip his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand. In the preceding verse (15) 'the left hand' is admittedly required for its own purpose, that the priest shall pour the oil into his left hand.

(11) Scripture therefore repeated 'the left hand' to indicate that the service shall be performed with the left hand only.

(12) Lev. XIV, 27, in connection with the rites of the poor man. This question applies to all the expressions used in connection with the rites of the poor leper.

(13) The new point being that the offerings for purification vary according to the means of the leper.

(14) Ibid. IV, 25.
(15) Ibid. XIV, 16. And as in this verse where both the expressions ‘priest’ and finger’ are stated the right must be used, so wherever these two expressions are found they imply the use of the right hand.
(16) I.e., the occurrence of either of these terms in connection with any service signifies that that service shall be performed with the right hand or with the right finger.
(17) Lev. I, 13.
(18) Cf. Zeb. 4a and elsewhere.
(19) Tamid 31b.
(20) Hence although the term ‘priest’ is used in connection with the service of ‘bringing nigh’, it nevertheless may be performed with the left hand!
(21) Whereas the service of ‘bringing nigh’ is not indispensable, for even if it were omitted, e.g., If the sacrifice was slaughtered close to the altar ascent so that there was no need for bringing the limbs to the altar, the atonement would not be impaired.
(22) Zeb. 15b. In cur. edd. before ‘we have learnt’ are inserted the following lines: ‘and with regard to which the term "priest" is stated, as it is written, And Aaron's sons, the priests, shall present the blood (Lev. I, 5), which refers to the receiving of the blood’. These lines are not found in any of the MSS. and apparently they were not in the text that was before Rashi. They are also omitted by Sh. Mek.
(23) Notwithstanding the expression ‘priest’ used in connection with the service, v. prec. n.
(24) Both the expressions ‘priest’ and ‘finger’ are necessary in order to signify the right hand.
(25) In order to signify the right finger.
(26) In a case where the term ‘finger’ is used the addition of the term ‘priest’ is of no significance whatsoever. This question and the answer which follows are omitted in all MSS.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 10b

Consider the case of the sprinkling [of the blood], with regard to which only the term ‘priest’ is used, yet we have learnt: If [the priest] sprinkled the blood with his left hand it is invalid; and R. Simeon does not differ! — Abaye answered, He does indeed differ in the Baraitha, for it was taught: If he received the blood in his left hand it is invalid, but R. Simeon declares it valid. If he sprinkled the blood with his left hand it is invalid, but R. Simeon declares it valid.

But then Raba's statement that the term ‘hand’ [is required for the purposes of analogy] with ‘hand’ in respect of the taking out of the handful,[1] is quite unnecessary, for it would have been inferred from the expression ‘priest’![2] — One [teaching] is required for the taking out of the handful and the other for the hallowing of the handful.[3] But according to R. Simeon who holds [according to one view] that the hallowing of the handful is not essential,[4] and even according to the other view that the hallowing of the handful is indeed essential but that it is valid if performed with the left hand, is not Raba's analogy by means of the common word ‘hand’ necessary? It cannot serve to indicate that the actual taking out of the handful [shall be performed with the right hand],[5] as this is already established by the teaching of R. Judah the son of R. Hiyya. For R. Judah the son of R. Hiyya said, What is the reason for R. Simeon's view?[6] Because the verse says, It is most holy as the sin-offering and as the guilt-offering;[7] that is to say, if [the priest] comes to perform the service with his hand[8] he must do so with his right hand as the sin-offering,[9] and if he comes to perform it in a vessel he must do so with his left hand as the guilt-offering![10] — It is only necessary with regard to the handful of the sinner's meal-offering; for I might have said that, since R. Simeon has expressed the view that his [the sinner's] offering shall not be sumptuous,[11] then even if the handful were taken out with the left hand it should be valid, we are therefore taught [by Raba's analogy that it must nevertheless be performed with the right hand].

IF ON TAKING THE HANDFUL THERE CAME INTO HIS HAND A SMALL STONE OR A GRAIN OF SALT

---

(1) Namely that it shall be performed with the right hand; v. supra p. 56.
(2) The term 'priest' is used in connection with the taking 'of the handful, and this alone, according to the view of the Rabbis as stated by Raba, indicates that the service must be performed with the right hand.
(3) Raba's analogy is required to teach that the hallowing of the handful, i.e., putting it into a vessel of ministry, must also be performed with the right hand.
(4) But that the handful taken out by the Priest may be carried directly to the altar and burnt thereon. V. infra 26a.
(5) Since R. Simeon does not accept the view that the term 'priest' by itself signifies the use of the right hand. V. supra p. 58.
(6) That the offering is valid even though the handful was not hallowed in a vessel of ministry.
(7) Lev. VI, 10, with reference to the meal-offering.
(8) I.e., he does not put the handful into a vessel of ministry, but places it on the altar directly from his hand.
(9) The sprinkling of the sin-offering — which corresponds to the burning of the handful of the meal-offering — must be performed with the right hand, since in connection therewith both the expressions 'priest' and 'finger' are employed.
(10) Sc. the guilt-offering of the leper with regard to which the left hand is expressly required. It is evident, however, from this teaching of R. Judah that any service that is performed with the hand, as the taking of the handful from the meal-offering, must be performed with the right hand; hence Raba's analogy is unnecessary.
(11) And therefore it must be offered without oil and frankincense; v. supra 6b.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 11a

OR A DROP OF FRANKINCENSE IT IS INVALID. Why are all these mentioned? — They are all necessary; for had [the Mishnah] only stated a small stone, [I should have said that it is invalid] because it is something that cannot be offered [upon the altar], but as for salt, since it is offered.[1] I would say that it does not render [the handful] invalid. And had the Mishnah stated salt only, [I should have said that it was invalid] because it is not prescribed to be brought with the meal-offering in the beginning, but as for frankincense, since it is prescribed to be brought with the meal-offering in the beginning, I would say that it does not render [the handful] invalid. We are therefore taught them all.

FOR THEY HAVE RULED: IF THE HANDFUL WAS TOO MUCH OR TOO LITTLE IT IS INVALID. Why is the reason given because it is too much or too little? Surely [it is invalid] because of the interposition?[2] — R. Jeremiah answered. It might have been at one side.[3] Abaye asked Raba, How is the handful taken? — He replied, As people usually take a handful.[4] He then raised the following objection against him: It was taught:[5] This one[6] is [for measuring] the span,[7] this one[8] [for taking] the handful,[9] this one[10] [for measuring] the cubit,[11] this one[12] is the finger,[13] and this one[14] the thumb![15] — It is used only in order to smooth the edge.[16] How then was it done? — R. Zutra b. Tobiah said in the name of Rab, He bends his three fingers until he reaches the palm of his hand and then takes the handful. [A Baraitha] has been taught to this effect: It is written, And he shall take out a full handful.[17] Now one might suppose that it should be overflowing, another verse therefore says, In his handful.[18] But from the verse, In his handful, one might suppose that it may be taken with the finger tips, it is therefore written, A full handful. How is it then to be? He should bend his three fingers over on to the palm of his hand and thus take the handful. In the case of a meal-offering prepared on a griddle or in a pan.[19] he must level it with his thumb on top and with his little finger below. And this was the most difficult service in the Temple. This, and none other? Was there not the nipping?[20] and the taking of 'both hands full'?[21] — Render: And this was one of the most difficult services in the Temple.

R. Papa said, I have no doubt at all that the expression 'a full handful' means in the manner in which people usually take a handful.[22] But, asked R. Papa, what if he took out the handful with his fingertips,[23] or with the side [of his hand],[24] or [if he took it] from below upwards?[25] These questions remain undecided.

R. Papa said, I have no doubt at all that the expression 'his hands full'[26] means in the manner in which people usually fill the hands.[27] But, asked R. Papa, what if he filled his hands with his finger tips, or with the sides,[28] or if he filled each hand separately and brought them together? — These questions remain undecided.

R. Papa raised the question: What if he stuck the handful to the side of the vessel?[29] Must it be put inside the vessel, which is the case here; or must it be put down inside the vessel, which is not the case here? — This remains undecided.

Mar b. R. Ashi raised the following question: What if he turned the vessel upside down and put down the handful on the bottom of the vessel?[30] Must it be put inside the vessel, which is the case here; or must it be put down in a normal manner,[31] which is not the case here? — This remains undecided.

MISHNAH. HOW SHOULD HE DO IT? HE SHOULD STRETCH OUT HIS FINGERS ON TO THE PALM OF HIS HAND. IF HE PUT IN TOO MUCH OF ITS OIL OR TOO LITTLE OF ITS OIL.[32] OR TOO LITTLE OF ITS FRANKINCENSE,[33] THE OFFERING IS INVALID.

GEMARA. What is meant by TOO MUCH OF ITS OIL? R. Eleazar said, If, for example, one set apart for it two logs of oil.[34] And why did he not suggest that ordinary [unconsecrated] oil or oil from another [meal-offering] was added to it? Should you, however, retort that [the addition of] ordinary [unconsecrated] oil or oil from another [meal-offering] would not render the offering invalid, then there is the objection (raised by R. Zutra b. Tobiah):[35] How can the ruling, that the sinner's meal-offering

Another interpretation is: he filled his hands with incense taken from the side of the vessel and not from the middle. is rendered invalid by the addition of oil,[36] ever be applied? If [you say that oil was especially set aside] for it — but it does not require any;[37] and if [you say that] ordinary [unconsecrated] oil or oil from another [meal-offering] was added to it — but you have now said that this would not render the offering invalid? And R. Eleazar [what does he say to this]?[38] — It is a case of 'it goes without saying'; thus, it goes without saying that the offering is rendered invalid by the addition of ordinary [unconsecrated] oil or oil of another [meal-offering]; but in the case where a man set aside for it two logs of oil, since each [log separately] is suitable for the purpose. I would say that it is not invalid; he therefore teaches us [that it is invalid]. But whence does R. Eleazar know this? — Raba said, Our Mishnah presented a difficulty to him. Why does it use the expression. IF HE PUT IN TOO MUCH OF ITS OIL? It should have stated, 'If he put in too much oil for it'. But its teaches us[39] that [it is invalid] even though he set aside for it two logs of oil.

IF HE PUT IN TOO LITTLE OF ITS FRANKINCENSE. Our Rabbis taught: If the frankincense had diminished until there remained one grain only, the offering is invalid; if there remained two grains, it is valid. So R. Judah. R. Simeon says. If there remained one grain, it is valid; if less than that it is invalid.

---

(1) For after the handful was placed upon the altar salt was sprinkled over it.

(2) When there is a stone or some other substance included in the handful it interposes or separates between the flour and the fingers, and this renders it invalid. And even where the stone happens to lie in the middle of the flour and does not touch the fingers it is also invalid for it interposes between the flour and divides it into two!

(3) The stone might have been at the end of the handful i.e., near the thumb or the little finger, so that there is no question of interposition, but it is invalid only because the handful is too little, since there is lacking flour to the extent of the volume of the stone.

(4) Using all the fingers of the hand, even the little finger.

(5) V. Keth. 5b.

(6) The little finger.
(7) I.e., the distance from the tip of the little finger to the tip of the thumb of a spread hand. The span was the measure of the breastplate of the High Priest; v. Ex. XXVIII, 16.
(8) The finger next to the little one.
(9) This finger was the limit on the one end of the handful, the thumb limiting it at the other end; so that the little finger was not used in taking the handful, contra Raba.
(10) The middle finger.
(11) I.e., the distance from the tip of the middle finger to the point of the elbow.
(12) The fourth from the little finger.
(13) Which is used in the priestly service, as when the priest dips his finger in the blood for the sprinkling.
(14) The fifth from the little finger.
(15) Which was the subject of special rites in the purification ceremony of the leper.
(16) The little finger was to be employed only to smooth level the side of the handful so that none of the flour should appear to be bursting out; this levelling was also performed at the other end by the thumb. It is clear, however, that the actual handful was made up by bending the middle three fingers over the palm. In cur. edd. there appears here in the text an explanatory gloss which is not found in any MS., it is struck out by Sh. Mek.
(17) Lev. II, 2.
(18) Ibid. VI, 8: the meaning of this expression being that the flour shall be entirely within the handful, so that none should burst out at the ends or between the fingers.
(19) These meal-offerings were first baked into cakes, the cakes broken into pieces, and then the priest took out a handful. They were not, however, broken fine, and therefore when the handful was taken, particles of the cakes would be protruding on all sides; the thumb and little finger were then brought into operation so as to smooth the sides-an awkward and difficult manipulation.
(20) Nipping off the head of a bird-offering. (v. Lev. I, 15) was an act which required considerable skill; cf. Zeb. 64b.
(21) V. ibid. XVI, 12, where it is stated that the High Priest on the Day of Atonement took both hands full of incense and offered it in the Holy of Holies. The circumstances in which he took these were such as to render the taking a very difficult task. V. Yoma 49b.
(22) I.e., by inserting the side of the hand, held at an angle, into the flour and scooping up a handful.
(23) With the palm of his hand facing downwards he inserted his finger-tips and scooped up the flour little by little into the palm of his hand.
(24) By laying his hand, palm upwards, upon the surface of the flour and moving it to and fro he gradually scooped up a handful. Another interpretation is: he took the handful from the flour at the side of the vessel and not from the middle.
(25) He cupped his hand and pressed it, palm upwards, into the flour and thus took out a handful.
(26) Ibid. XVI, 12. V. supra n. 3.
(27) I.e., by cupping the hands, inserting them into the heap, drawing them towards each other, and taking out two hands full.
(28) By laying the hands flat, palms upwards, on the incense and heaping up the incense on them via the space between the thumb and the first finger.
(29) When putting back the handful to be hallowed in a vessel of ministry, the priest did not put it down in the bottom of the vessel but stuck it on the side of the vessel.
(30) The vessel was overturned and the handful was put down on the now concave base of the vessel.
(31) Lit, 'in its ordered manner'.
(32) The amount of oil prescribed is one log (v. Glos.) for each tenth part of an ephah of flour.
(33) The prescribed amount of frankincense is one handful; v. infra 106b.
(34) And the oil was then mixed with the flour, so that to all appearances there are here two meal-offerings.
(35) The bracketed words are deleted by Sh. Mek.
(36) The sinner's meal-offering was to be without oil (v. Lev. V, 11); if any oil was put into it it is invalid, v. infra 59b.
(37) And therefore what was set aside for it does not become consecrated.
(38) Why then did he not suggest an addition of ordinary unconsecrated oil?
(39) The expression 'TOO MUCH OF ITS OIL' implies that a large quantity had been set aside for this meal-offering at the very beginning.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 11b

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 11b

But have we not been taught [in another Baraitha]:[1] If the handful of frankincense had diminished, no matter how little, it is invalid?[2] — Render: If the [last] grain of frankincense had diminished, no matter how little, it is invalid. Alternatively I may say. One[3] [Baraitha] refers to the frankincense that was offered together with the meal-offering,[4] and the other to a separate offering of frankincense.[5]

R. Isaac b. Joseph said in the name of R. Johanan. In this matter there are three different views: R. Meir[6] holds that there must be a handful [of frankincense] at the outset[7] and also a handful in the end; R. Judah holds, a handful at the outset and two grains in the end; R. Simeon holds, a handful at the outset and one grain in the end. All these three [Rabbis] derived their opinions from the same verse, vis., And all the frankincense which is upon the meal-offering.[8] R. Meir is of the opinion that [the offering is invalid] unless there is present now all the frankincense that was prescribed to be offered with the meal-offering at the outset. R. Judah maintains that the expression 'all'[9] implies even one grain, and the particle 'eth'[10] adds to it another grain. R. Simeon, however, does not interpret the particle 'eth'.[11]

R. Isaac b. Joseph also said in the name of R. Johanan. They[12] differ only with regard to the frankincense that is offered together with the meal-offering, but with regard to frankincense that is offered by itself, all agree that there must be a handful at the outset and a handful in the end. Therefore the words 'which is upon the meal-offering' are expressly stated to indicate that this is so[13] only [with regard to the frankincense] that is offered with the meal-offering, but not with regard to that offered by itself. R. Isaac b. Joseph further said in the name of R. Johanan, They[12] differ only with regard to the frankincense that is offered together with the meal-offering, but as for the frankincense offered in the dishes,[14] all agree that there must be two handfuls at the outset and two handfuls in the end.[15] Surely this is obvious![16] — You might have thought that since [the frankincense in the two dishes] is brought together with the Shewbread it is in the same category as that which is offered with a meal-offering; we are therefore taught [that it is not so].

This, however, is a matter of dispute between R. Ammi and R. Isaac Nappaha. One says, They[17] differ only with regard to the frankincense that is offered together with the meal-offering, but with regard to the frankincense offered by itself, all agree that there must be a handful at the outset and a handful in the end. The other says, Just as they differ in the former case so they differ in the latter case too.

IF HE PUT IN TOO LITTLE OF ITS FRANKINCENSE THE OFFERING IS INVALID. It follows, however, that if he put in too much, it is valid; but we have been taught. If he put in too much it is invalid? — Rami b. Hama answered, That was a case where he set apart two handfuls.[18]

Rami b. Hama also said, If a man set apart two handfuls [of frankincense], and one of them was lost before the taking of the handful [of flour, the offering is valid, for] they had not yet been appointed [for this meal-offering]; if [one was lost] after the taking of the handful, [the offering is invalid, for] they had already been appointed [for this meal-offering].[19]

Rami b. Hama also said, If he set apart four handfuls [of frankincense] for the two dishes, and two of them were lost before the taking away of the dishes,[20] [it is valid, for] they had not yet been appointed [for the Shewbread]; if [two were lost] after the taking away of the dishes, [it is invalid, for] they had already been appointed [for the Shewbread]. Wherefore was this case necessary? It is the same as the other! — You might have thought that, since in this case the handful is separate.[21] as soon as the time for its removal has arrived it is regarded as already removed;[22] we are therefore taught otherwise.

MISHNAH. IF HE TOOK THE HANDFUL[23] FROM THE MEAL-OFFERING [INTENDING] TO EAT THE REMAINDER OUTSIDE [THE TEMPLE COURT] OR AN OLIVE'S BULK OF THE REMAINDER OUTSIDE, OR TO BURN[24] THE HANDFUL OUTSIDE OR AN OLIVE'S BULK OF THE HANDFUL OUTSIDE, OR TO BURN ITS FRANKINCENSE OUTSIDE, THE OFFERING IS INVALID, BUT THE PENALTY OF KARETH[25] IS NOT INCURRED.[26] [IF HE INTENDED] TO EAT THE REMAINDER ON THE MORROW[27] OR AN OLIVE'S BULK OF THE REMAINDER ON THE MORROW, OR TO BURN THE HANDFUL ON THE MORROW OR AN OLIVE'S BULK OF THE HANDFUL ON THE MORROW, OR TO BURN ITS FRANKINCENSE ON THE MORROW,

---

(1) The words 'R. Simeon says' are deleted by all commentators on the strength of Rashi's remark: 'I believe that R. Simeon is the author of the statement'.

(2) There is here a contradiction between the views of R. Simeon, for the view expressed in the second Baraitha is also that of R. Simeon.

(3) The first quoted Baraitha which contains the dispute between R. Judah and R. Simeon.

(4) In which case the offering is valid as long as there remained one grain of frankincense.

(5) In which case there must be nothing less than a handful at all times.

(6) The anonymous author of our Mishnah.

(7) I.e., at the time of the taking of the handful of flour there must be in the vessel a handful of frankincense. This is admitted by all authorities; v. infra 106b.

(8) Lev. VI. 8, Heb. ואת כל.

(9) The expression כל 'all' is interpreted here, by R. Judah and R. Simeon, in the same sense as the Rabbinic כל שהוא 'anything', 'aughtsoever'.

(10) את. Hence there must be left at least two grains.

(11) As having any particular significance apart from its grammatical use.

(12) R. Meir, R. Judah and R. Simeon.

(13) That a diminution of the frankincense does not invalidate the offering according to R. Judah and R. Simeon.

(14) V. infra 106b.

(15) I.e., there must be a handful of frankincense in each dish from the time that they are set upon the table up to the time they are removed to be burnt.

(16) Since there is here no Biblical term or expression, like כל, to indicate that a diminution of the prescribed quantity is allowed.

(17) R. Meir, R. Judah and R. Simeon.

(18) Which is an excessive amount and therefore invalid; anything more than one handful but less than two would be valid. According to another interpretation, it is valid where two handfuls were set apart, for each handful can serve separately for the purpose.

(19) And the amount of frankincense was excessive. Or it is invalid, according to the aforementioned view of R. Meir, because there is a diminution of the frankincense appointed for the offering.

(20) I.e., of frankincense which had remained on the table the past week and which were removed on the Sabbath and burnt upon the altar.

(21) For it is contained in dishes and stands apart from the rest of the offering.

(22) So that as soon as the time for the removal of the dishes of frankincense of the past week has come about (which is immediately after the offering of the Sabbath additional sacrifice), the frankincense that has been set apart may be regarded as already appointed for their purpose; and therefore it is invalid if thereafter a part of it was lost.

(23) The rule here stated applies equally well to each of the four main services of the meal-offering-taking out the handful, putting it into a vessel, bringing it nigh to the altar, and burning it.

(24) The wrongful intention must be in respect of those parts of the offering that are usually eaten, but the term 'eat' includes also what is 'eaten' by the altar, i.e., burnt thereon, in this case the handful and the frankincense. This is derived from the fact that in Lev. VII, 18 there is a duplicated expression for eating, האכל יאכל, thus referring to two kinds of eating.

(25) V. Glos.

(26) If a priest actually, ate the remainder or actually burnt the handful or the frankincense outside the Temple court.

(27) Which is 'outside the proper time', for a meal-offering must be eaten the same day and evening until midnight.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 12a

THE OFFERING IS PIGGUL,[1] AND THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS INCURRED. THIS IS THE GENERAL RULE: IF ONE TOOK THE HANDFUL OR PUT IT INTO THE VESSEL OR BROUGHT IT NIGH OR BURNT IT, [INTENDING] TO EAT A THING THAT IS USUAL TO EAT OR TO BURN A THING THAT IS USUAL TO BURN, OUTSIDE ITS PROPER PLACE, THE OFFERING IS INVALID BUT THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS NOT INCURRED; BUT IF [HE INTENDED THE LIKE] OUTSIDE ITS PROPER TIME, THE OFFERING IS PIGGUL AND THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS INCURRED; PROVIDED THAT THE MATTIR[2] WAS OFFERED ACCORDING TO ITS PRESCRIBED RITE.[3] HOW IS THE MATTIR OFFERED ACCORDING TO ITS PRESCRIBED RITE? IF HE TOOK OUT THE HANDFUL IN SILENCE, BUT PUT IT INTO THE VESSEL AND BROUGHT IT NIGH AND BURNT IT [INTENDING AT EACH SERVICE TO EAT THE REMAINDER] OUTSIDE ITS PROPER TIME; OR IF HE TOOK OUT THE HANDFUL [INTENDING TO EAT THE REMAINDER] OUTSIDE ITS PROPER TIME, BUT PUT IT INTO THE VESSEL AND BROUGHT IT NIGH AND BURNT IT IN SILENCE; OR IF HE TOOK OUT THE HANDFUL AND PUT IT INTO THE VESSEL AND BROUGHT IT NIGH AND BURNT IT [INTENDING AT EACH SERVICE TO EAT THE REMAINDER] OUTSIDE ITS PROPER TIME — SUCH IS A CASE WHERE THE MATTIR IS OFFERED ACCORDING TO ITS PRESCRIBED RITE.[4] HOW IS THE MATTIR OFFERED NOT ACCORDING TO ITS PRESCRIBED RITE? IF HE TOOK OUT THE HANDFUL [INTENDING TO EAT THE REMAINDER] OUTSIDE ITS PROPER PLACE, AND PUT IT INTO THE VESSEL AND BROUGHT IT NIGH AND BURNT IT [INTENDING AT EACH SERVICE TO EAT THE REMAINDER] OUTSIDE ITS PROPER TIME; OR IF HE TOOK OUT THE HANDFUL [INTENDING TO EAT THE REMAINDER] OUTSIDE ITS PROPER TIME, AND HE PUT IT INTO THE VESSEL AND BROUGHT IT NIGH AND BURNT IT [INTENDING AT EACH SERVICE TO EAT THE REMAINDER] OUTSIDE ITS PROPER PLACE; OR IF HE TOOK OUT THE HANDFUL AND PUT IT INTO THE VESSEL AND BROUGHT IT NIGH AND BURNT IT [INTENDING AT THESE SERVICES TO EAT THE REMAINDER] OUTSIDE ITS PROPER PLACE[5] — (SUCH IS A CASE WHERE THE MATTIR IS OFFERED NOT ACCORDING TO ITS RITE).[6] OR IF IT WAS A SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING[7] OR A MEAL-OFFERING OF JEALOUSY.[7] AND HE TOOK THE HANDFUL THEREFROM UNDER ANY NAME OTHER THAN ITS OWN, AND PUT IT INTO THE VESSEL AND BROUGHT IT NIGH AND BURNT IT [INTENDING AT EACH SERVICE TO EAT THE REMAINDER] OUTSIDE ITS PROPER TIME; OR IF HE TOOK OUT THE HANDFUL [INTENDING TO EAT THE REMAINDER] OUTSIDE ITS PROPER TIME, AND PUT IT INTO THE VESSEL AND BROUGHT IT NIGH AND BURNT IT UNDER ANY NAME OTHER THAN ITS OWN; OR IF HE TOOK OUT THE HANDFUL AND PUT IT INTO THE VESSEL AND BROUGHT IT NIGH AND BURNT IT UNDER ANY NAME OTHER THAN ITS OWN — SUCH IS A CASE WHERE THE MATTIR IS OFFERED NOT ACCORDING TO ITS PRESCRIBED RITE.

[IF HE INTENDED][8] TO EAT AN OLIVE'S BULK OF THE REMAINDER OUTSIDE ITS PROPER PLACE AND ANOTHER OLIVE'S BULK THEREOF ON THE MORROW, OR TO EAT AN OLIVE'S BULK THEREOF ON THE MORROW AND ANOTHER OLIVE'S BULK THEREOF OUTSIDE ITS PROPER PLACE, OR TO EAT A HALF-OLIVE'S BULK THEREOF OUTSIDE ITS PROPER PLACE AND A HALF-OLIVE'S BULK ON THE MORROW,[9] OR TO EAT A HALF-OLIVE'S BULK THEREOF ON THE MORROW AND AN HALF-OLIVE'S BULK OUTSIDE ITS PROPER PLACE,[9] THE OFFERING IS INVALID BUT THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS NOT INCURRED. R. JUDAH SAID, THIS IS THE GENERAL RULE: IF THE INTENTION ABOUT THE TIME PRECEDED THE INTENTION ABOUT THE PLACE, THE OFFERING IS PIGGUL AND THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS INCURRED; BUT IF THE

INTENTION ABOUT THE PLACE PRECEDED THE INTENTION ABOUT THE TIME, THE OFFERING IS INVALID BUT THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS NOT INCURRED.[10] BUT THE SAGES SAY, IN BOTH CASES THE OFFERING IS INVALID BUT THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS NOT INCURRED.

GEMARA. The question was raised: According to him who holds that if the remainder of the meal-offering had diminished in the time between the taking of the handful and the burning thereof he may nevertheless burn the handful on account of it; and we had established that that remainder may not be eaten[11] — [the question arises], can the burning of the handful have any effect [upon this remainder] that it should become piggul,[12] and that it should no more be subject to the law of Sacrilege or not?[13] — R. Huna said, Even according to R. Akiba who said that the sprinkling [of the blood] has an effect upon [the consecrated meat] that was taken out [of its prescribed bounds],[14] that is so only with regard to what was taken out, since it is entirely here but has become invalid only through some extrinsic cause,[15] but upon that which has diminished, which is an intrinsic defect, the burning surely can have no effect.[16] Thereupon Raba said, On the contrary,[17] even according to R. Eliezer who said that the sprinkling of the blood has no effect upon what was taken out, that is so only with regard to what was taken out, since it is no longer inside [the Sanctuary], but upon that which has diminished, since it is still inside [the Sanctuary], the burning surely can have an effect.

Raba said, How do [arrive at the above? Because we have learnt: IF HE TOOK THE HANDFUL FROM THE MEAL-OFFERING [INTENDING] TO EAT THE REMAINDER OUTSIDE [THE TEMPLE COURT]. OR AN OLIVE'S BULK OF THE REMAINDER OUTSIDE; and R. Hiyya when learning this Mishnah quoted, 'IF HE TOOK THE HANDFUL FROM THE MEAL-OFFERING', etc., but he did not include in it OR AN OLIVE'S BULK. Now why did he not include OR AN OLIVE'S BULK? Surely [because he assumed the Mishnah to be dealing with] the case where the remainder had diminished until there was only an olive's bulk left;[18] and since with regard to the services of putting the handful into a vessel, of bringing it nigh, and of burning it, [R. Hiyya] could not have stated

---

(1) Heb. פיגול, lit., 'an abomination'. This term piggul which also involves the penalty of kareth (v. Glos.) applies only to a wrongful intention concerning the time of the eating of the offering, in contradistinction from the wrongful intention concerning the place which merely renders the sacrifice פסול 'invalid', but which does not involve the penalty of kareth.

(2) Heb. מתיר; lit., 'that which renders permissible'. This refers to the handful of flour and the frankincense of a meal-offering which, on being burnt, render the remainder permissible to be eaten. It also refers to the blood of an animal-offering which, on being sprinkled upon the altar, renders the meat thereof permissible to be eaten.

(3) I.e., there was no other imperfection or fault in the course of the services of the offering save the wrongful intention of 'out of time'. If, however, there was some other fault during the course of the services, either before or after the wrongful intention of 'out of time', the offering is not piggul but merely invalid, and the penalty of kareth is not incurred by them that eat thereof. The Mishnah now proceeds to exemplify the two rules stated.

(4) For the only defect in this offering was the 'out of time' intention, even though it was expressed during the other services too.

(5) During one of these services, however, the intention was expressed of eating the remainder outside its proper time; thus in this offering there were two defects: the 'out of time' intention and the 'out of place' intention.

(6) This sentence is struck out by Sh. Mek., and it is not found in MS.M. and other MSS.

(7) These meal-offerings can also be rendered invalid by a wrongful intention concerning the nature of the offering. i.e., by treating the offering as if it were something else. V. supra 2a.

(8) During one service two wrongful intentions as exemplified in the Mishnah; and it is immaterial which intention was expressed first. This is in contradistinction from the foregoing cases of the Mishnah where two wrongful intentions were expressed during two services.

(9) In this case the two half-olive's bulks are reckoned together so as to invalidate the offering.

(10) This rule of R. Judah applies to two wrongful intentions expressed during two services as well as during one

service.

(11) V. supra 9a and b.

(12) I.e., if while burning the handful the priest expressed the intention of eating this remainder (which in fact may not he eaten since it was found to be lacking) outside its proper time. This case may be put in the same category as where a wrongful intention was expressed concerning ‘a thing that it is not usual to eat’, which according to our Mishnah is not included in the law of piggul. On the other hand, since the burning of the handful is carried out according to law, it is in no wise different from the burning in any other meal-offering, and it can render the offering piggul.

(13) The general rule is that after the burning of the handful the remainder of the meal-offering is not subject to the law of Sacrilege since it is now permitted to the priests (Me'il I, 1); and therefore if a layman were to derive any enjoyment whatsoever from the remainder, he would not be liable to bring a guilt-offering for Sacrilege. In this case, however, since even after the burning of the handful, the priests are not permitted to eat the remainder, it might rightly be said that the law of Sacrilege still applies.

(14) It is also established law that after the sprinkling of the blood of the animal-offering the consecrated meat is no more subject to the law of Sacrilege, since it may now be eaten by the priests. This rule, according to R. Akiba, applies even to what was taken out of its bounds and which consequently may not be eaten; v. Me'il. 7a.

(15) By being taken out of its prescribed bounds; nothing however of the meat was lacking.

(16) It is therefore still subject to the law of Sacrilege.

(17) Raba is of the opinion that consecrated matter that was taken out of the Temple is a more serious matter than if it had diminished.

(18) This of course can be the case with the other services but not with the service of the taking of the handful, for if at the time of taking the handful the meal-offering had diminished it is invalid, and can in no wise be affected by any wrongful intention.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 12b

‘or an olive's bulk’,[1] he therefore did not state ‘or an olive's bulk’ even with regard to the service of taking out the handful. Nevertheless, he states in the later clause, THE OFFERING IS PIGGUL AND THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS INCURRED; hence, it is evident, that the burning [of the handful] has an effect [upon the diminished remainder]! Said to him Abaye. It is not so,[2] but the author is R. Eleazar; for we have learnt: If a man offered outside [the Temple court] an olive's bulk of the handful,[3] or of the frankincense,[3] or of the incense-offering.[4] or of the mealoffering of the priests.[5] or of the meal-offering of the anointed [High] Priest, or of the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings, he is liable;[6] but R. Eleazar declares him exempt unless he offered the whole thereof. Since therefore the expression ‘or an olive's bulk’ cannot be stated in connection with the [burning of the] handful, this same expression ‘or an olive's bulk’ is not stated in connection with the remainder.[7] But if it is R. Eleazar, why is it stated[8] ‘[Intending] to burn the handful’? It should state, ‘[Intending] to burn the handful and the frankincense’! For we have learnt:[9] If a man offered either the handful or the frankincense outside [the Temple court], he is liable; but R. Eleazar declares him exempt unless he offered both! — It refers to the handful of the sinner's meal-offering.[10] And did the Tanna trouble to teach us the case concerning the handful of the sinner's meal-offering? — He did. And likewise when R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he reported in the name of R. Eleazar that it referred only to the handful of the sinner's meal-offering, and it was in accordance with R. Eleazar's view.

Later Raba said, What I said before was wrong. For it has been taught: The expression It is[11] implies that if one of the loaves was broken all are invalid. It follows however, that if one was taken out of the Sanctuary[12] those that are inside are valid. Now whom have you heard say that the sprinkling [of the blood] has an effect upon what was taken out?[13] [Obviously] it is R. Akiba, and yet it states that if one of the loaves was broken they are not [valid].[14] Thereupon Abaye said to him, Does [the Baraitha] expressly state ‘But if one was taken out [the others are valid]’? Perhaps the correct inference is: If one became unclean the others are valid, and that is because the [High Priest's] plate[15] renders it acceptable, whereas if one was taken out the others would not [be valid],[16]

for the teaching is in accordance with R. Eleazar's view who maintains that the sprinkling of the blood has no effect upon what was taken out. And by right the Tanna [of the Baraitha] should have also stated the case where one [of the loaves] was taken out, but he only stated the case where one was broken to teach us that, even though it is still inside [the Sanctuary], the 'burning' has no effect upon it. According to R. Akiba, however, who said that the sprinkling of the blood has an effect upon what was taken out, the 'burning' likewise will have an effect upon that which had diminished.[17]

MISHNAH. [IF HE INTENDED] TO EAT A HALF-OLIVE'S BULK AND TO BURN A HALF-OLIVE'S BULK,[18] THE OFFERING IS VALID, FOR EATING AND BURNING CANNOT BE RECKONED TOGETHER.

GEMARA. Now the reason [why they cannot be reckoned together] is that [there was an intention] to eat and to burn, but it follows that where [there was the intention] to eat [what it is usual to eat] and also to eat what it is not usual to eat, they can be reckoned together;[19] but it has been stated earlier [in the Mishnah]: '[Intending] to eat a thing that it is usual to eat or to burn a thing that it is usual to burn'. Hence [a wrongful intention to eat] is of consequence only in respect of a thing that it is usual to eat, but not in respect of a thing that it is not usual to eat![20] — Said R. Jeremiah: The author [of our Mishnah] is R. Eliezer, who maintains that a wrongful intention to consume upon the altar what is usually eaten by man, or to eat what is usually consumed upon the altar is of consequence.[21] For we have learnt: If he took out the handful from the meal-offering [intending] to eat a thing that it is not usual to eat or to burn a thing that it is not usual to burn, the offering is valid; but R. Eliezer declares it to be invalid. Abaye said, You may even say that [this Mishnah] is in accordance with the view of the Rabbis, but you must not infer from it that where [there was the intention] to eat [a half-olive's bulk of what it is usual to eat] and to eat [the same of] what it is not usual to eat [they can be reckoned together], but rather infer this, that where the intention was to eat [a half-olive's bulk] and also to eat [the same of] a thing that it is usual to eat [they can be reckoned together].[22] What does it teach us?[23] We have expressly learnt this case in the earlier [Mishnah]: If he intended to eat an olive's bulk [of the remainder] outside its proper place and another olive's bulk thereof on the morrow, or to eat an olive's bulk thereof on the morrow and another olive's bulk thereof outside its proper place, or to eat a half-olive's bulk thereof outside its proper place and another half-olive's bulk thereof on the morrow, or to eat a half-olive's bulk thereof on the morrow and another half-olive's bulk thereof outside its proper place, the offering is invalid, but the penalty of kareth is not incurred.

---

(1) For once it is assumed as a fact that after the taking out of the handful the remainder had diminished until there was only an olive's bulk left, then it is absurd to state 'if he put the handful into a vessel (or brought it nigh, or burnt it) intending to eat the remainder or an olive's bulk of the remainder outside its proper time . . .' for the two, the remainder and the olive's bulk, are identical. This being so, R. Hiyya for the sake of consistency omitted the expression 'or an olive's bulk' even in the case of the taking of the handful where this expression is indeed meaningful. The condition of the text both in the Gemara and in Rashi is very doubtful and at present most unsatisfactory. The translation is based on the interpretation of R. Meir and his son Rashbam, given in cur. edd. at the end of Chapter I, infra 13a.

(2) The reason why R. Hiyya omits 'or an olive's bulk' was not as suggested above by Raba, but because R. Hiyya stated the teaching in accordance with the view of R. Eleazar, v. Zeb. 109b.

(3) Of an ordinary meal-offering.

(4) Which was offered daily in the Temple, morning and evening.

(5) Every meal-offering of the priest was to be wholly burnt. So too was the meal-offering of the High Priest which he was to bring daily, known as חביתי כהן גדול. Likewise, the meal-offerings that were offered with the drink-offerings that accompanied most sacrifices (v. Num XV, 4ff) were wholly burnt.

(6) To the penalty of kareth; v. Lev. XVII, 8, 9.

(7) Hence, according to R. Eleazar, to burn only an olive's bulk of the handful is no 'burning', and an intention to do so outside its proper time expressed during another service (say, during the taking out of the handful) would not render the

offering piggul. Accordingly one must omit the expression ‘or an olive's bulk’ from the first clause, which deals with a wrongful intention in connection with the burning of the handful, and for the sake of consistency the expression was omitted by R. Hiyya throughout.

(8) In the Mishnah as taught by R. Hiyya.

(9) Zeb. 110a.

(10) I.e., the Mishnah taught by R. Hiyya on the authority of R. Eleazar refers specifically to the sinner's meal-offering in which there was no frankincense at all, so that the ‘burning’ consists only of the burning of the handful.

(11) Lev. XXIV, 9: For it is most holy unto him; with reference to the Shewbread.

(12) In all MSS. the following is added here in the text: ‘or if one was rendered unclean’. So also Sh. Mek.

(13) For here it is said that the burning of the frankincense of the Shewbread-offering — which corresponds to the sprinkling of the blood of an animal-offering — has an effect upon what was taken out, insofar as the number of the loaves is considered complete, the result being that those loaves which remained inside are now permitted to be eaten.

(14) Hence, although the burning can have an effect upon what was taken out, it is admitted, even according to R. Akiba, that it can have no effect upon that which had diminished, and if one loaf was broken all are invalid, Raba thus agrees with R. Huna, and retracts his former view,

(15) Heb, **ציץ**: the High Priest's plate of pure gold worn on the forehead which had the power of propitiation (v. Ex. XXVIII, 36ff); i.e., it secured the Divine acceptance of the sacrifice even though the flesh or the blood or any other part thereof had become unclean.

(16) For the burning of the frankincense must be on behalf of the whole Shewbread, i.e., twelve loaves, and here there is not this number.

(17) Thus contrary to R. Huna's view.

(18) Each either outside the proper time or outside the proper place.

(19) E.g., if while taking the handful he intended to eat a half-olive's bulk of the remainder outside the Sanctuary and also to eat outside a half-olive's bulk of the handful (which is to be burnt and not eaten), these two intentions would be reckoned as one in respect of an olive's bulk and the offering would be invalid.

(20) Such an intention even in respect of a whole olive's bulk is of no consequence whatsoever; so that there can then be no question at all of reckoning this intention together with another in order to render the offering invalid.

(21) The handful is a thing that it is usual to burn upon the altar, and the remainder is a thing that it is usual to eat. Hence, according to R. Eliezer (v. infra 17a), a wrongful intention made in respect of a thing that it is not usual to eat or to burn renders the offering invalid and a fortiori if made partly in respect of a thing that it is usual to eat and partly in respect of a thing that it is not usual to eat.

(22) The one to be eaten outside its proper place and the other on the morrow. Our Mishnah, by inference, teaches that these intentions combine and the offering is invalid.

(23) From this point until the end of the chapter the text is very doubtful and in many parts obviously corrupt; as is indeed evident from the many bracketed lines and words. In fact the entire passage seems to have been taken over bodily from Zeb. 31b, and altered in parts so as to suit the context in our tractate; hence the confusion. V. Tosaf. s.v. **אלא**. The translation given is based entirely upon Rashi and upon the text that was apparently before him. V. also D.S. on this passage.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 13a

What further does our Mishnah teach us? If it suggests the inference that where there was the intention to eat [a half-olive's bulk of what it is usual to eat] and also to eat [a half-olive's bulk] of what it is not usual to eat they can be reckoned together — but you already know from the first clause;[1] and if [it teaches] that where there was the intention to eat and burn [a half-olive's bulk they cannot be reckoned together] — but you surely know this by inference from the preceding Mishnah: for if the intentions to eat [what it is usual to eat] and to eat what it is not usual to eat, cannot be reckoned together, is it then necessary to state that the intentions to eat and to burn [cannot be reckoned together]?[2] — Yes, it is necessary to state that the intentions to eat and to burn [cannot be reckoned together]; for you might have thought that only in that case[3] [the intentions cannot be reckoned together], for there is an intention there with regard to what is not proper.[4] but here,[5] since each intention relates to what is proper in each case, I might say that they should be reckoned

together; — we are therefore taught [that they cannot be reckoned together].

CHAPTER II

MISHNAH. IF HE TOOK OUT THE HANDFUL [INTENDING] TO EAT THE REMAINDER OR TO BURN THE HANDFUL ON THE MORROW, IN THIS CASE R. JOSE AGREES THAT THE OFFERING IS PIGGUL[6] AND THAT THE PENALTY OF KARETH[6] IS INCURRED ON ACCOUNT THEREOF.[7] [IF HE INTENDED] TO BURN THE FRANKINCENSE THEREOF ON THE MORROW, R. JOSE SAYS, IT IS INVALID BUT THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS NOT INCURRED ON ACCOUNT THEREOF; BUT THE SAGES SAY, IT IS PIGGUL AND THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS INCURRED ON ACCOUNT THEREOF. THEY SAID TO HIM, HOW DOES THIS DIFFER FROM AN ANIMAL-OFFERING?[8] HE SAID TO THEM, WITH THE ANIMAL-OFFERING THE BLOOD, THE FLESH AND THE SACRIFICIAL PORTIONS ARE ALL ONE;[9] BUT THE FRANKINCENSE IS NOT OF THE MEAL-OFFERING.

GEMARA. Why does the Mishnah state, IN THIS CASE R. JOSE AGREES? — Because the Tanna wished to state the next clause: [IF HE INTENDED] TO BURN THE FRANKINCENSE THEREOF ON THE MORROW, R. JOSE SAYS, IT IS INVALID BUT THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS NOT INCURRED ON ACCOUNT THEREOF. Now you might have thought that the reason for R. Jose's opinion [in the last clause] was that a wrongful intention in respect of half the mattir does not render piggul[10] and that consequently [R. Jose] differs even in the first clause.

---

(1) I.e., from the preceding Mishnah that these two intentions cannot combine; v. supra 12a.

(2) For if two ‘eatings’ cannot combine, surely ‘eating’ and ‘burning’ cannot!

(3) Where the intention was to eat outside the Sanctuary a half-olive's bulk of the remainder and a half-olive's bulk of the handful.

(4) I.e., to eat a thing that it is not usual to eat, sc. the handful.

(5) In our Mishnah where the intention is to eat of the remainder outside and to burn of the handful outside, each action being the proper practice.

(6) V. Glos.

(7) Should one eat it.

(8) For if one slaughtered an animal-offering intending to burn the sacrificial portions on the morrow the offering is certainly piggul. The same surely should be the case with the meal-offering, for the frankincense corresponds to the sacrificial portions of the animal-offering.

(9) Explained in the Gemara.

(10) The mattir (Heb. מתיר lit., ‘that which renders permissible’) of the meal-offering is the handful and the frankincense, for only after the burning of those two upon the altar is the remainder of the meal-offering rendered permitted to be eaten. It is now suggested that the reason for R. Jose's view in the second clause of our Mishnah is that a wrongful intention expressed during a service in respect of the frankincense, which is only half the mattir, is of no consequence. According to this principle, R. Jose should also hold in the first clause of our Mishnah that the offering is not piggul, since the wrongful intention was only in respect of the burning of the handful which is also only half the mattir.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 13b

We are therefore taught [that there he agrees].[1]

[IF HE INTENDED] TO BURN THE FRANKINCENSE THEREOF ON THE MORROW, R. JOSE SAYS, IT IS INVALID BUT THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS NOT INCURRED. Resh Lakish said, R. Jose laid down the principle that a ‘mattir cannot render piggul the other mattir.[2] So, too, you may say of the two dishes of frankincense of the Shewbread, that one mattir cannot render piggul the other mattir.[3] What is the point of ‘So, too, you may say’?[4] — You might have supposed

that R. Jose's reason in the case of the frankincense [in our Mishnah] was that it was not of the same substance as the meal-offering,[5] but in the case of the two dishes of frankincense, since they each contain the same substance, you might have thought that one could render the other piggul; we are, therefore taught [that it is not so]. But how can you say that R. Jose's reason in the case of the frankincense is not 'that it is not of the same substance as the meal-offering'? Surely it is expressly so stated in the last clause: THEY SAID TO HIM, HOW DOES THIS DIFFER FROM AN ANIMAL-OFFERING? HE SAID TO THEM, WITH THE ANIMAL-OFFERING THE BLOOD, THE FLESH AND THE SACRIFICIAL PORTIONS ARE ALL ONE; BUT THE FRANKINCENSE IS NOT OF THE MEAL-OFFERING![6] — The expression 'IS NOT OF THE MEAL-OFFERING' means, it is not dependent upon the [handful of the] meal-offering: for it is not right to say. as the handful is indispensable to the remainder-for so long as the handful has not been burnt the remainder may not be eaten-so it is indispensable to the frankincense; but in fact if he wishes he may burn this first and if he wishes he may burn that first.[7] And what do the Rabbis [say to this]? — [They hold that] we apply the principle. 'a mattir cannot render piggul another mattir', only to such a case as where [the mattirs] are not ordained to be in one vessel,[8] but where they are ordained to be in one vessel[9] they are regarded as one [mattir].

R. Jannai said, If a non-priest gathered up the frankincense,[10] it is invalid. Why? — R. Jeremiah said, This touches upon the law of 'bringing nigh'.[11] He is of the opinion that 'bringing nigh' without even moving the feet is quite a proper act,[12] and [it is established that] if a non-priest brought it nigh, it is invalid.

R. Mari said, We have also learnt the same:[13] This is the general rule: If one took the handful or put it into the vessel or brought it nigh or burnt it [etc.]. Now it is clear that the taking of the handful corresponds to the slaughtering [of the animal-offering],[14] the bringing nigh [of the handful] to the bringing nigh [of the blood], the burning [of the handful] to the sprinkling [of the blood], but as to the putting [of the handful] into a vessel what [service] is he performing! Should you say that it corresponds to the receiving [of the blood], but surely there is no comparison between them, for there [the blood] comes in of itself [into the vessel], whereas here [the handful] is taken and put into the vessel. We must therefore say that, since it[15] can in no wise be omitted, it is an important service, and perforce is regarded as corresponding to the receiving [of the blood]; here, too, since it[16] can in no wise be omitted, it is an important service, and perforce is regarded as the 'bringing nigh'! — It is not so, for in fact it[15] corresponds to the receiving of the blood; and as for your objection 'There it comes in of itself, whereas here it is taken and put into the vessel', I reply that, seeing that in both cases the subject is hallowed in a vessel, there can be no difference, surely, whether it comes into the vessel of itself or it is taken and put into the vessel![17]

MISHNAH. IF HE SLAUGHTERED THE TWO LAMBS[18] [INTENDING] TO EAT ONE OF THE [TWO] LOAVES ON THE MORROW, OR IF HE BURNT THE TWO DISHES [OF THE FRANKINCENSE INTENDING] TO EAT ONE OF THE [TWO] ROWS OF THE SHEWBREAD[19] ON THE MORROW, R. JOSE SAYS, THAT LOAF OR THAT ROW ABOUT WHICH HE EXPRESSED THE INTENTION IS PIGGUL AND THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS INCURRED ON ACCOUNT OF THEM, WHILE THE OTHER IS INVALID BUT THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS NOT INCURRED. BUT THE SAGES SAY, BOTH ARE PIGGUL AND THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS INCURRED ON ACCOUNT OF THEM.

GEMARA. R. Huna said, R. Jose maintains that if one expressed an intention which makes piggul in connection with the right thigh, the left thigh is not thereby rendered piggul.[20] What is the reason? You may say it is based upon a logical argument, or you may say it is based upon a verse. 'You may say it is based upon a logical argument', for surely the wrongful intention is not stronger than actual uncleanness! And if one limb became unclean is the whole unclean?[21] 'Or you may say it is based upon a verse', for it is written, And the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity,[22] that is, of it[23]

but not of any other part.

R. Nahman raised an objection against R. Huna from the following: 'There is never the penalty of kareth incurred unless he expressed an intention which makes piggul with regard to an olive's bulk from both'.[24] Thus an olive's bulk from both, but not from one.[25] Now who is the author of this Baraitha? Should you say it is the Rabbis — but according to them even though [the intention was] in respect of one loaf only [both are piggul].[26] Obviously then it is R. Jose. Now if you say that they are regarded as one body [there],[27] then it is evident why they can be combined [here].[28]

---

(1) For R. Jose's reason is not as suggested above, but as given by Resh Lakish infra; v. next note.

(2) R. Jose holds that in every offering in which there are two mattirs, a wrongful intention expressed during the service of one mattir with regard to the other mattir is of no consequence; thus an intention expressed during the burning of the handful (the first mattir) to burn the frankincense (the second mattir) on the morrow, would not render the offering piggul.

(3) The two dishes of frankincense are the mattirs of the Shewbread, for only after the burning of both dishes are the twelve loaves of the Shewbread permitted to be eaten by the priests. Now if a wrongful Intention was expressed during the burning of the one dish in respect of the other dish (e.g., to burn the other dish on the morrow), it is of no consequence.

(4) It is surely an obvious application of R. Jose's principle!

(5) The mattirs of the meal-offering, the handful and the frankincense, are of different substances, and it might therefore be said that only in such a case does R. Jose hold that a mattir cannot render piggul the other mattir, but not where the mattirs are alike as in the case of the Shewbread.

(6) And the meaning presumably is this: the blood and the sacrificial portions of an animal-offering all come from the one animal; the frankincense, on the other hand, is a different substance and does not come from the meal-offering.

(7) This then is the position of R. Jose: a mattir does not render piggul another mattir; yet, says R. Jose, there is a distinction between an animal-offering and a meal-offering. In the case of an animal-offering the blood and the sacrificial portions are one, so that they are not regarded as separate mattirs; and therefore if a wrongful intention was expressed during the sprinkling of the blood with regard to the burning of the sacrificial portions, this would render the offering piggul. On the other hand, in the case of the meal-offering, the handful and the frankincense are two separate mattirs, for they ate of different substances, and are independent of each other, for either may be offered before the other; therefore the principle of a mattir not rendering piggul another mattir will apply.

(8) E.g.. the two lambs offered at the Feast of Weeks; cf. Lev. XXIII, 19. These lambs are also mattirs, for by their slaughtering the 'two loaves' (ibid. 17) are rendered permissible unto the priests. This example is inserted in the text in brackets, but is wanting in MS.M., and has been struck out by Sh. Mek.

(9) The handful and the frankincense of a meal-offering were both originally in the same vessel.

(10) After the burning of the handful the frankincense was picked from the flour and then burnt upon the altar. V. Sotah 14b.

(11) For when the non-priest hands over the frankincense to the officiating priest he has certainly reduced the distance of 'bringing nigh', which being an essential service must be performed by the priest only, whereas here it was partly performed by the non-priest.

(12) Lit., 'its name is bringing nigh'. Therefore even if the non-priest did not move his feet at all, but merely handed over the frankincense which he had gathered up to the priest, this action is sufficient to fulfil the requirements of the 'bringing nigh'; and therefore if performed by a non-priest it is invalid.

(13) V. supra 12a. R. Mari desires to prove from this Mishnah that the gathering up of the frankincense is a vital service.

(14) For as the slaughtering separates the blood (i.e. the altar's portion) from the flesh (i.e., the priests' portion), so the taking of the handful separates the handful (i.e., the altar's portion) from the remainder (i.e., the priests' portion).

(15) Sc. the putting of the handful into the vessel.

(16) I.e., the gathering up of the frankincense.

(17) Thus between these two services there is at least a point in common, but the gathering up of the frankincense is in no wise comparable with either of these services, and therefore is not regarded as a vital service.

(18) Offered as peace-offerings on the Feast of Weeks, accompanied by two loaves as firstfruits; v. Lev. XXIII, 17,19. Throughout the whole of this chapter the expression 'lamb' refers to this special peace-offering.

(19) V. ibid. XXIV, 5ff.
(20) I.e., if a person while slaughtering the sacrifice expressed the intention of eating the right thigh outside the time prescribed for it, that thigh only is piggul and whosoever eats of it incurs the penalty of kareth, but the rest of the flesh of the animal is not piggul. R. Huna arrived at this by taking R. Jose's view expressed in our Mishnah to an extreme length; viz., just as each loaf is a separate body or entity and the wrongful intention with regard to one loaf will not affect the other, so is each limb a separate body and the wrongful intention with regard to one limb will not affect the other.
(21) Certainly not! Of course the limb spoken of here had been detached from the animal.
(22) Lev. VII, 18.
(23) Which was the subject of a wrongful intention.
(24) I.e., if the wrongful intention was in respect of both loaves, even though only to the extent of a half-olive's bulk of each loaf, they are both piggul and the penalty of kareth is incurred by them that eat thereof.
(25) I.e., if the wrongful intention was in respect of an olive's bulk of one loaf only, the other loaf would not be piggul.
(26) V. our Mishnah.
(27) I.e.,that two limbs (as the right and left thigh) are not regarded as separate entities but as one 'body' derived from the one animal; so that if a wrongful intention was expressed with regard to one limb both would be piggul, contra R. Huna.
(28) For the two loaves are, by reason of the form of the intention expressed (not 'a half-olive's bulk from each loaf', but 'an olive's bulk from the two loaves'), also regarded as one entity. In our Mishnah, however, the two loaves are admittedly regarded as two separate entities, for they were in no wise combined in one, not even by the intention expressed.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 14a

But if you say that they are regarded as two bodies [there], why are they combined [here]?[1] The author of that [Baraitha] is Rabbi. For it was taught: If he slaughtered the lamb intending to eat a half-olive's bulk of the one loaf [on the morrow], and likewise [he slaughtered] the other lamb intending to eat a half-olive's bulk of the other loaf [on the morrow], Rabbi says, I maintain that this offering is valid. Now this is so only because he referred to two halves,[2] but had he referred to an olive's bulk of both [loaves] they would be combined.[3]

Whose ruling does Rabbi follow? If you say that of the Rabbis, but [according to them] even though the intention was in respect of one loaf only [both would be piggul]; and if you say that of R. Jose, then our original question confronts us again.[4] It must be that he follows the ruling of the Rabbis, but read not [in the above mentioned Baraitha] 'unless he expressed an intention which makes piggul with regard to an olive's bulk from both',[5] but rather 'unless he expressed an intention which makes piggul with regard to an olive's bulk in both',[6] even though the intention was only [in respect of an olive's bulk] of one [loaf]. He thus rejects the view of R. Meir who said, A wrongful intention expressed during the service of half the mattir renders the offering piggul; and he teaches us [that it is not so].

If so, why is this introduced by the expression 'It must be'?[7] If, of course, you would have said that the author of that Baraitha meant from both [loaves] and in both [lambs],[8] adopting thus the view of R. Jose and rejecting the views of R. Meir[9] and the Rabbis,[10] the expression 'It must be' would be quite in order. But if you merely say that he adopted the view of the Rabbis, rejecting only the view of R. Meir, why then the expression 'It must be'? Moreover R. Ashi had raised an objection [against R. Huna from the following]: Come and hear: Rabbi says in the name of R. Jose, If[11] [whilst performing a service outside][12] he expressed an intention which makes piggul in respect of another service which is performed outside, the offering is piggul, if in respect of another service which is performed inside, it is not piggul. Thus, if whilst standing outside he said, 'Behold I am slaughtering with the intention of sprinkling the blood thereof on the morrow', it is not piggul, for this is an intention expressed whilst serving outside in respect of a service performed inside. If whilst standing inside he said, 'Behold I am sprinkling the blood with the intention of burning the sacrificial portions

on the morrow', or, 'of pouring out the residue of the blood on the morrow', it is not piggul for this is an intention expressed whilst serving inside in respect of a service performed outside. If whilst standing outside he said, 'Behold I am slaughtering with the intention of pouring out the residue of the blood on the morrow', or 'of burning the sacrificial portions on the morrow', it is piggul; for this is an intention expressed whilst serving outside in respect of a service performed outside. Now [in the latter case] where the intention was of pouring out the residue of the blood, what is it that becomes piggul?[13] Should you say that it is the blood that becomes piggul,[14] but does the blood become piggul? Behold we have learnt:[15] For the following things the penalty of piggul is not incurred: viz., the handful, the frankincense, the incense-offering, the meal-offering of the priests, the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings, the meal-offering of the anointed [High] Priest, and the blood![16] Obviously then it is the flesh that becomes piggul. Now if in that case where no intention was expressed with regard to the flesh at all R. Jose holds that it nevertheless becomes piggul, how much more so in this case where he actually expressed an intention with regard to the [flesh of the] offering![17] Moreover Rabina had raised an objection [against R. Huna] from the following: Come and hear: if he took out the handful intending to eat the remainder or to burn the handful on the morrow, in this case R. Jose agrees that the offering is piggul and that the penalty of kareth is incurred on account thereof. Now where the intention was to burn the handful, what is it that becomes piggul? Should you say that it is the handful that becomes piggul, but does the handful become piggul? Behold we have learnt: For the following things the penalty of piggul is not incurred: viz., the handful, etc. Obviously then it is the remainder that becomes piggul. Now if in that case where no intention was expressed with regard to the remainder at all

---

(1) For if the two limbs which are derived from the one body are regarded as two entities so that the wrongful intention in respect of one will not affect the other, then the two loaves are a fortiori regarded as two entities and can by no means be combined in one merely by the form of intention expressed. Why then is it held that where the intention was in respect of an olive's bulk of the two loaves both are piggul?

(2) Lit., 'half', 'half'. I.e., the wrongful intention was expressed each time in respect of a half-olive's bulk only of the loaf, and therefore the two intentions cannot be combined to make the offering piggul.

(3) Thus identical with the view stated in the Baraitha quoted by R. Nahman.

(4) V. supra, beginning of 14a: 'But if you say... ', v. p. 83, n.9.

(5) I.e., from the two loaves. Heb. בשתיהן the fem. form referring to the loaves.

(6) I.e., in the course of the slaughtering of the two lambs. Heb. בשניהן the masc. form referring to the lambs. The wrongful intention which makes piggul must be expressed during the service of both lambs, which together form the mattir, i.e., that which renders the loaves permissible, and not during the slaughtering of one of the lambs which is only half the mattir. This clearly conflicts with R. Meir's view.

(7) Heb. לעולם, a dialectic term usually employed when a view is suggested rejecting all others.

(8) So that there must be an intention which makes piggul expressed during the slaughtering of both lambs and in respect of both loaves. This would be in accordance with R. Jose's view as stated in our Mishnah.

(9) Who maintains that a wrongful intention expressed during the slaughtering of one of the lambs, which is but half the mattir, renders piggul. This view is rejected by the statement in the Baraitha 'in both'.

(10) Who maintain that the wrongful intention expressed in respect of one loaf renders the other piggul too. This view is rejected by the expression 'from both'.

(11) This refers to the bullocks and the he-goats that were to be wholly burnt (Lev. IV, 1-12; 13-21; XVI, 3 and 5; Num. XV, 24). The procedure in these offerings (v. Zeb. V, 2) was as follows: the animals were slaughtered outside in the courtyard; the blood was sprinkled inside the Temple, i.e., on the veil and on the golden altar; the sacrificial portions, i.e., the entire beast, were burnt outside upon the outer altar; and the residue of the blood was poured out at the western base of the outer altar which stood in the Temple courtyard.

(12) In this passage the term 'outside' signifies outside the Temple building, i.e., in the Temple courtyard, and the term 'inside' within the Temple building.

(13) I.e., what portion of this offering must one eat in order to incur the penalty of kareth for eating piggul?

(14) So that if one were to eat the blood of this sacrifice in error one would be liable to bring two sin-offerings for the two counts of kareth, (a) for eating blood, and (b) for eating piggul.

(15) Zeb. 42b.
(16) I.e., if the offering was rendered piggul and one ate of the parts enumerated, the penalty of kareth is not incurred, for the law of piggul does not apply to that part of the offering which is the mattir, i.e., which renders other parts permissible. V. Zeb. 42b, 43a.
(17) Thus the piggul-intention expressed in connection with the right thigh will certainly render the left thigh also piggul-contra R. Huna. This sentence is found in the text in cur. edd., but it is wanting in MS.M. Sh. Mek. strikes it out as a gloss.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 14b

It nevertheless becomes piggul how much more so in this case where he actually expressed an intention with regard to the [flesh of the] offering! — Rather said R. Johanan, This is the reason for R. Jose's opinion:[1] Scripture regards [the two loaves] as one body and Scripture also regards them as two bodies. As one body-since one cannot be offered without the other; and as two bodies-since the Divine Law ordains that each [loaf] shall be prepared separately. Therefore if they were reckoned as one,[2] they are thereby united, since Scripture regards them as one body; if they were separated,[3] they remain thus separated, since Scripture regards them also as two bodies.

R. Johanan raised the following questions: What is the position if one expressed an intention which makes piggul in respect of the loaves of the thank-offering?[4] or in respect of the baked meal-offering?[5] — Thereupon R. Tahlifa the Palestinian recited to him the following teaching: You must say the same[6] of the loaves of the Thank-offering, and you must say the same of the baked meal-offering.

Our Rabbis taught: If during the slaughtering he intended to eat a half-olive's bulk [of the flesh after its prescribed time], and during the sprinkling [of the blood] he also intended to eat a half-olive's bulk [after its prescribed time], the offering is piggul, for the slaughtering and the sprinkling can be reckoned together as one.[7] Some explained that this applied only to the slaughtering and the sprinkling since they are both mattirin,[8] but not to the receiving and the bringing nigh; whilst others explained that this applied even to these services which are not consecutive,[9] and all the more to those services which are consecutive.[10]

This surely cannot be, for Levi has taught: The four services, viz., slaughtering, receiving, bringing nigh, and sprinkling cannot be reckoned together so as to render piggul! — Raba answered, There is no contradiction: the one[11] represents the view of Rabbi, the other the view of the Rabbis. For it was taught: If he slaughtered the lamb intending to eat a half-olive's bulk of the one loaf [on the morrow], and likewise [he slaughtered] the other lamb intending to eat a half-olive's bulk of the other loaf [on the morrow], Rabbi says, I maintain that this offering is valid. Said Abaye to him, perhaps Rabbi held that view only in the case of a [wrongful intention expressed during] half the mattir[12] in respect of half [the minimum quantity for] eating,[13] but he might not uphold that view in the case of [a wrongful intention expressed during] the whole mattir in respect of half [the minimum quantity for] eating?[14] Raba son of R. Hanan then said to Abaye, But if [as you say,] Rabbi holds that in the case of [a wrongful intention expressed during] the whole mattir in respect of half [the minimum quantity for] eating, [the offering is piggul], then he should declare the offering piggul even in the case of [a wrongful intention expressed during] half the mattir in respect of half [the minimum quantity for] eating, as a precautionary measure against the case of [a wrongful intention expressed during] the whole mattir in respect of half [the minimum quantity for] eating; for R. Jose adopts such a precautionary measure, and the Rabbis also adopt such a precautionary measure. 'R. Jose adopts such a precautionary measure', as we have learnt: [If he intended] to burn the frankincense thereof on the morrow, R. Jose says, it is invalid,[15] but the penalty of kareth is not incurred on account thereof; but the Rabbis say, it is piggul and the penalty of kareth is incurred on account thereof. 'And the Rabbis also adopt such a precautionary measure', as we have learnt: If he

expressed an intention which makes piggul during the [burning of the] handful and not during the [burning of the] frankincense, or during the [burning of the] frankincense and not during the [burning of the] handful, R. Meir says, It is piggul and the penalty of kareth is incurred; but the Rabbis say, The penalty of kareth is not incurred unless the intention which makes piggul was expressed during the service of the whole of the mattir.[16] — He replied, There is no comparison between the cases. I grant you that there R. Jose declares invalid the case [where the wrongful intention was in respect] of the handful of frankincense as a precautionary measure against the case [where the wrongful intention was in respect] of the handful of the meal-offering;[17] and also that the Rabbis declare invalid the case [where the wrongful intention was expressed during the burning] of the handful as a precautionary measure against the case [where the wrongful intention was expressed during the burning] of the handful of the sinner's meal-offering;[18] and that they declare invalid the case [where the wrongful intention was expressed during the burning] of the frankincense as a precautionary measure against the case [where the wrongful intention was expressed during the burning] of the frankincense of the dishes.[18] And in the case of the lambs too,[19] they declare invalid the case [where the wrongful intention was expressed during the slaughtering] of one lamb as a precautionary measure against the case [where the wrongful intention was expressed during the slaughtering] of the other lamb too;[19] and they declare invalid the case [where the wrongful intention was expressed during the burning] of one dish of frankincense as a precautionary measure against the case [where the wrongful intention was expressed during the burning] of the other dish too.[20] In our case, however, is there ever a case of [a wrongful intention expressed during the service of] half a mattir in respect of half [the minimum quantity for] eating [that renders piggul], so that we should take here precautionary measures?[21] Indeed it stands to reason that this[22] is the explanation of the view of the Rabbis, for in the next clause [of that Mishnah][19] it states: The Rabbis, however, agree with R. Meir that if it was a sinner's meal-offering or a meal-offering of jealousy, and he expressed an intention which makes piggul during the burning of the handful, the offering is piggul and the penalty of kareth is incurred on account thereof, since the handful [alone] is the [entire] mattir. Now why was it necessary for this [last expression] to be stated? It is quite obvious, for is there then [in these cases] any other mattir? We must therefore say that it teaches us this: namely, the reason [why the Rabbis declare the offering invalid in the case where a wrongful intention was expressed during the burning] of the handful [of the 'ordinary meal-offering] is that there is the handful of the sinner's meal-offering which is similar to it [and which is a real case of piggul].

MISHNAH. IF ONE OF THE [TWO] LOAVES[23] OR ONE OF THE [TWO] ROWS [OF THE SHEWBREAD] BECAME UNCLEAN, R. JUDAH SAYS, BOTH MUST BE TAKEN OUT TO THE PLACE OF BURNING, FOR THE OFFERING OF THE CONGREGATION MAY NOT BE DIVIDED.[24] BUT THE SAGES SAY, THE UNCLEAN [IS TREATED] AS UNCLEAN, BUT THE CLEAN MAY BE EATEN.

GEMARA. R. Eleazar said, They differ only [in the case where one loaf became unclean] before the sprinkling of the blood,[25] but [where it became unclean] after the sprinkling, all agree that the unclean one is treated as unclean and the clean one may be eaten. And [in the case where one became unclean] before the sprinkling, on what principle do they differ? — R. Papa said, They differ as to whether the [High Priest's] plate renders [the offering] acceptable [where] the eatable portions [had become unclean].[26] [

---

(1) R. Huna's view is untenable, for it is accepted by all that a wrongful intention in respect of one limb certainly affects the other; nevertheless the case of the two loaves dealt with by R. Jose in our Mishnah is a special one, as R. Johanan proceeds to show.

(2) In the case where there was expressed an intention to eat one olive's bulk of the two loaves. This intention certainly reckoned the two loaves as one 'body' or entity, and therefore both are piggul, as stated in the Baraitha quoted supra p. 83 by R. Nahman.

(3) In the case where the expressed intention referred to one loaf only. The other loaf is not affected by this intention, as

stated in the Mishnah.

(4) The thank-offering consisted of an animal-sacrifice and an offering of forty cakes, ten cakes of each of the four different kinds prescribed, v. Lev. VII, 12, 13. Now if during one of the services in connection with the animal-offering a wrongful intention was expressed with regard to the eating of the cakes of one kind, the question is: would R. Jose in this case also differ with the Rabbis and maintain that the other kinds of cakes are in no wise affected, or would he agree with them, seeing that all the kinds are rendered permissible by the offering of one sacrifice?

(5) The baked meal-offering consisted of either ten unleavened cakes or ten unleavened wafers (v. ibid II, 4), whilst according to R. Simeon it may consist of five cakes and five wafers; v. infra 63a. The question arises here according to R. Simeon's view: If a wrongful intention was expressed in respect of the cakes only or in respect of the wafers only, would R. Jose agree with the Rabbis that the other kind is also affected, seeing that only one handful was taken from this meal-offering on behalf of both kinds, or not?

(6) R. Jose in this case too differs with the Rabbis.

(7) It is regarded as though during one service an intention was expressed in respect of one whole olive's bulk.

(8) These services are alike in that each renders some part of the offering permissible: the slaughtering renders the blood permissible for sprinkling, and the sprinkling renders the flesh permissible to be eaten.

(9) Lit., 'which are far apart from each other'.

(10) The order of the services is: slaughtering, receiving, bringing nigh, and sprinkling. Now if the first and the last services are reckoned together as one, how much more can those services which are consecutive be reckoned together!

(11) The Baraitha taught by Levi that services cannot be reckoned together.

(12) I.e., during the slaughtering of one of the two lambs which is only half of the mattir, for it is only the slaughtering of the two lambs which renders the two loaves permissible to be eaten.

(13) Sc. a half-olive's bulk.

(14) Indeed Rabbi would also agree that if an intention which makes piggul was expressed during the slaughtering of an ordinary offering (which is a whole mattir, v. supra n. 2) in respect of a half-olive's bulk of the flesh, and a similar intention was expressed during the sprinkling of the blood (which is also a whole mattir, ibid.), these intentions would be reckoned together to make the offering piggul.

(15) Strictly the offering should be valid for there is no piggul here; R. Jose, however, declares it invalid only as a precautionary measure, since this case is similar to a real case of piggul, namely, where the intention was to burn the handful of the meal-offering on the morrow.

(16) The offering, however, is invalid, as a precautionary measure against a real case of piggul where the burning of the handful of the meal-offering alone constitutes the whole mattir (as in the case of the sinner's meal-offering), or where the burning of the frankincense alone constitutes the whole mattir (as in the case of the frankincense of the Shewbread); v. infra 16a.

(17) Which is undoubtedly a real case of piggul; v. p. 89. n. 1.

(18) Which is a real case of piggul; v. supra p. 89, n. 2.

(19) infra 16a, Mishnah.

(20) Which is admittedly a real case of piggul.

(21) There is no such case, hence there is no ground for a precautionary measure.

(22) I.e., that in every case where the offering is declared to be invalid it is only as a precautionary measure against a case of absolute piggul which is similar to it.

(23) The two loaves offered with the two lambs on the Feast of Weeks; cf. Lev. XXIII, 19, 20.

(24) And if a part of the offering was rendered unfit for eating, as here on account of uncleanness, the whole may not be eaten.

(25) Or, in the case of the Shewbread-offering, before the burning of the dishes of the frankincense which corresponds to the sprinkling of the blood in an animal-offering.

(26) The High Priest's plate worn on the forehead had a propitiatory effect (v. Ex. XXVIII, 36-38), and if a part of the sacrifice became unclean the offering was nevertheless acceptable, and the sprinkling of the blood was deemed to he a valid sprinkling. The Rabbis and R. Judah differ as to what portions of the sacrifice are comprehended within the propitiating effect of the plate, whether it includes even those portions usually eaten by the priests (Heb. אכילות), or only those portions offered upon the altar (Heb. עולין), as the blood and the fat, and the frankincense.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 15a

The Rabbis are of the opinion that the plate renders [the offering] acceptable [even though] the eatable portions [had become unclean];[1] but R. Judah is of the opinion that the plate does not render [the offering] acceptable [where] the eatable portions [had become unclean].[2] Thereupon R. Huna the son of R. Nathan said to R. Papa, Behold the plate certainly renders [the offering] acceptable [where] the sacrificial portions [had become unclean], and yet they differ! For it has been taught: If one of the dishes of frankincense became unclean, R. Judah says, Both are offered in conditions of uncleanness, for an offering of the congregation may not be divided.[3] But the Rabbis say, The unclean is offered in conditions of uncleanness and the clean in cleanness. Moreover R. Ashi had raised an objection thus: Come and hear: R. Judah says, Even though one tribe only was unclean and all the other tribes were clean, [all the Passover-offerings] shall be offered in conditions of uncleanness, for the offering of the congregation may not be divided.[4] Now in this case, how does the principle of the plate rendering the offering acceptable apply?[5] Furthermore Rabina had raised an objection thus: Come and hear: IF ONE OF THE [TWO] ROWS [OF THE SHEWBREAD] BECAME UNCLEAN, R. JUDAH SAYS, BOTH MUST BE TAKEN OUT TO THE PLACE OF BURNING, FOR THE OFFERING OF THE CONGREGATION MAY NOT BE DIVIDED. BUT THE SAGES SAY, THE UNCLEAN [IS TREATED] AS UNCLEAN, BUT THE CLEAN ONE MAY BE EATEN. Now if that were so,[6] then it should have stated: 'for the plate does not render [the offering] acceptable [where] the eatable portions [had become unclean]'. — R. Johanan therefore said, It is an accepted teaching in the mouth of R. Judah that the offering of the congregation may not be divided.[7]

MISHNAH. THE THANK-OFFERING[8] CAN RENDER THE BREAD PIGGUL BUT THE BREAD CANNOT RENDER THE THANK-OFFERING PIGGUL. THUS, IF HE SLAUGHTERED THE THANK-OFFERING INTENDING TO EAT A PART THEREOF ON THE MORROW, BOTH IT AND THE BREAD ARE PIGGUL; IF HE INTENDED TO EAT OF THE BREAD ON THE MORROW, THE BREAD IS PIGGUL BUT THE THANK-OFFERING IS NOT PIGGUL.

THE LAMBS[9] CAN RENDER THE BREAD PIGGUL BUT THE BREAD CANNOT RENDER THE LAMBS PIGGUL. THUS, IF HE SLAUGHTERED THE LAMBS INTENDING TO EAT A PART THEREOF ON THE MORROW, BOTH THEY AND THE BREAD ARE PIGGUL IF HE INTENDED TO EAT OF THE BREAD ON THE MORROW, THE BREAD IS PIGGUL BUT THE LAMBS ARE NOT.

GEMARA. Why is it?[10] Should you say it is because of R. Kahana's teaching, who said, Whence do we know that the cakes of the thank-offering are called 'the thank-offering'? From the verse, He shall offer for the sacrifice of the thank-offering unleavened cakes.[11] Then the reverse should also be true.[12] This, however, is no difficulty, for the bread is referred to as 'the thank-offering', whereas the thank-offering is nowhere referred to as 'the bread'. But when [the Mishnah] states: THE LAMBS CAN RENDER THE BREAD PIGGUL BUT THE BREAD CANNOT RENDER THE LAMBS PIGGUL, the question will be asked, Where do we find the bread ever referred to as 'the lambs'? — It must be that this is the reason [for our Mishnah]: the bread is appurtenant to the thank-offering[13] but the thank-offering is not appurtenant to the bread; the bread is appurtenant to the lambs but the lambs are not appurtenant to the bread. Now both cases had to be stated [in our Mishnah]. For had it stated only the case of the thank-offering, I would have thought that only in that case is it held that an intention which makes piggul expressed in respect of the bread does not render the thank-offering piggul since they[14] are not dependent upon each other for the rite of waving,[15] but in the case of the lambs, since they[14] are dependent upon each other with regard to the rite of waving,[15] I would say that an intention which makes piggul expressed in respect of the bread would render the lambs piggul too.[16] Therefore [both cases] had to be stated.

R. Eleazar put this question to Rab: What is the law if he slaughtered the thank-offering intending to eat an olive's bulk of it and of its bread on the morrow?[17] Of course, as to whether the thank-offering becomes piggul thereby, I have no doubt at all [that it does not], for if where the intention was in respect of a whole olive's bulk of the bread the thank-offering does not become piggul, can there be any question where [the intention was in respect of an olive's bulk made up] of it and of the loaves? My question is as to whether the bread becomes piggul or not. Is the thank-offering to be reckoned with [the bread] so as to render the bread piggul or not? — He answered, In this case too, the bread is piggul but the thank-offering is not piggul. But why is this so? Surely one can apply here an a fortiori argument thus, if what helps to make the other piggul does not itself become piggul,[18] then surely what cannot even help to make the other piggul[19] does not itself become piggul! And do we apply an a fortiori argument of such a kind? Behold, it has been taught: It once happened that a man

---

(1) Of course, there is no question at all that the unclean portions are forbidden to be eaten; for there is an express prohibition against it (Lev. VII, 19). They hold, however, that where one loaf became unclean the offering is acceptable, and the sprinkling is a valid sprinkling; consequently the other loaf is permitted to be eaten.

(2) And as the sprinkling is not valid, even the clean loaf may not be eaten. R. Papa apparently ignores the reason stated by R. Judah in our Mishnah, FOR THE OFFERING OF THE CONGREGATION MAY NOT BE DIVIDED, and submits quite a new argument for R. Judah's view.

(3) It is established law (Pes. 80a) that an offering of the congregation may be offered in conditions of uncleanness. And as the unclean dish of frankincense is offered in conditions of uncleanness, the other dish may be made unclean and offered together with the first. It is thus manifest that the reason for R. Judah's view is as stated here and also in our Mishnah, namely that the offering of the congregation may not be divided, and it has nothing whatever to do with the effectiveness of the plate, for we see that he put forward this reason in our Mishnah where it was suggested that R. Judah held that the plate does not render the offering acceptable where the eatable portions had become unclean, and he also gives this reason in the Baraitha quoted where he admits that the plate renders the offering acceptable where the sacrificial portions had become unclean.

(4) Where all the members of one tribe of Israel became unclean on the fourteenth day of Nisan, the day for the offering of the Passover-lamb, they are permitted, according to R. Judah, to offer the Passover-lamb in conditions of uncleanness; and since the offering of the congregation may not be divided, all the Passover-lambs are to be offered in conditions of uncleanness.

(5) There can be no question here of the plate rendering the offering acceptable for the plate exercises a propitiatory effect only where part of the offering became unclean but not where the person officiating became unclean. Again it is clear from this that the reason stated, ‘For the offering of the congregation may not be divided’, has nothing whatever to do with the propitiating effect or otherwise of the plate.

(6) That the reason for R. Judah's view is that the plate does not render the offering acceptable where the eatable portions had become unclean.

(7) In truth it has no relation to the propitiatory effect of the plate.

(8) The thank-offering consisted of an animal-offering and a bread-offering of forty cakes, ten cakes of each of the four different kinds specified; v. Lev. VII, 12, 13. The entire thank-offering had to be consumed on the same day of offering until midnight.

(9) Of the special peace-offering offered on the Feast of Weeks and accompanied by a bread-offering of two loaves as firstfruits, v. Lev. XXIII, 17-19. This peace-offering and the loaves had to be eaten on the same day of offering.

(10) That a wrongful intention which makes piggul expressed during the service of the thank-offering renders the bread piggul too.

(11) Ibid. VII, 12.

(12) I.e., a wrongful intention expressed in respect of the bread should also render the thank-offering piggul. Yet this is not the case.

(13) The slaughtering of the thank-offering renders the bread consecrated; so too does the slaughtering of the lambs at the Feast of Weeks.

(14) Sc. the animal-offering and the bread-offering.

(15) In the thank-offering the breast was waved before the Lord (Lev. VII, 30) but not in conjunction with the

bread-offering; on the Feast of Weeks, however, the lambs were waved together with the loaves (ibid. XXIII, 20).
(16) And, on the other hand, had the Mishnah only stated the case of the lambs, I should have thought that only there is it held that an intention which makes piggul expressed in respect of the lambs renders the bread piggul too, since they are dependent upon each other for the rite of waving; but since this is not the case with the thank-offering and its bread I would say that an intention which makes piggul expressed in respect of the thank-offering does not render the bread piggul.
(17) I.e., the olive's bulk that he proposes to eat on the morrow is made up of a half-olive's bulk of the flesh of the offering and a half-olive's bulk of the bread.
(18) The half-olive's bulk of the thank-offering helps by combining with the half-olive's bulk of the bread to render the other, sc. the bread piggul, although the thank-offering does not itself become piggul thereby.
(19) Lit., 'which came to render piggul but did not actually make piggul'. The half-olive's bulk of the bread does not combine with the half-olive's bulk of the thank-offering to render the other (sc. the thank-offering) piggul.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 15b

sowed [with his own seeds] his neighbour's vineyard which was in the budding stage;[1] the case came before the Rabbis and they pronounced the seeds forbidden and the vines permissible. But why? Surely one could apply there [this kind of] a fortiori argument thus, If what makes the other forbidden[2] does not itself become forbidden, what may have made the other forbidden but did not do so[3] surely does not itself become forbidden![4] — There can be no comparison. There [with regard to diverse kinds] the Torah has forbidden[5] hemp and arum,[6] but other seeds are forbidden only Rabbinically; therefore he who transgressed the law was penalized by the Rabbis, and he who did not transgress the law was not penalized by the Rabbis.[7] In our case, however, one must certainly apply the a fortiori argument.[8]

Others refer the above argument to the case of the lambs thus: R. Eleazar put this question to Rab: What is the law if he slaughtered the lambs intending to eat an olive's bulk of them and of the bread [on the morrow]? Of course, as to whether the lambs become piggul thereby, I have no doubt at all [that they do not] for if where the intention was in respect of a whole olive's bulk of the bread the lambs do not become piggul, can there be any question where [the intention was in respect of an olive's bulk made up] of them and of the bread? My question is as to whether the bread becomes piggul or not. Are the lambs to be reckoned with [the bread] so as to render the bread piggul or not?-He answered, In this case too, the bread is piggul but the lambs are not. But why is this so? Surely one can apply here an a fortiori argument thus, If what helps to make the other piggul does not itself become piggul, then surely what cannot even help to make the other piggul does not itself become piggul! And do we apply an a fortiori argument of such a kind? Behold, it has been taught: It once happened that a man sowed [with his own seeds] his neighbour's vineyard which was in the budding stage, etc. But why? Surely one could apply there [this kind of] a fortiori argument thus, If what makes the other forbidden does not itself become forbidden, what might have made the other forbidden, but did not do so, does not itself become forbidden! — There can be no comparison. There [with regard to diverse kinds] the Torah has forbidden hemp and arum, but other seeds are forbidden only Rabbinically; therefore he who transgressed the law was penalized by the Rabbis, and he who did not transgress the law was not penalized by the Rabbis. In our case, however, one must certainly apply the a fortiori argument.

Now those who refer it[9] to the case of the thank-offering refer it all the more to the case of the lambs; but those who refer it to the case of the lambs maintain that it applies only to the case of the lambs since they[10] are dependent upon each other with regard to the rite of waving, but not to the case of the thank-offering since they are not dependent upon each other with regard to the rite of waving.

R. Abba the Younger stated the question thus, R. Eleazar enquired of Rab: What is the law if he

slaughtered the lamb intending to eat an olive's bulk of the other on the morrow? Does 'the other' mean the [other] lamb, in which case there is no piggul at all;[11] or does it mean the bread, in which case [the bread becomes] piggul? — He answered, You have learnt it: If he slaughtered one of the lambs intending to eat a part of it on the morrow, that [lamb] is piggul and the other [lamb] is valid; if he intended to eat of the other [lamb] on the morrow, both are valid.[12] Hence it is clear that 'the other' means the other lamb. Perhaps [however in that Mishnah] he expressly said 'the other lamb'.

MISHNAH. THE ANIMAL-OFFERING CAN RENDER THE DRINK-OFFERINGS PIGGUL[13] AFTER THEY HAVE BEEN HALLOWED IN THE VESSEL. SO R. MEIR. BUT THE DRINK-OFFERINGS CANNOT RENDER THE ANIMAL-OFFERING PIGGUL. THUS, IF HE SLAUGHTERED AN ANIMAL-OFFERING INTENDING TO EAT THEREOF ON THE MORROW, BOTH IT AND THE DRINK-OFFERINGS ARE PIGGUL; IF HE INTENDED TO OFFER THE DRINK-OFFERINGS ON THE MORROW, THE DRINK-OFFERINGS ARE PIGGUL BUT THE ANIMAL-OFFERING IS NOT.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: For the drink-offerings of an animal-sacrifice the penalty of piggul is incurred, since the blood of the animal-offering renders them permissible to be offered [upon the altar].[14] So R. Meir. They said to R. Meir, Is it not the fact that a man may bring his animal-offering to-day and the drink-offerings thereof in ten days' time?[15] He replied, I also only spoke of the case where they were brought together with the animal-offering. But[16] surely they may be transferred to another animal-offering![17] — Raba said, R. Meir is of the opinion that with the slaughtering they became appropriated [to this offering] like the cakes of the thank-offering.[18]

Our Rabbis taught: For the leper's log of oil[19] the penalty of piggul is incurred, since the blood of the guilt-offering renders it permissible to be applied to the thumb and the great toe.[20] So R. Meir. They said to R. Meir, Is it not the fact that a man may bring his guilt-offering to-day and the log of oil in ten days' time? He replied, I also only spoke of the case where it was brought together with the guilt-offering. But surely it may be transferred to another [leper's] guilt-offering! — Raba said, R. Meir is of the opinion that with the slaughtering it became appropriated [to this guilt-offering] like the cakes of the thank-offering.

---

(1) The sowing of seeds in a vineyard is expressly prohibited, cf. Deut. XXII, 9.

(2) Sc. the vines, on account of which the seeds are declared forbidden.

(3) Sc. the seeds, on account of which the vines would have been forbidden were it not for the reason stated infra in the Gemara.

(4) Nevertheless the seeds are forbidden and such an a fortiori argument is not applied.

(5) Of course in addition to the five kinds of grain (R. Nissim, Hul. X). V. however Sh. Mek. note 2.

(6) Of all seeds only these kinds are forbidden to be sown in a vineyard, for they ripen only after three years, and their seed does not perish in the ground but they leave roots behind them; moreover they grow in clusters like grapes. In the cur. edd. there is here quoted the Mishnah Kil. I, 5; but it is omitted in all MSS.

(7) So that in the above case where a man sowed seed in his neighbour's vineyard the prohibition involved was only a Rabbinic one, and the Rabbis penalized only him who transgressed their enactment but not the owner of the vineyard. Thus there is no place for the a fortiori argument, for even the seeds are not forbidden strictly but only as a penalty.

(8) Concerning piggul, v. supra p. 95 at end.

(9) Sc. Rab's answer to the question, namely that the offering combines with the bread to render the latter piggul.

(10) Sc. the bread and the offering. V. supra P. 95, n. 2.

(11) For, since the slaughtering of both lambs is the mattir, i.e., that which renders the loaves permissible, a wrongful intention expressed during the slaughtering of one lamb, which is only part of the mattir, in respect of the other part of the mattir, i.e., the other lamb, does not make piggul.

(12) Infra 16a.

(13) And whosoever partakes of the drink-offerings incurs the penalty of kareth on the ground of piggul. The drink-offerings consisted of prescribed quantities of flour and oil for the meal-offering and of wine for the libation; they

accompanied most sacrifices (cf. Num. XV, 4-10).

(14) And it is established law: Whatsoever is rendered permissible (דבר שיש לו מתירין), whether for man or for the altar, by a certain rite is subject to the law of piggul. V. Zeb. 43a; Yoma 60a.

(15) Hence it is evident that the drink-offerings are not part of the offering and are not affected by any intention concerning them expressed during the slaughtering of the offering.

(16) In cur. edd. 'They said to him'. This is not found in the MSS. and is deleted by Sh. Mek.

(17) Consequently they cannot be rendered piggul through any intention expressed during the slaughtering of the animal-offering, since they are not specifically bound to that offering.

(18) And they may not be transferred to be used for another offering.

(19) Cf. Lev. XIV, 10ff. If therefore while slaughtering the leper's guilt-offering he intended to deal with the oil on the morrow, the latter becomes piggul, and whosoever partakes of it incurs the penalty of kareth.

(20) I.e., the oil may be applied only after the rites in connection with the blood of the guilt-offering have been performed. It is thus דבר שיש לו מתירין; v. supra p. 98,n. 4.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 16a

MISHNAH. IF HE EXPRESSED AN INTENTION WHICH MAKES PIGGUL [IN RESPECT OF THE REMAINDER] DURING THE [BURNING OF THE] HANDFUL AND NOT DURING THE [BURNING OF THE] FRANKINCENSE, OR DURING THE [BURNING OF THE] FRANKINCENSE AND NOT DURING THE [BURNING OF THE] INCENSE, R. MEIR SAYS, IT IS PIGGUL AND THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS INCURRED ON ACCOUNT THEREOF; BUT THE SAGES SAY, THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS NOT INCURRED UNLESS HE EXPRESSED THE INTENTION WHICH MAKES PIGGUL DURING THE SERVICE OF THE WHOLE OF THE MATTIR.[1] THE SAGES, HOWEVER, AGREE WITH R. MEIR THAT, IF IT WAS A SINNERS MEAL-OFFERING[2] OR A MEAL-OFFERING OF JEALOUSY,[2] AND HE EXPRESSED AN INTENTION WHICH MAKES PIGGUL DURING THE [BURNING OF THE] HANDFUL, IT IS PIGGUL AND THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS INCURRED ON ACCOUNT THEREOF, SINCE THE HANDFUL IS THE ENTIRE MATTIR. IF HE SLAUGHTERED ONE OF THE LAMBS[3] INTENDING TO EAT THE TWO LOAVES ON THE MORROW, OR IF HE BURNT ONE OF THE DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE[4] INTENDING TO EAT THE TWO ROWS [OF THE SHEWBREAD] ON THE MORROW, R. MEIR SAYS, IT IS PIGGUL AND THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS INCURRED ON ACCOUNT THEREOF; BUT THE SAGES SAY, THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS NOT INCURRED UNLESS HE EXPRESSED THE INTENTION WHICH MAKES PIGGUL DURING THE SERVICE OF THE WHOLE OF THE MATTIR. IF HE SLAUGHTERED ONE OF THE LAMBS INTENDING TO EAT A PART OF IT ON THE MORROW, THAT [LAMB] IS PIGGUL BUT THE OTHER [LAMB] IS VALID; IF HE INTENDED TO EAT OF THE OTHER [LAMB] ON THE MORROW, BOTH ARE VALID.

GEMARA. Rab said, The dispute[5] is only where he offered[6] the handful in silence and then the frankincense with the expressed intention, but where he offered the handful with the expressed intention and then the frankincense in silence, all agree that it is piggul, for everything that a man does [in silence] he does in accordance with his first resolve.[7] But Samuel said, There is still a dispute in that case too.[8]

Raba was once sitting and reciting this statement [of Rab], when R. Aha b. R. Huna raised against Raba the following objection: This[9] applies only to the service of taking the handful, or of putting it in the vessel or of bringing it nigh;[10] but if he had already reached the service of burning, and he offered the handful in silence and then the frankincense with the expressed intention, or if he offered the handful with the expressed intention and then the frankincense in silence, R. Meir says, It is piggul and the penalty of kareth is incurred on account thereof. The Sages say, The penalty of kareth is not incurred unless he expressed an intention which makes piggul during the service of the whole of the mattir. Now here is stated the clause: 'Or if he offered the handful with the expressed intention

and then the frankincense in silence', and yet they differ![11] — Render: [Or if he offered the handful with the expressed intention] having already offered the frankincense in silence. But there are two objections to this: in the first place, it is identical with the first clause;[12] and secondly, it has been taught [in another Baraitha]: 'And then'![13] — R. Hanina explained that here there were two minds.[14]

Come and hear: This[15] applies only to offerings whose blood must be sprinkled upon the outer altar;[16] but in the case of offerings whose blood must be sprinkled upon the inner altar, as for example the forty-three sprinklings on the Day of Atonement,[17] or the eleven sprinklings of the bullock of the anointed High Priest,[18] or the eleven sprinklings of the bullock offered for the error of the community,[18] if [the priest] expressed an intention which makes piggul either during the first [sprinklings] or the second or the third,[19] R. Meir says, It is piggul and the penalty of kareth is incurred on account thereof. But the Sages say, The penalty of kareth is not incurred unless he expressed the intention which makes piggul during the service of the whole mattir.[20] Now here it states: 'If he expressed an intention which makes piggul either during the first [sprinklings] or the second or the third', and yet they differ![21] Should you, however, reply that there too there were two minds,[22] I grant you that this is satisfactory according to him who holds that the expression 'with a bullock'[23] means also 'with the blood of the bullock';[24] but what can be said according to him who holds that the expression 'with a bullock' excludes the blood of the bullock?[25] — Raba said, We must suppose here that he[26] expressed an intention which makes piggul during the first sprinklings, was silent during the second, and again expressed an intention which makes piggul during the third; in which case we say, If you accept the principle that whatsoever a man does [in silence] he does according to his first resolve, why then did he express again an intention which makes piggul during the third [sprinklings]? R. Ashi demurred, saying, Does [the Baraitha] actually state 'he was silent'? — Rather, said R. Ashi, We must suppose here that he expressed an intention which makes piggul during the first [sprinklings] and also during the second;[27] in which case we say, If you accept the principle that whatsoever a man does [in silence] he does according to his first resolve, why then did he again express an intention which makes piggul during the second [sprinklings]?[27]

---

(1) V. supra p. 89, n. 2.

(2) Which is offered without frankincense; cf. Lev. V, 11 and Num. V, 15.

(3) Which is but half the mattir; for two lambs were offered as peace-offerings on the Feast of Weeks, along with a bread-offering of two loaves; v. Lev. XXIII, 17ff.

(4) Also half the mattir; for two dishes of frankincense were offered with the Shewbread. V. ibid. XXIV, 7.

(5) Between R. Meir and the Sages in our Mishnah.

(6) Lit., 'put it in' sc. the vessel, in readiness for the burning upon the altar. It must be remembered that the handful of flour was first burnt upon the altar and then the frankincense.

(7) And as his first resolve expressed during the offering of the handful was an intention of piggul-namely, of eating the remainder on the morrow — it is to be assumed that such was also his intention-though unexpressed during the offering of the frankincense.

(8) MS.M. adds: And so also said R. Johanan, There is still a dispute in that case too.

(9) The ruling that a wrongful intention expressed whilst dealing with the handful alone renders piggul.

(10) For each of these services is performed once only and that in connection with the handful, hence at each of these services the intention is in respect of the whole mattir; whereas the burning is performed twice, viz., the burning of the handful of flour and of the frankincense.

(11) Thus contrary to Rab's view.

(12) Where the first service was performed in silence, for it is immaterial whether that first service was the burning of the handful or of the frankincense.

(13) Although in the Baraitha cited by R. Aha the expression 'and' may be explained as meaning 'having already', this cannot be so in the other Baraitha which expressly states 'and then'.

(14) I.e., two Priests had performed the rites of the meal-offering, one burnt the handful of flour with an intention of piggul and the other burnt the frankincense in silence. In such a case the principle, 'Whatever a man does in silence he does in accordance with his first resolve', cannot apply; for this can only be said of one person but not of two.

(15) The law that a wrongful intention expressed during one single sprinkling of the blood renders the offering piggul.
(16) For since with these offerings one single sprinkling would effect atonement (v. Zeb. 36b) that sprinkling is accounted as the whole mattir and can therefore render piggul.
(17) Made up as follows: eight sprinklings (one above and seven below) between the staves of the ark, of the blood of the bullock, and likewise eight of the blood of the he-goat; these same sprinklings repeated in the Sanctuary upon the veil; four sprinklings of the blood of the bullock and of the he-goat when mixed together, i.e., one upon each of the four corners of the golden altar, and seven upon the cleansed surface (i.e. the top) of the golden altar. V. Yoma Ch. V.
(18) These are: the seven sprinklings of the blood towards the veil, and the four sprinklings, one upon each of the four corners of the altar. Cf. Lev. IV, 6,7 and 17, 18.
(19) The first, second and third sprinklings refer to the sprinklings of the blood in the Holy of Holies between the staves of the ark, towards the veil, and upon the altar respectively.
(20) I.e., during all the three sprinklings.
(21) The Sages holding that where the intention which makes piggul was expressed during the first sprinklings only, the others being performed in silence, the offering is not piggul. Apparently the principle, Whatsoever a man does in silence he does according to his first resolve, is not adopted; contra Rab.
(22) I.e., the sprinklings were performed by two High Priests, the High Priest who performed the first sprinklings having died immediately thereafter or The Master stated: 'R. Meir says, It is piggul and the penalty having become unclean; in which case the sprinklings in silence by the second High Priest can have no reference to or bearing upon the resolve of the former High Priest.
(23) Lev. XVI, 3.
(24) If the High Priest, after having slaughtered the bullock, could not continue to serve, his successor continued the service, and was not required to begin all the services anew and slaughter another bullock for himself; for the verse, Herewith shall Aaron (sc. the High Priest) come into the holy place; with a bullock (ibid.) does not imply that the High Priest shall begin his service with a living bullock, but he may even take the blood of the bullock which was slaughtered by his predecessor. V. Yoma 49b.
(25) According to him the service can never be performed by two High Priests, for the successor must begin anew.
(26) The High Priest.
(27) 'And also during the third' — so in cur. edd. but wanting in all MSS. and struck out by Sh. Mek. The case is clearly one where the High Priest was silent during the third sprinklings; so that only a part and not the whole of the mattir was performed with an intention which makes piggul.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 16b

But does not the Baraitha state: Either. . .or?[1] — This is a difficulty. of kareth is incurred on account thereof'. Consider: the penalty of kareth is incurred only after all the mattirin[2] have been offered, for a Master has stated:[3] The expression 'accepted'[4] suggests, as the acceptance of a valid offering so is the acceptance[5] of an invalid offering; that is to say, as the acceptance of a valid offering is effected only after all the mattirin have been offered, so the acceptance of an invalid offering is effected only after all the mattirin have been offered. Now in this case since he expressed a wrongful intention [when sprinkling] within,[6] he has thereby rendered it invalid, consequently when he later sprinkles in the Sanctuary it is as though he were sprinkling water![7] — Rabbah said, It can happen where four bullocks and four he-goats were used.[8] Raba said, You may even hold that there was only one bullock and one he-goat, but [the sprinklings] are acceptable in regard to the law of piggul.[9]

'Forty-three [sprinklings]'. But we have been taught: Forty-seven! — This is no difficulty; one [Baraitha] accepts the view that for the sprinklings upon the horns of the altar they mix together [the blood of the bullock and the blood of the he-goat], whereas the other accepts the view that they do not mix them.[10] But we have been taught: Forty-eight?-This is no difficulty; one [Baraitha] accepts the view that the [pouring out of the] residue [of the blood] is an indispensable service,[11] whereas the other accepts the view that the [pouring out of the] residue is not indispensable.

The question was raised: What is the law if he expressed an intention which makes piggul at the

bringing nigh [of the handful to the altar]?[12] R. Johanan said that the bringing nigh is like unto the taking of the handful;[13] but Resh Lakish said that the bringing nigh is like unto the burning.[14] Now Resh Lakish's view is clear, for there is also the bringing nigh of the frankincense; but what is the reason for R. Johanan's view? — Raba said, R. Johanan is of the opinion that any service which is not an absolute mattir[15] is regarded as a service complete in itself with regard to piggul.[16] Whereupon Abaye said to him, Behold the slaughtering of one of the lambs [on the Feast of Weeks] is a service which is not an absolute mattir,[17] and yet they differ! For we have learnt: IF HE SLAUGHTERED ONE OF THE LAMBS INTENDING TO EAT THE TWO LOAVES ON THE MORROW, OR IF HE BURNT ONE OF THE DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE INTENDING TO EAT THE TWO ROWS [OF THE SHEWBREAD] ON THE MORROW, R. MEIR SAYS, IT IS PIGGUL AND THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS INCURRED ON ACCOUNT THEREOF; BUT THE SAGES SAY, THE PENALTY OF KARETH IS NOT INCURRED UNLESS HE EXPRESSED THE INTENTION WHICH MAKES PIGGUL DURING THE SERVICE OF THE WHOLE OF THE MATTIR! — He replied, Do you imagine that the loaves are hallowed already in the oven? It is the slaughtering of the lambs that hallows them; and whatsoever serves to hallow is on the same footing as whatsoever serves to render permissible.[18]

R. Shimi b. Ashi raised an objection. It was taught: Others say, If he had in mind first the circumcised persons and then the uncircumcised, it is valid; if he had in mind first the uncircumcised persons and then the circumcised, it is invalid.[19] And it was established that they differ concerning half the mattir![20] — He replied, Do you think that the blood [of an animal-offering] is already hallowed in the throat? It is the knife [of slaughtering] that hallows it; and whatsoever serves to hallow is on the same footing as that which serves to render permissible.

Come and hear: This[21] applies only to the services of taking the handful, or putting it in the vessel or bringing it nigh; [but if he had already reached the service of burning etc.] Now 'bringing nigh' surely means bringing nigh for the purposes of burning, does it not?[22] — No, it means bringing nigh in order to put it in the vessel.[23] But if so, why is it stated [in this order] 'putting it in the vessel or bringing it nigh'? It ought surely to have stated 'bringing it nigh or putting it in the vessel'! — This is no difficulty, for you may render it thus.[24] But [it will be asked], why does it state 'but if he had already reached the service of burning'? It ought to have stated 'but if he had already reached the service of bringing nigh'![25] — This, too,is no difficulty, for since the bringing nigh is for the purposes of burning he refers to it as the burning. But [it will be asked], why does it state 'and he offered'? It ought to have stated, 'and he brought it nigh'![26] — This is indeed a difficulty.

If he burnt the size of a sesame seed of the handful intending to eat the size of a sesame seed of the remainder [on the morrow, and he repeated this again and again] until the handful was entirely [burnt up],[27] — in this case R. Hisda, R. Hamnuna and R. Shesheth differ. One holds that it is piggul, the other that it is invalid, and the third that it is valid. Now shall we say that he who holds that it is piggul is in agreement with R. Meir,[28] he who holds that it is invalid is in agreement with the Rabbis,[28] and he who holds that it is valid is in agreement with Rabbi?[29] — But is this so? perhaps R. Meir is of that opinion only there where he expressed [the intention which makes piggul] during a complete service,[30] but not here where he did not express [such an intention] during a complete service. Moreover, perhaps the Rabbis are of their opinion only there where he did not express an intention [which makes piggul] during the service of the whole mattir, but here where he actually expressed an intention [which makes piggul] during the service of the whole mattir [they would agree that] it is piggul. And again, perhaps Rabbi is of his opinion only there where he did not make up [the minimum quantity] later in the same service,[31] but here where he made up the quantity in the same service [he would agree that] it is invalid! — We must therefore say that he who holds that it is piggul holds thus according to all views; he who holds that it is invalid holds thus according to all views, and he who holds that it is valid holds thus according to all views. 'He who holds that it is piggul holds thus according to all views', for he maintains that that[32] is a way of eating as well as a

way of burning.[33] 'He who holds that it is invalid holds thus according to all views', for he maintains that that[32] is a way of eating but not a way of burning, and it was as though [the handful of] the meal-offering had not been burnt at all.[34] 'And he who holds that it is valid holds thus according to all views', for he maintains that that[32] is a way of burning but not a way of eating.[35]

---

(1) This implies that the intention which makes piggul was expressed only during one of the three sprinklings mentioned.
(2) מתירין pl. of מתיר, 'that which renders the offering permissible'; v. Glos. The penalty of kareth for eating piggul is not incurred unless the whole mattir was offered according to its prescribed rite except for the expressed intention which made it piggul. Thus where the mattir consists of a number of sprinklings, and at the first sprinklings there was expressed an intention which makes piggul, then it is essential, if the penalty of kareth is to apply, that the subsequent sprinklings be performed according to the prescribed rite.
(3) Zeb. 28b, 42b.
(4) Lev. XIX, 7 and XXII, 27; the former referring to an offering which has been made piggul and the latter to a valid offering.
(5) Regarding the liability for piggul.
(6) Sc. in the Holy of Holies between the staves of the ark, this being the first of the sprinkling services.
(7) The penalty of kareth cannot therefore be incurred; how then can R. Meir say that kareth is incurred in those circumstances? It must be observed that at first sight this same question could also be raised in the case where a piggul intention was expressed during the slaughtering or during the receiving of the blood, for since the offering is rendered invalid by that intention the subsequent sprinkling is no service, consequently the penalty of kareth cannot be incurred. Rashi, however, suggests this distinction: in this case the slaughtering or the receiving was performed entirely in sanctity, for the intention of piggul related to some subsequent service, whereas in the case of our text the sprinkling was not performed entirely in sanctity, for the intention of piggul related to the other sprinklings of this same service. V. also Rashi in Zeb. 42b, s.v. כי; and Tosaf. here s.v. כי.
(8) Where after the High Priest had sprinkled the blood of the bullock and of the he-goat in the Holy of Holies between the staves of the ark, the residue of the blood had spilt, so that it was necessary to slaughter another bullock and he-goat to obtain their blood for sprinkling in the Sanctuary. Again after the second sprinklings the residue of the blood had spilt and so another bullock and he-goat were once more slaughtered in order to perform the sprinklings upon the four corners of the altar. Once again owing to this same mishap, a fourth bullock and he-goat were slaughtered in order to perform the final sprinklings seven times upon the cleansed portion of the altar. In these circumstances the offering would be valid (v. Yoma 61a), for each of the sprinklings is considered as a separate service. Now if an intention which makes piggul had been expressed at the first sprinklings the offering would be piggul, for here the subsequent three sprinklings were admittedly in themselves valid and were not affected by the wrongful intention of the first sprinklings. In the normal case, however, where only one bullock and one he-goat had been used in the service, R. Meir would agree that, where an intention which makes piggul was expressed at the first sprinklings, the penalty of kareth cannot be incurred.
(9) Since the subsequent sprinklings had been performed without any further intention they are considered as vital services offered according to rule, and not as 'sprinklings of water'. The offering therefore is piggul.
(10) But the blood of the bullock and of the he-goat must each separately be sprinkled upon the four corners of the altar; hence an addition of four to the total number of sprinklings. V. Yoma 57b.
(11) The pouring out of the residue of the blood to the base of the altar, being an important service, is added to the number of the sprinklings, making thus a total of forty-eight. V. Yoma 60b.
(12) The service of bringing nigh to the altar applies both to the handful of flour and to the frankincense, so that it can be said that the bringing nigh of one is but half the mattir, and the dispute between the Sages and R. Meir would hold good here too.
(13) Which is a complete service, a whole mattir, for the handful was only taken from the flour but not from the frankincense.
(14) Of which there are two services: the burning of the handful and of the frankincense. And therefore the dispute between the Sages and R. Meir applies also to the service of bringing nigh.
(15) I.e., it can be dispensed with; the bringing nigh can in certain cases be dispensed with for the handful can be passed on from priest to priest till it reaches the altar (Rashi). Aliter: it does not render aught permissible; in this respect the service of bringing nigh is different from other services, for the receiving the blood of the animal-offering renders the sprinkling possible, and the sprinkling renders the flesh permissible (v. Sh. Mek. n. 4).

(16) And the ruling of the Sages that piggul does not apply to half a mattir does not apply here, since this service is not a mattir in the strict sense of the word.
(17) For it does not render aught permissible. V. supra n. 3.
(18) So that the slaughtering is on a par with an absolute mattir, and therefore the Sages hold that it is piggul only when the whole of this mattir (i.e., the slaughtering of both lambs) was affected by the wrongful intention.
(19) V. Pes. 62b. The Baraitha refers to the case of a person who, whilst slaughtering the Passover-lamb on behalf of a number of people, circumcised and uncircumcised, cut one organ of the animal's throat on behalf of one class of people and then the second organ on behalf of the other class too. The view here stated is introduced by the expression 'Others say', which usually represents the view of R. Meir; the Sages, however, differ.
(20) I.e., whether a wrongful intention expressed during the service of half the mattir can invalidate the offering or not; and here the cutting of the first organ is, as it were, but half the mattir. Now the mattir here spoken of, namely the slaughtering, is not an absolute mattir since it does not render aught permissible, and yet the Sages differ with R. Meir and hold that the wrongful intention in regard to half the mattir is of no consequence; contra Raba's interpretation of R. Johanan.
(21) That a wrongful intention expressed whilst dealing with the handful alone renders piggul. V. supra p. 101.
(22) And the Sages agree that a wrongful intention expressed during the bringing nigh renders piggul; contra Resh Lakish.
(23) Which is a complete service, for only the handful was put into a vessel and not the frankincense.
(24) And reverse the order of the Baraitha.
(25) For the service of bringing nigh is prior to the burning, and the Sages and R. Meir differ herein, too, according to Resh Lakish.
(26) For even if it is accepted, as suggested, that the term 'burning' includes the bringing nigh, when describing the service the Tanna of the Baraitha should have mentioned the first act thereof, namely the bringing nigh, and not the act of offering (lit., 'the putting' upon the altar, i.e., the burning).
(27) And so he did too with the frankincense.
(28) That an intention which makes piggul expressed during the service of a portion of the mattir — in this case during the burning of the size of a sesame seed of the handful and of the frankincense — renders the offering piggul. The Sages, however, in such a case declare the offering invalid.
(29) V. supra 14a where Rabbi holds the view that the two parts of the mattir cannot be reckoned together to affect the offering, where each intention was made in respect of less than the minimum quantity that constitutes eating, namely an olive's bulk.
(30) Viz., during the burning of the handful which, though but half of the mattir, for there is also the burning of the frankincense, is nevertheless a complete service.In this case only does R. Meir maintain that the offering is piggul.
(31) For in the case dealt with by Rabbi the piggul intention was expressed during the slaughtering of one lamb about a half-olive's bulk of one loaf and a similar piggul intention was expressed during the slaughtering of the other lamb about the same quantity of the other loaf.
(32) The taking of quantities the size of a sesame seed at a time.
(33) So that this case is no-different from the usual cases of piggul where during the burning of an olive's bulk of the handful there was an intention expressed to eat an olive's bulk of the remainder on the morrow.
(34) And therefore it is invalid.
(35) The burning in this manner is regarded as a normal burning of the handful, whereas the intention concerning the eating of the remainder is no intention in law so as to invalidate the offering.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 17a

The keen intellects of Pumbeditha[1] said, An intention which makes piggul expressed during one service of burning concerning another service of burning renders the offering piggul.[2] And this is so even according to the Rabbis who ruled that an intention which makes piggul expressed during the service of half the mattir does not render piggul, for that is their ruling only in the case where he expressed an intention [which makes piggul] about the remainder [of the meal-offering], the frankincense, however, remaining unaffected; but in this case where he expressed an intention [which makes piggul] about the frankincense, it is as though he had expressed the intention during the service of the whole mattir. Raba said, We have also learnt to the same effect: This is the general rule: If one took the handful or put it into the vessel or brought it nigh, or burnt it, intending to eat a thing that it is usual to eat or to burn a thing that it is usual to burn, outside its proper place, the offering is invalid but the penalty of kareth is not incurred; but if [he intended the like] outside its proper time, the offering is piggul and the penalty of kareth is incurred.[3] Now presumably the service of burning is similar to the other [services],[4] and as with the others [the intention which makes piggul may be] either concerning the eating [of the remainder] or concerning the burning [of the frankincense], so with the service of burning [the intention which makes piggul may be] either concerning the eating [of the remainder] or concerning the burning [of the frankincense]! — No; with the others the intention may be either concerning the eating or concerning the burning, but with the service of burning the intention can be only concerning the eating but not concerning the burning.

R. Menasiah b. Gadda was once sitting before Abaye and recited the following in the name of R. Hisda: An intention which makes piggul expressed during one service of burning concerning another service of burning does not render the offering piggul. And this is so even according to R. Meir who ruled that an intention which makes piggul expressed during the service of half the mattir renders piggul; for that is his ruling only where the intention expressed was concerning the remainder, since it is the handful that renders the remainder permissible; in this case, however, since the handful does not render the frankincense permissible,[5] it cannot make the offering piggul.[6]

Thereupon Abaye said to him, Tell me, Sir, was that [statement] in the name of Rab? He replied, Yes. And it has been so reported: R. Hisda said in the name of Rab, An intention which makes piggul expressed during one service of burning concerning another service of burning does not render the offering piggul.

R. Jacob b. Abba[7] said in the name of Abaye, We have also learnt the same: IF HE SLAUGHTERED ONE OF THE LAMBS INTENDING TO EAT A PART OF IT ON THE MORROW, THAT [LAMB] IS PIGGUL BUT THE OTHER [LAMB] IS VALID; IF HE INTENDED TO EAT OF THE OTHER [LAMB] ON THE MORROW, BOTH ARE VALID. Now what is the reason?[8] It is, is it not, because [the one lamb], not being the mattir of the other, cannot make the offering piggul by reason of an intention concerning [that other]?[9] — No, there the reason is because they are not joined in one vessel;[10] here, however, since they are joined in the one vessel, they are considered as one.[11]

R. Hamnuna said, The following was taught me[12] by R. Hanina and is equal in worth to me to all my studies: If he burnt the handful intending to burn the frankincense [on the morrow], [and] to[13] eat the remainder on the morrow, the offering is piggul. What is it that he teaches us? If he teaches us that an intention which makes piggul expressed during one service of burning concerning another service of burning renders the offering piggul, then he should [only] have said, If he burnt the handful intending to burn the frankincense [on the morrow]. And if he teaches us that an intention which makes piggul expressed during the service of half the mattir renders piggul, then he should have [only] said, If he burnt the handful intending to eat the remainder on the morrow. And if he

teaches us both these rules, then he should have said, If he burnt the handful intending to burn the frankincense [on the morrow] and[14] to eat the remainder on the morrow! — R. Adda b. Ahabah said, Actually he is of the opinion that an intention which makes piggul expressed during one service of burning concerning another service of burning does not render piggul, and he holds also that an intention which makes piggul expressed during the service of half the mattir does not render piggul, yet in this case it is different since the wrongful intention has spread over the entire meal-offering.[15]

A Tanna once recited before R. Isaac b. Abba: If he burnt the handful intending to eat the remainder [on the morrow], all hold it to be piggul. But surely this is a matter of dispute?[16] — Rather render: All hold it to be invalid.[17] But could he not have corrected himself thus: It is piggul, that is, according to R. Meir? — The Tanna evidently was taught the ruling 'all hold', and he confused in his mind 'piggul' with 'invalid'; but he would not confuse 'it is [piggul]' with 'all hold'.[18]

CHAPTER III

MISHNAH. IF HE TOOK THE HANDFUL FROM THE MEAL-OFFERING INTENDING TO EAT[19] A THING THAT IT IS NOT USUAL TO EAT[20] OR TO BURN[19] A THING THAT IT IS NOT USUAL TO BURN,[21] THE OFFERING IS VALID; BUT R. ELIEZER DECLARES IT TO BE INVALID. IF HE INTENDED TO EAT[19] LESS THAN AN OLIVE'S BULK OF A THING THAT IT IS USUAL TO EAT, OR TO BURN[19] LESS THAN AN OLIVE'S BULK OF A THING THAT IT IS USUAL TO BURN, THE OFFERING IS VALID. IF HE INTENDED TO EAT[19] A HALF-OLIVE'S BULK AND TO BURN[19] A HALF-OLIVE'S BULK, THE OFFERING IS VALID, FOR EATING AND BURNING CANNOT BE RECKONED TOGETHER.

GEMARA. R. Assi said in the name of R. Johanan, What is the reason for R. Eliezer s view? Because the verse reads, And if any of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings be at all eaten.[22] The verse here speaks of two 'eatings'. the 'eating' by man and the 'eating' by the altar, to inform you that as there can be a wrongful intention concerning what is usually eaten by man, so there can be a wrongful intention concerning what is usually 'eaten' by the altar; and furthermore, as there can be a wrongful intention concerning what is usually eaten by man in regard to man's eating thereof[23] and concerning what is usually 'eaten' by the altar in regard to the altar's 'eating' thereof, so there can be a wrongful intention concerning what is usually eaten by man in regard to the altar's 'eating' thereof[24] and concerning what is usually 'eaten' by the altar in regard to man's eating thereof. And why is this? Because the Divine Law expressed [the burning upon the altar] by the term 'eating'. And the Rabbis, [what would they say to this]? — The reason why the Divine Law expressed it by the term 'eating' was [to teach you]

---

(1) V. Sanh. 17b. This title of honour was applied to 'Efah and Abimi, the sons of Rehabah the Pumbedithan.

(2) I.e., if during the burning of the handful of the meal-offering the officiating priest expressed the intention of burning the frankincense on the morrow, the offering is piggul.

(3) Supra 12a.

(4) Which are stated in this Mishnah in connection with the handful.

(5) For the frankincense is not dependent upon the burning of the handful; v. supra 13b, p. 80.

(6) Where the piggul intention was expressed during the burning of the handful concerning the frankincense.

(7) So in all MSS. and Sh. Mek.; in cur. edd. 'ldi'.

(8) That both are valid.

(9) Just as the burning of the handful, not being the mattir of the frankincense, cannot render the offering piggul by reason of a piggul intention concerning the latter.

(10) The two lambs, which are the two mattirs, are not united by any act or service, but are separate and distinct; and therefore one is not affected by the other.

(11) The handful and the frankincense are placed together in the same vessel, and so regarded as one mattir.

(12) Lit., 'I was made to swallow'.

(13) The word ולבונה 'and the frankincense', found in all edd. is wanting in the MSS. and is struck out by Sh. Mek. The translation in the text is based upon the text and interpretation of Rashi. Maim. apparently included the word ולבונה in the text, and the translation would read thus: If he burnt the handful intending to burn the frankincense on the morrow, and (then he burnt) the frankincense intending to eat the remainder on the morrow, the offering is piggul. V. Maim. Yad, Pesule Hamuk. XVI, 8; and also לקוטי הלכות on Men. a.l. by Israel Meir Hakohen.

(14) The 'and' however would be taken,' as often, in the sense of 'or'.

(15) Although each intention by itself would not render piggul, the two together affect the whole of the meal-offering and render it piggul.

(16) Between R. Meir and the Sages; and according to the latter it is not piggul since the intention was expressed during the service of half the mattir only.

(17) The Sages agree that such an intention renders the offering invalid.

(18) It is more probable that the Tanna confused in his mind פיגול with פסול 'invalid', rather than that he confused הרי זו 'it is' with דברי הכל 'all hold'.

(19) On the morrow.

(20) E.g., the frankincense or the handful.

(21) E.g., the remainder of the meal-offering.

(22) Lev. VII, 18. Heb. אם האכל יאכל lit., 'If eaten there shall be eaten'; hence the verse contemplates two kinds of eating.

(23) I.e., an intention expressed during the burning of the handful that what is usually eaten by man (sc. the remainder) shall be eaten by man beyond the time prescribed for the eating thereof. This intention renders the offering piggul. Similarly the intention that what is usually consumed by the altar shall be burnt upon the altar outside the prescribed time renders the offering piggul.

(24) I.e., the intention that what is usually eaten by man shall be burnt upon the altar outside the prescribed time also renders the offering piggul.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 17b

that it makes no difference whether the wrongful intention for the altar was expressed by the use of the term 'eating'[1] or by use of the term 'burning. Or [to teach you] that as for eating the quantity of an olive's bulk is essential,[2] so for the burning the quantity of an olive's bulk is essential. The term 'eating', however, always means in the usual manner.[3] And R. Eliezer? — If so, [he says], the Divine Law should have stated either he'akol he'akol[4] or ye'akel ye'akel;[5] why does it say he'akol ye'akel?[6] That you may infer two things therefrom.[7]

R. Zera said to R. Assi, If this[8] is the reason for R. Eliezer's view, then one should also incur the penalty of kareth? And should you say that this is indeed so, but you yourself have reported in the name of R. Johanan that R. Eliezer admits that one is not thereby liable to kareth! — He replied, Tannaim differ as to the real view of R. Eliezer; some say that it is invalid by Biblical law,[9] others that it is invalid by Rabbinical law only. For it was taught: If one slaughtered an animal-offering intending to drink its blood[10] on the morrow, or to burn its flesh[11] on the morrow, or to eat of the sacrificial portions[10] on the morrow, the offering is valid; but R. Eliezer declares it to be invalid. If he intended to leave some of its blood for the morrow, R. Judah declares it to be invalid. R. Eleazar said, Even in this case, R. Eliezer declares it to be invalid, and the Sages declare it to be valid. Now whose view does R. Judah adopt?[12] Do you say that of the Rabbis? But surely if in the case where the intention expressed is included under the term 'eating'[13] the Rabbis declare the offering to be valid, how much more so in this case![14] It must therefore be that of R. Eliezer. And thereupon R. Eleazar had said, 'Even in this case, R. Eliezer declares it to be invalid, and the Sages declare it to be valid'. Is not R. Eleazar identical with R. Judah? It must therefore be said that the difference between them is on the question of kareth. The first Tanna[15] is of the opinion that in the case of 'leaving'[16] [R. Eliezer holds that] it is invalid only, but in the other cases[17] [R. Eliezer holds that] he is even liable to kareth; whereas R. Eleazar comes to tell us that in both these cases [R. Eliezer holds that] it is invalid only but the penalty of kareth is not incurred! — No, all are of the opinion that there is no

penalty of kareth involved; but in this dispute there are three different views. The first Tanna is of the opinion that only in the other cases do they[18] differ,[19] but in the case of 'leaving' all[18] agree that it is valid. [

---

(1) I.e., if the priest whilst taking the handful expressed the intention that the handful shall be 'eaten' by the altar on the morrow, the offering is piggul

(2) In order to render the intention effective so as to make the offering piggul.

(3) The handful to be burnt upon the altar and the remainder to be eaten by man; only in these cases is the intention of consequence.

(4) האכל האכל i.e., the repetition of the verb in the infinitive.

(5) יאכל יאכל, both in the finite mood.

(6) האכל יאכל, the first verb being in the infinitive and the second in the finite mood.

(7) (a) That for the burning there must be an intention in respect of an olive's bulk, and (b) that an intention to burn upon the altar what is eaten by man, or an intention that what is usually burnt on the altar shall be eaten by man, is of consequence.

(8) As given above, derived from the verse in Lev. VII, 18.

(9) In which case the penalty of kareth would be incurred.

(10) I.e., what is usually consumed by the altar to be eaten by man.

(11) I.e., what is usually eaten by man to be consumed on the altar.

(12) I.e., what is R. Judah's view in the first case where the intention expressed was to drink the blood on the morrow, etc?

(13) To drink and to burn upon the altar are acts included under the term 'eating'.

(14) Where there was no intention of eating at all, but merely to leave the blood for the morrow.

(15) Sc. R. Judah. In cur. edd. 'R. Judah' is also found in the text; evidently an explanatory gloss.

(16) I.e., the second clause of the abovementioned Baraitha, where there was an intention of leaving over some of the blood for the morrow.

(17) I.e., those cases mentioned in the first clause of the abovementioned Baraitha, where there was an intention of drinking the blood on the morrow or burning the flesh on the morrow.

(18) R. Eliezer and the Sages.

(19) R. Eliezer holding that where there was an intention of burning on the morrow what is usually eaten, the offering is invalid by Rabbinical law, merely as a precautionary measure against an intention of burning on the morrow what is usually burnt, in which case the offering would be piggul by the law of the Torah.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 18a

R. Judah is of the opinion that only in the other cases do they differ, but in the case of 'leaving' all agree that it is invalid, the reason being that we must declare the offering invalid [in the case where the intention was in respect of leaving] part of the blood [for the morrow] as a precautionary measure against [an intention of leaving] all the blood [for the morrow], and [an intention of leaving] all the blood [for the morrow] renders the offering invalid by Biblical law. For it was taught:[1] Said R. Judah to them, 'You would agree with me, would you not, that if he actually left [the blood] for the morrow the offering is invalid? Then even where he intended to leave it for the morrow it is also invalid'. R. Eleazar then comes to tell us that even in this case,[2] R. Eliezer declares it to be invalid and the Sages declare it to be valid.

Is then R. Judah of the opinion that in the case where there was an intention of leaving part of the blood for the morrow all agree that it is invalid? But it has been taught: Rabbi said, When I went to R. Eleazar b. Shammua' to have my learning examined[3] (others say: To sound the learning of R. Eleazar b. Shammua'). I found there Joseph the Babylonian sitting before him. Now he [Joseph] was very dear to him.[4] He [Joseph] then said to him, 'Master, what is the law if one slaughtered an offering intending to leave the blood for the morrow?' 'It is valid', he replied. In the evening he again replied. 'It is valid'. On the next morning he again replied. 'It is valid' — At midday he again

replied. ‘It is valid’ In the afternoon he replied. ‘It is valid, but R. Eliezer declares it to be invalid’. Thereupon Joseph's face lighted up. Said to him [R. Eleazar], ‘Joseph, it seems to me that our traditions did not correspond until now’ — ‘Quite so, Master’, he replied. ‘quite so. For R. Judah had taught me the view that it was invalid; and when I sought out all his disciples so as to find a supporter of this view, I could not find any.[5] But now that you have taught me the view that it is invalid, you have thus restored to me what I had lost’. Thereupon the eyes of R. Eleazar b. Shammua’ streamed with tears and he exclaimed, ‘Happy are ye, O scholars, to whom the words of the Torah are so dear!’ He then applied to him [Joseph] the following verse: ‘O how I love thy law! It is my meditation all the day.[6] For it was only because R. Judah was the son of R. Ila'i, and R. Ila'i was the disciple of R. Eliezer that he [R. Judah] taught you the view of R. Eliezer.’ Now if it be assumed that [R. Judah] taught that all hold it is invalid, then what did he [Joseph] mean when he said ‘You have thus restored to me what I had lost’? He [R. Eleazar b. Shammua’] had only told him [in the end] that there was a difference of opinion in the matter![7] — What then would you say? That he [R. Judah] taught him ‘It is valid, but R. Eliezer declares it to be invalid’! If so, why the expression ‘For it was only because’?[8] We also learnt [from R. Eleazar b. Shammua’] that there was a difference of opinion in the matter! — We must indeed say that he [R. Judah] taught him that all hold it is invalid; but what did he [Joseph] mean by saying, ‘You have thus restored to me what I had lost’? He meant that he had brought the view ‘it is invalid’ to light.[9]

MISHNAH. IF HE DID NOT POUR IN [THE OIL],[10] OR IF HE DID NOT MINGLE IT, OR IF HE DID NOT BREAK UP [THE MEAL-OFFERING] IN PIECES,[11] OR IF HE DID NOT SALT IT,[12] OR WAVE IT,[13] OR BRING IT NIGH,[14] OR IF HE BROKE IT UP INTO LARGE PIECES,[15] OR DID NOT ANOINT IT[16] [WITH OIL], IT IS VALID.

GEMARA. What is meant by HE DID NOT POUR IN [THE OIL]? Shall we say that he did not pour in [any oil] at all? But Scripture has indicated that this is indispensable![17] — We must say therefore that it means, the priest did not pour in [the oil] but a non-priest did. If so, the next item HE DID NOT MINGLE IT, would also mean, the priest did not mingle it but a non-priest did; from which it follows that if it was not mingled at all it would be invalid,

---

(1) V. Zeb. 36a.

(2) Where there was an intention of leaving over some of the blood for the morrow.

(3) Lit., ‘to drain my measures to the last drop’; i.e., to overhaul my studies and to have all matters of doubt cleared up.

(4) Heb. עד לאחת, corresponding to the Aramaic לחדא=very much. (R. Nissim, in Tosaf. ad. loc. s.v. עד). According to Rashi: ‘until one’, i.e., until they had reached the subject dealt with here; or, everything that R. Eleazar said was dear to Joseph and accepted by him unhesitatingly until they had reached this law, which he did not accept until the end.

(5) And I therefore thought that l must have been mistaken in my report of R. Judah since the other disciples of R. Judah had not heard of it.

(6) Ps. CXIX, 97.

(7) So that even the final reply of R. Eleazar b. Shammua’ did not correspond with the teaching Joseph had received from R. Judah. It must therefore be said that R. Judah had also taught his disciple Joseph that there was a difference of opinion in the matter, and so contrary to the premise set out at the beginning of this passage.

(8) For when R. Eleazar b. Shammua’ had remarked ‘For it was only because...’ he evidently meant to say that R. Judah had taught his disciple Joseph that particular view only out of admiration and reverence for his teachers, whereas in fact the law was not in accordance with that view. But as matters now stand the teachings of R. Eleazar b. Shammua’ and of R. Judah are identical.

(9) For until the final reply of R. Eleazar b. Shammua’ there was not even the vaguest hint that any Rabbi held the view that it is invalid; and this so disturbed Joseph that he was led to doubt the accuracy of his memory concerning R. Judah's teaching. The final reply of R. Eleazar b. Shammua’ gave him some measure of reassurance.

(10) The fixed procedure in the preparation of the meal- offering was: first some oil was poured in a vessel and the fine flour was then put in; then more oil was poured in and it was mingled with the flour. It was then baked into cakes and

thereafter broken in pieces. The remainder of the oil was then poured on it, and the handful was taken therefrom. V. infra 74b. The first case of the Mishnah means that no oil was poured in at the end but it had all been poured in at first.

(11) Cf. Lev. II, 6. All meal-offerings which were baked before the taking out of the handful had to be broken up in pieces; v. infra 75b. In this case only an amount sufficient for the handful was broken up, but the rest remained unbroken (Rashi).

(12) Ibid. 13. Only the handful was salted but not the rest of the meal-offering(Bertinoro and Tosaf. Yom-tob; and cf. prec. n.). According to others: the handful was not salted by a priest but by a layman (Maim. and Tif. Yisrael; and cf. infra the Gemara's interpretation of the first item of our Mishnah).

(13) Sc. the 'Omer meal-offering (ibid. XXIII, 11) or the meal-offering of suspicion (Num. V, 25). V. infra 61a.

(14) To the southwestern horn of the altar; cf. Lev. II, 8.

(15) Or, he broke it up too fine; v. Gemara infra 18b.

(16) Those cakes which were not mingled with oil but were, after baking, anointed with oil; cf. ibid. VII, 12.

(17) For the rite of pouring in oil is stated twice (Lev. II, 1 and 6), and whatsoever rite is repeated in connection with the meal-offering is accounted indispensable. V. infra 19b.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 18b

but we have learnt:[1] Sixty [tenths] can be mingled together[2] but not sixty-one. And when we were considering this [and it was asked], What does it matter if they cannot be mingled together? Have we not learnt: IF HE DID NOT MINGLE IT . . . IT IS VALID? R. Zera answered, Wherever proper mingling is possible the mingling is not indispensable, but wherever proper mingling is not possible the mingling is indispensable?[3] — Is this an argument? Surely this has its own meaning and that has its own meaning. The item HE DID NOT POUR IN means, the priest did not pour in [the oil] but a non-priest did; whereas the item HE DID NOT MINGLE IT means, it was not mingled at all.

OR IF HE BROKE IT UP INTO LARGE PIECES. But surely if where he did not break it up at all it is valid, is it then necessary to state [that it is valid if he broke it up into] large pieces? — The expression 'LARGE PIECES' really means many pieces.[4] Or, if you will, I may say that actually large pieces were meant, [nevertheless it had to be stated in our Mishnah]. For you might have thought that only there[5] [is it valid] since they retain the character of cakes, but [not] here[6] since they are neither cakes nor crumbs. We are therefore taught [that here,[6] too, it is valid].

Shall we say that our Mishnah[7] is not in agreement with R. Simeon? For it was taught: R. Simeon says, A priest who does not believe in the service has no portion in the priesthood,[8] for it is written, He among the sons of Aaron, that offereth the blood of the peace-offerings, and the fat, shall have the right thigh for a portion;[9] that is to say, if he believes in the service he has a portion in the priesthood, and if he does not believe in the service he has no portion in the priesthood. Now I know it only of this [service stated in the verse], but whence do I know it also of the fifteen services, viz., pouring in [the oil],[10] mingling, breaking it up, salting it, waving it, bringing it nigh, taking the handful, burning it, nipping off[11] [the head of a bird-offering], receiving [the blood], sprinkling it, giving the water to a woman suspected of adultery,[12] breaking the heifer's neck,[13] purifying the leper,[14] and raising the hands in blessing both within [the Temple] and without?[15] The verse therefore adds, 'Among the sons of Aaron', that is, all services that are entrusted to the sons of Aaron; and the priest who does not believe in it has no portion in the priesthood![16] — There is no difficulty, said R. Nahman. There[17] it deals with the meal-offering of a priest,[18] here with the meal-offering of an Israelite. In the case of the meal-offering of an Israelite, from which the handful must be taken, the duty of the priesthood begins with the taking out of the handful; we thus learn that the pouring in [of the oil] and the mingling are valid [even though performed] by non-priests. In the case of the meal-offering of a priest, from which the handful is not taken, the services of the priesthood are required from the very beginning. Thereupon Raba said to him, Just see, whence do we deduce that the rite of pouring in the oil applies also to the meal-offering of a priest? From the meal-offering of an Israelite,[19] do we not? Well, as there [the pouring in] may be performed by a

non-priest, in this case too it may be performed by a non-priest! (Others have the following version. There is no difficulty, said R. Nahman. Here it deals with meal-offerings from which the handful is taken, there[20] with meal-offerings from which the handful is not taken.[21] Thereupon Raba said to him, Just see, whence do we deduce that the rite of pouring in the oil applies also to meal-offerings from which the handful is not taken? From those meal-offerings from which the handful is taken, do we not? Well then they must be like unto those from which the handful is taken, and as in the latter case [the pouring in] may be performed by a non-priest, here too it may be performed by a non-priest!) — Obviously, then, our Mishnah is not in agreement with R. Simeon.

What is the reason of the Rabbis?[22] — It is written, And he shall pour oil upon it, and put frankincense thereon. And he shall bring it to Aaron's sons the priests; and he shall take thereout his handful.[23] From the taking of the handful and onwards is the function of the priesthood; we thus learn that the pouring in [of the oil] and the mingling are valid [even though performed] by non-priests. And R. Simeon? — [He says,] The Scriptural expression ‘Aaron's sons

---

(1) Infra 103b. The line quoted from this Mishnah is actually stated in the form of a question.

(2) In the one vessel with one log (v. Glos.) of oil.

(3) It is evident, therefore, that according to R. Zera our Mishnah teaches that the mingling can be dispensed with entirely, provided it were possible to do so if desired. Similarly the first case of our Mishnah would mean that no oil at all was poured in.

(4) I.e., he broke it up too small.

(5) In the case where the cakes were not broken up at all.

(6) Where they were broken up into a few large pieces.

(7) Which permits the rite of pouring in the oil to be performed by a non-priest.

(8) I.e., he is not entitled to a portion in the distribution of the priestly gifts. V. Hul. 132b.

(9) Lev. VII, 33.

(10) This and the following seven services relate to the various kinds of meal-offerings.

(11) lbid. I, 15; V, 8.

(12) Num. V, 24.

(13) Deut. XXI, 4.

(14) Lev. XIV, 1ff.

(15) For the priestly benediction, whether in the Temple at Jerusalem (ibid IX, 22) or in the synagogues in every town in Israel (Num. VI, 22ff.)

(16) It is clear, however, that R. Simeon counts the pouring in of the oil as a special service of the priests and which may not be performed by a layman, contrary to the view of our Mishnah.

(17) In the Baraitha taught by R. Simeon.

(18) From which no handful was taken but the whole meal-offering was burnt upon the altar. Cf. Lev. VI, 16.

(19) The rite of pouring in the oil over the flour is stated only in connection with the meal. offering of an Israelite, but it is extended so as to apply to all meal-offerings; v. infra 75a.

(20) In the Baraitha taught by R. Simeon.

(21) The meal-offering of a priest and also the meal-offering which accompanied most sacrifices; cf. Num. XV, 4ff.

(22) Who hold the view of our Mishnah.

(23) Lev. II,1,2.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 19a

the priests’ is to be interpreted as referring to what precedes as well as to what follows.[1] And is R. Simeon of the opinion that a Scriptural expression is to be interpreted as referring to what precedes as well as to what follows? But it has been taught: It is written, And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar.[2] ‘And... shall take.. . with his finger’, this teaches us that the taking [of the blood] shall be with the right hand only; ‘with his finger and put it’, this teaches us that the sprinkling shall be with [the finger of] the right hand only.

R. Simeon said, Is the expression ‘hand’[3] written in connection with the taking [of the blood]? Since the expression ‘hand’ is not written in connection with the taking [of the blood], if he took the blood with the left hand it is still valid. And Abaye said that they differ as to whether a Scriptural expression is to be interpreted as referring to what precedes as well as to what follows or not![4] — This rather is the reason for R. Simeon's view: It is written, And he shall bring it;[5] the term ‘and’ indicates conjunction with the preceding subject.[6] But is R. Simeon of the opinion that the term ‘and’ indicates conjunction with the preceding subject? Then consider this: It is written, And he shall slaughter the bullock before the Lord; and Aaron's sons, the priests, shall present the blood, and sprinkle the blood,[7] from which it is clear that only from the act of receiving[8] [the blood] and onwards is the function of the priesthood; we thus learn that the slaughtering may be performed by a non-priest. But according to R. Simeon, since the term ‘and’ indicates conjunction with the preceding subject, the slaughtering by a non-priest should not be permitted![9] Here it is different, for it is written, And he shall lay his hand[10] ... and he shall slaughter; and as the laying of the hands is performed by non-priests so the slaughtering may be performed by non-priests. Then should it not follow, as the laying of the hands must be performed by the owner [of the offering], so the slaughtering, too, shall be performed by the owner! — You cannot say that, as there is an a fortiori argument against it. For if the sprinkling which is the chief service of atonement is not performed by the owner, a fortiori the slaughtering which is not the chief service of atonement! And should you retort, But surely the possible is not to be inferred from the impossible![11] then [I say], the fact that the Divine Law enjoined with regard to the service on the Day of Atonement, And he shall slaughter the bullock of the sin-offering which is for himself,[12] indicates that elsewhere the slaughtering need not be performed by the owners.

Rab said, Wherever the expressions ‘law’ and ‘statute’ occur [in connection with any rites,] their purpose is only to indicate the indispensability [of those rites]. Now it was assumed that both expressions were necessary for this purpose, as in the verse, This is the statute of the law.[13] (Mnemonic: Nataz Yikmal.).[14] But is there not the case of the Nazirite,[15] where only the expression ‘law’ is used,[16] and yet Rab has said that the [absence of the] rite of waving[17] in the case of the Nazirite invalidates [the service]? — That case is different, for since there is written, so he must do,[18] it is as though the expression ‘statute’ were used. And is there _not the thank-offering, where only the expression ‘law’ is used,[19] yet we have learnt:[20] Of the four [kinds of cakes] of the thank-offering[21] the [absence of] one invalidates the others? — The case of the thank-offering is also different, since it has been placed side by side with the Nazirite in the verse, With the sacrifice of his peace-offerings for thanksgiving,[22] and the Master has taught[23] that the term ‘peace-offerings’ includes the peace-offerings of the Nazirite.

And is there not the case of the leper, where only the expression ‘law’ is used,[24] yet we have learnt:[23] Of the four kinds [used in the purification] of the leper[25] the [absence of] one invalidates the others? — That case is different, for since there is written, This shall be the law of the leper,[24] it is as though the word ‘statute’ were also written.[26]

And is there not the Day of Atonement, where only the expression ‘statute’ is used,[27] yet we have learnt:[23] Of the two he-goats of the Day of Atonement the [absence of] one invalidates the other? — Hence we must say that either the expression ‘law’ [by itself] or ‘statute’ [by itself indicates indispensability].

But with all other offerings only the expression ‘law’ is found,[28] and yet the rites [in each offering] are not indispensable![29] — We must therefore say that the expression ‘law’ requires with it the expression ‘statute’ [in order to indicate indispensability], whereas statute’ does not require with it ‘law’. But did not [Rab] say, The expressions ‘law’ and ‘statute’?[30] — He meant to say this: Even though the expression ‘law’ is used, only if there is also used the expression ‘statute’ is [indispensability implied], otherwise it is not so.

But in the case of the meal-offering only the expression 'statute' is used,[31] and yet Rab has stated, Every rite of the meal-offering which is repeated in another verse[32] is indispensable; which shows that only if it is repeated is it [indispensable], otherwise it is not![33] — That case is different, for the expression 'statute' relates only to the eating.[34]

And is there not the Shewbread, where [undoubtedly] the expression 'statute' relates only to the eating,[35] yet we have learnt:[36] Of the two rows [of the Shewbread] the [absence of] one invalidates the other, of the two dishes [of frankincense] the [absence of] one invalidates the other, of the rows and the dishes the [absence of] one invalidates the other? — Therefore [we must say that] even where [the expression 'statute'] is used in connection with the eating [of the offering], it relates to all [the rites of that offering]; in that case,[37] however, it is different, for since it is written, Of the bruised corn thereof and of the oil thereof[38] [it is clear that only]

---

(1) So that the rites prior to the taking of the handful, namely the pouring in of the oil and the mingling, must also be performed by the priests alone.

(2) Ibid. IV, 25. It is to be particularly observed that the expression 'with his finger' (which in conjunction with the term 'priest', according to Rabbinic interpretation, signifies the use of the right hand or of the finger of the right hand; v. supra 10a) is so placed in the middle of the verse that it might be said to refer to the rite of taking the blood which precedes, or to the rite of sprinkling which follows, or even to both.

(3) The expression 'finger' is here meant.

(4) The first Tanna holds that the expression 'with his finger' refers to what precedes as well as to what follows, and therefore both services must be performed with the right hand; whereas R. Simeon holds that 'with his finger' refers to what follows, namely the sprinkling, and therefore the taking of the blood may be performed even with the left hand.

(5) Lev. II, 2.

(6) And the former service (sc. the pouring in of the oil) is determined by the latter (sc. the taking of the handful); as the latter is performed by the priest only,so the former may be performed by the priest only. To reason the same with regard to the sin-offering thus: since the second service is introduced by the term 'and', therefore as the second service, sc. the sprinkling, must be performed with the right finger so the preceding service, sc. the receiving of the blood, shall also be performed with the right hand, is not admissible, for the two services of the verse are separated by the expression 'with his finger' (Rashi).

(7) Ibid. I, 5.

(8) Which is understood by the expression 'present the blood'.

(9) For the services which follow the term 'and', namely the receiving and the sprinkling, may be performed by none other than priests.

(10) Lev. I, 4.

(11) Whereas the sprinkling is 'impossible', i.e., may not be performed by the owner, since that would be in direct conflict with the Scriptural precept, the slaughtering on the other hand is 'possible', i.e., may be, and therefore should be, performed by the owner.

(12) Ibid. XVI, 11.

(13) Num. XIX, 2.

(14) נתין יקמל (he dashes and will pluck off), a mnemonic of the initial or characteristic letters of the cases adduced here in argument against Rab's principle.

(15) Cf. Num. VI, 2ff.

(16) Ibid. 21: This is the law of the Nazirite.

(17) Cf. Ibid. 19, 20.

(18) Ibid. 21.

(19) Lev. VII, 11.

(20) Infra 27a.

(21) Sc. leavened, cakes, unleavened cakes, wafers, and soaked cakes; cf. Lev. VII, 12, 13.

(22) Ibid. 13.

(23) Infra 27a.

(24) Ibid. XIV, 2.
(25) Sc. cedarwood, scarlet, hyssop, and two clean birds; cf. ibid. 4'
(26) For the expression 'shall be' also signifies indispensability.
(27) Cf. Ibid. XVI, 29.
(28) Cf. ibid. VII, 37: This is the law of the burnt-offering etc.
(29) E.g., the offering is valid even though the sacrificial portions of the guilt-offering were not burnt upon the altar (supra 4a). and the meal-offering even though it was not brought nigh unto the altar (supra 18a).
(30) It is clear that the expressions are on an equal footing and one is not more significant than the other.
(31) Cf. Lev. VI, 11.
(32) The meal-offering is dealt with primarily in Lev. II, and also in VI, 7-11.
(33) In spite of the fact that the expression 'statute' is used.
(34) As it is written (ibid. VI, 11): Every male among the children of Aaron shall eat of it, it is a perpetual statute. It cannot be taken as a general term indicating indispensability.
(35) For it is written (ibid. XXIV, 9): And they shall eat it in a holy place, for it is most holy unto him . . . by a perpetual statute.
(36) Infra 27a.
(37) Sc. of the meal-offering.
(38) Ibid. II, 16.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 19b

the bruised corn and the oil are indispensable, but no other thing is indispensable.[1]

[To turn to] the main text: 'Rab said, Every rite of the meal-offering which is repeated in another verse is indispensable. Samuel, however, said, The bruised corn and the oil are indispensable, but no other thing is indispensable.[2] Is it then suggested that according to Samuel even though the rite is repeated in another verse it is not indispensable?[3] — Rather [the position is this]: Wherever any rite is repeated in another verse it is certainly indispensable; they differ only as to [the effect of] the interpretation of the phrases 'his handful' and 'with his hand'. For it was taught: The phrases 'his handful'[4] and 'with his hand'[5] signify that he shall not use a measure for the taking of the handful.[6] Now Rab maintains that this too has been stated in another verse, as it is written, And he presented the meal-offering and filled his hand therefrom;[7] Samuel, however, says that we cannot derive a permanent law from a temporary enactment.[8]

Is Samuel then of the opinion that we cannot derive a permanent law from a temporary enactment? But we have learnt: The vessels for liquids hallow liquids, and the measuring vessels for dry stuffs hallow dry stuffs; the vessels for liquids cannot hallow dry stuffs, neither can the measuring vessels for dry stuffs hallow liquids.[9] And thereupon Samuel had said, This applies only to the measuring vessels [for liquids], but the sprinkling bowls hallow [also dry stuffs], for it is written, Both of them full of fine flour![10] — This case is different since the verse is repeated twelve times.[11]

R. Kahana and R. Assi said to Rab, But is not the bringing nigh [of the meal-offering to the altar] repeated in Scripture, nevertheless it is not indispensable?[12] — Where is it repeated? Because it is written, And this is the law of the meal-offering: the sons of Aaron shall bring it nigh before the Lord, [to the front of the altar]?[13] But surely that verse merely determines the place [whither it shall be brought]. As it has been taught: [If the verse had only stated,] 'Before the Lord', I might have thought that it meant on the west [side of the altar],[14] the verse therefore added, To the front of the altar.[15] And [if the verse had only stated,] To the front of the altar, I might have thought that it meant on the south side, the verse therefore stated, 'Before the Lord'. So what was the procedure? He brought it nigh unto the south-west corner opposite the point of the altar's horn, and that sufficed. R. Eliezer says, It is possible [to think that the meaning is] he can bring it nigh either to the west corner or to the south corner;[16] but you can answer, Wherever you find two texts, one self-confirmatory and

confirming the words of the other, whereas the second is self-confirmatory but annuls the words of the other, we abandon the latter and accept the former. Thus when you emphasize 'before the Lord', i.e., on the west side [of the altar], you annul 'to the front of the altar', which is on the south side; but when you emphasize 'to the front of the altar', i.e., on the south side, you confirm 'before the Lord', which is on the west side. But how do you confirm it?[17] — R. Ashi said, This Tanna holds that the whole of the altar stood in the north.[18]

R. Huna demurred, But the salting [of the meal-offering] is not repeated in Scripture, nevertheless it is indispensable! For it has been taught: The verse, It is a covenant of salt for ever,[19] signifies that there is

---

(1) It is evident that the expression 'statute' used in connection with the meal-offering is of no significance, seeing that it was found necessary to derive the teaching that the measures of the bruised corn and of the oil shall each be full, from the emphatic and indeed superfluous particles 'thereof' attached to each, and not by inferring it from the expression 'statute' (Rashi). According to Tosaf. (s.v. ושאני) the interpretation is: the fact that Scripture repeats here (v. 16) practically the same rite that is mentioned in v. 2, signifies that in this instance the expression 'statute' is of no significance.

(2) Even though the rite is repeated in another verse.

(3) Surely not; for what else could be the purpose of the repetition of that rite if not to indicate indispensability?

(4) Lev. II, 2.

(5) Ibid. VI, 8. So literally.

(6) From these two phrases we learn that the priest must take out the handful with his hand and may not use a measure which holds as much as a handful for the purpose.

(7) Ibid. IX, 17. This verse clearly repeats the injunction that the handful must be taken out with the hand; hence it is indispensable, and if it was taken with a measure it is invalid.

(8) The above verse referred to relates to the meal-offering brought by Aaron at his installation as High Priest, and the provisions stated with regard thereto are obviously temporary enactments only and not rules for all time. Hence, according to Samuel, if the handful was taken with a measure the offering is valid.

(9) Supra 8b; Zeb. 88a.

(10) Num. VII, 13, and frequently in the chapter. 'Both' refers to the silver dish and the silver sprinkling bowl mentioned previously in the verse in connection with the presentation of gifts and offerings by the Princes of the twelve tribes at the dedication of the altar. These vessels obviously hallowed the flour that was put into them; hence Samuel derives the rule for all time that a sprinkling bowl hallows also dry stuffs.

(11) With the presentation of each of the princes. This oft repeated rite was clearly intended for all times.

(12) As we have learnt in our Mishnah: OR (IF HE DID NOT) BRING IT NIGH . . IT IS VALID.

(13) Lev. VI, 7. This rite has already been stated previously: And he shall bring it nigh unto the altar (ibid II, 8).

(14) As this side of the altar faced the entrance of the Temple (wherein was the Holy of Holies) which was located in the west of the Temple court. V. fig. 1.

(15) I.e., the south, for here was the ascent leading up to the altar.

(16) So Tosaf. and Rashi in Sotah 14b. Here Rashi interprets: 'both to the west . . . and to the south'.

(17) If the meal-offering is brought to the south side of the altar it can by no means be said to be 'before the Lord', i.e., opposite the entrance of the Temple which is on the west.

(18) Of the Temple court. So that the south side of the altar, being in fact nearest to the entrance of the Temple, is described as 'before the Lord'. V. fig. 2.

(19) Num. XVIII, 19.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 20a

a covenant declared in regard to salt.[1] So R. Judah. R. Simeon says, Here it is said, It is a covenant of salt for ever, and there it is said, The covenant of an everlasting priesthood,[2] as it is impossible to conceive of sacrifices without the priesthood so it is impossible to conceive of sacrifices without salt![3] — R. Joseph answered, Rab agrees with the Tanna of our [Mishnah] who said, IF HE DID

NOT SALT IT . . . IT IS VALID. Thereupon Abaye said to him, Are you then suggesting that 'HE DID NOT POUR means he did not pour in [any oil] at all? It surely means that the priest did not pour in [the oil] but a non-priest did it; then here, too, it must be explained that the priest did not salt it but a non-priest did it.[4] — He replied, How can it even enter your mind that a non-priest shall draw near to the altar?[5] Alternatively, I can say, since with regard to [the salting] the expression 'covenant' is used, it is as though it were repeated in a verse.[6]

And is not [the salting actually] repeated in a verse? But it is written, And every offering of thy meal-offering shalt thou season with salt![7] — This verse is required for the following which had been taught: If the verse had stated, 'And every offering shalt thou season with salt', I would have concluded that it also applied to the wood and the blood,[8] since these are also termed 'offering';[9] the verse therefore adds meal-offering; thus as the meal-offering is distinguished in that other things are requisite for it,[10] so everything for which other things are requisite [must be seasoned with salt]. But I can argue: as the meal-offering is distinguished in that it renders something permissible,[11] so everything which renders something permissible [must be seasoned with salt]; I would thus include the blood since it renders something permissible![11] The verse therefore states, [Neither shalt thou suffer the salt . . . to be lacking] from thy meal-offering,[7] but not 'from thy blood'. I might conclude then that the whole meal-offering requires salting; the verse therefore states, offering, [signifying that] only what is offered[12] requires salting, but the whole meal-offering does not require salting. I know now that the handful [requires salting] but whence do I know to include the frankincense? I include the frankincense since it is offered with [the handful] in the same vessel. And whence do I know to include the frankincense that is offered by itself,[13] the frankincense that is offered in the dishes,[14] the incense-offering, the meal-offering of priests, the meal-offering of the anointed [High] Priest,[15] the meal-offering that is offered together with the drink-offerings,[16] the sacrificial parts of the most holy and the lesser holy sacrifices, the limbs of the burnt-offering [of an animal] and the burnt-offering of a bird? The verse therefore states, With all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt.[17]

The Master stated: 'I know now that the handful [requires salting], but whence do I know to include the frankincense? I include the frankincense since it is offered with [the handful] in the same vessel'. But have you not stated previously, 'As the meal-offering is distinguished in that other things are requisite for it'?[18] — This is what he meant: I might argue that the expression 'offering' is a general proposition and 'meal-offering' a particular item, so that we would have here a general proposition followed by a particular item, in which case the scope of the proposition is limited to the particular item specified, hence only the meal-offering [would require salting] but no other thing! The verse therefore added, With all thine offerings, which is another general proposition; so that we have now two general propositions separated from each other by a particular item, in which case they include only such things as are similar to the particular item specified: as the item specified[19] is clearly something for which other things are requisite, so everything for which other things are requisite [requires salting]. And what are the other things that are requisite for it? It is the wood.[20] So that everything [which requires] wood [must be seasoned with salt]. But perhaps it is the frankincense, so that I would include the blood since there go with it the drink-offerings![21] — The drink-offerings go rather with the burning of the sacrificial parts, for eating and drinking' [go together].[22] On the contrary atonement and joy [go well together]![23] — This is what was meant: the frankincense goes together [with the handful] in the same vessel, whereas the drink-offerings do not go together [with the blood] in the same vessel; the wood, on the other hand, just as it is essential for the meal-offering so it is essential for all offerings.[24] But I could argue thus: As the item specified[25] is clearly something for which other things are requisite and also renders aught permissible, so everything for which other things are requisite and which renders aught permissible [requires salting]; and in this way only the frankincense that is in the dishes [would be included] since it renders the Shewbread permissible, but no other offering! — Since the expression, 'From thy meal-offering' was necessary to exclude the blood,[26] it follows that everything else is included by [its similarity with the meal-offering in] one respect.

The Master stated: '[Neither shalt thou suffer the salt . . . to be lacking] from thy meal-offering, but not from thy blood'. But perhaps it is to be interpreted: From thy meal-offering, but not from thy sacrificial limbs![27] — It is more reasonable to include the limbs since (mnemonic: A. Sh. B. N. T. M. A.)[28] other things are requisite for them as for [the meal-offering], they are burnt by fire like it, they are treated outside like it,[29] they are subject to the law of nothar[30] like it, to the law of uncleanness like it and to the law of sacrilege like it,[31]

---

(1) I.e., salt must not be omitted from any sacrifice.

(2) Ibid. XXV, 13.

(3) Hence it is clear that salting is indispensable even though it is not repeated in Scripture, thus contrary to Rab's principle.

(4) So that even the Tanna of our Mishnah is of the opinion that the salting cannot be dispensed with entirely.

(5) The suggestion that a non-priest salted the meal-offering cannot be entertained, since the salting took place at the head of the altar, and it is inconceivable that a non-priest would approach so near the altar.

(6) And so the salting is, according to Rab, indispensable; thus in agreement with R. Judah and R. Simeon of the foregoing Baraitha.

(7) Lev. II, 13; and the verse concludes: With all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt.

(8) That the wood which is burnt upon the altar must first be salted, likewise the blood before the sprinkling.

(9) Cf. Neh. X, 35: And we cast lots for the offering of wood. The blood can well be designated 'offering' since it is the chief part of the offering.

(10) Namely, wood for the burning of the handful of the meal-offering.

(11) The burning of the handful renders the remainder of the meal-offering permitted to be eaten; likewise the sprinkling of the blood renders the sacrifice permissible, i.e., the sacrificial portions to be burnt and the flesh to be eaten. The result of this argument would be that the blood would require salting since it is similar to the meal-offering in one respect (vis., it renders permissible), and all other offerings would require salting since they, too, are similar to the meal-offering in another respect (viz., for each wood is requisite), and only the wood is excluded. V. Rashi s.v. אי.

(12) Sc. the handful, The remainder of the meal-offering, however, does not require salting.

(13) As a separate offering, e.g., if a man said, 'I vow to offer frankincense'; v. infra 106b. Whence do we know that this and all the other offerings mentioned, which are burnt upon the altar, must first be salted?

(14) With the Shewbread.

(15) Known as חביתי כהן גדול, the meal-offering prepared on a griddle (hence חביתין from מחבת) offered by the High Priest daily. Cf. Lev. VI, 13, 14.

(16) V. Num. XV, 4ff.

(17) Lev. II, 13.

(18) And by that argument the frankincense has already been included, since wood is required for the burning thereof; why then is the question raised again?

(19) Sc. the handful of the meal-offering which is burnt upon the altar.

(20) Which is essential for the burning of the offering upon the altar.

(21) The suggestion is that the expression 'other things are requisite' does not refer to the wood, but to any act or service that accompanies the offering, e.g., the burning of the frankincense that goes with the offering of the handful, and in the same way the drink-offerings that go with the sprinkling of the blood of animal-offerings.

(22) It is more logical to say that the drink-offerings go with the sacrificial parts, for in this way the 'meal' is complete, consisting of 'eating' (the burning of the sacrificial parts) and 'drinking' (the libation of the drink-offerings), rather than with the sprinkling of the blood.

(23) The drink-offerings, it is now argued, are closely associated with the sprinkling of the blood, for the joy at atonement which is brought about by the sprinkling is now expressed in the libations of wine.

(24) And therefore the relation of the frankincense to the handful is a closer one than that of the drink-offerings to the blood. The wood, too, is closely connected with the offering since without it the offering is not possible.

(25) Sc. the handful of the meal-offering.

(26) Which was similar to the meal-offering only in one respect (viz., each renders something permissible).

(27) I.e., the sacrificial limbs are not to be salted before being offered upon the altar.

(28) These are the initial or characteristic letters of the points in common between the meal-offering and the sacrificial limbs. It will be observed that the mnemonic contains seven letters whilst the Gemara enumerates but six points in common. Tosaf. explain that the seventh letter (א standing for אוכל 'a foodstuff') was a point too obvious to be mentioned. The last letter of this mnemonic, however, is wanting in MS.M.
(29) I.e., both the sacrificial limbs and the meal-offering are offered upon the altar that is outside in the Temple Court, whereas the blood in the case of certain offerings is sprinkled inside the Temple upon the veil and between the staves.
(30) Heb. נותר 'what is left over'. A person is liable if he eats of the meal-offering or of the sacrificial limbs outside the appointed time, or if he eats them whilst in a state of uncleanness. This is not so with regard to the blood.
(31) The law of sacrilege (i.e., the profane appropriation or use of sacred objects) does not apply to the blood. V. Yoma 60a.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 20b

On the contrary, it is more reasonable to include the blood since it renders something permissible like [the meal-offering][1] and is rendered invalid at sunset like it![2] — The others [the limbs] have more points in common.

The Master said: 'I would have concluded that it also applied to the wood and the blood since these are also termed "offering".' Whom have you heard express the opinion that the wood is termed 'offering'? It is Rabbi, is it not? But according to Rabbi it actually requires salting. For it was taught: The term 'offering'[3] signifies that one may offer wood as a freewill-offering. And how much must it be? Two logs. And it is written, And we cast lots for the offering of wood.[4] Rabbi says, The wood-offering is included under the term 'offering', and therefore it requires salting and also to be brought near[5] [the altar]. And Raba had said that according to Rabbi's view it is essential to take a handful out of the wood.[6] And R. Papa had said that according to Rabbi's view an offering of wood entails other wood too![7] — Strike out 'wood' from here.[8] Then what does the verse exclude? It surely cannot exclude the blood, for this is excluded by the expression 'from thy meal-offering'![9] —

---

(1) The sprinkling of the blood renders the sacrifice permissible, just as the handful renders the rest of the meal-offering permissible to be eaten.
(2) The blood may not be sprinkled at night and if it remained overnight it is invalid, likewise with the handful of the meal-offering; whereas the sacrificial portions may be burnt throughout the whole night.
(3) Lev, II, 1. V. infra 106b.
(4) Neh. X, 35.
(5) To the south-western corner of the altar like the meal-offering.
(6) The wood must be cut up into small thin strips and a handful of these be taken and burnt upon the altar, like the handful of the meal-offering.
(7) As with every offering, wood from the Temple store is required for the burning of the offering, so here wood from the Temple store is required to burn the wood offered.
(8) I.e., from the argument in the passage stated by the Master,
(9) In the original Baraitha, supra p. 129, it will be seen that the first argument established that the expression 'meal-offering' excludes the blood and the wood. Later this Baraitha excluded the blood from another phrase of the verse 'from thy meal offering'. If now we strike out 'the wood' from the first argument then we are left in this position, that the Baraitha by the interpretation of two different expressions each time excludes the blood and nothing more.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 21a

Leave out 'the wood' and insert 'the drink-offerings' in its place. For it was taught: But the wine, the blood, the wood and the incense do not require salting. Who is the author of this Baraitha? If Rabbi, then the [inclusion of the] wood is a difficulty;[1] and if the Rabbis, then the [inclusion of the] incense is a difficulty.[2] — It is the following Tanna, for it was taught: R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka says, Just as the particular item specified[3] is clearly something which can contract

uncleanness,is consumed by fire and is offered upon the outer altar, so everything which can contract uncleanness, is consumed by fire and is offered upon the outer altar [requires salting]. Hence the wood is excluded since it cannot contract uncleanness, the blood and the wine are excluded since they are not consumed by fire, and the incense is excluded since it is not offered upon the outer altar.

Now this is so[4] clearly because the verse excluded the blood, but otherwise I should have said that the blood must be salted. Surely by salting it it loses the character of blood![5] For Ze'iri said in the name of R. Hanina, If blood was cooked [and then one ate of it], one does not thereby commit a transgression.[6] And Rab Judah said in the name of Ze'iri, If blood was salted [and one ate of it], one does not thereby commit a transgression.[7] Moreover Rab Judah on his own authority said, If the sacrificial limbs were roasted and then brought up [on the altar], they are no longer under the denomination of 'a sweet savour'![8] — One might have thought that in compliance with the precept a little [salt] should be sprinkled therein, we are therefore taught [that it is excluded from this law].

The text [above stated]: 'Ze'iri said in the name of R. Hanina, If blood was cooked [and then one ate of it], one does not thereby commit a transgression'. Raba was sitting reciting this statement, when Abaye raised against him the following objection: If a man coagulated blood[9] and ate it, or if he dissolved forbidden fat and gulped it down, he is culpable! — This is no difficulty, in the one case he coagulated it by the fire, in the other he coagulated it in the sun; if by the fire it will not resolve into its former state,[10] if in the sun it will do so. But even though [it was coagulated] in the sun should we not say that once it has been set aside it must remain so?[11] For did not R. Mani enquire of R. Johanan, 'What is the law if one ate congealed blood?' and he replied, 'Once it has been set aside it must remain so'?[12] — He[13] remained silent. Then said [Abaye] to him, perhaps the one case deals with [the blood of] external[14] sin-offerings,[15] and the other[16] with [the blood of] internal[17] sin-offerings.[18] You have now, he exclaimed, reminded me of the law. For Rabbah said in the name of R. Hisda, If one ate the congealed blood of an external sin-offering, one is culpable, for the Divine Law says, And he shall take . . . and put it,[19] and such is fit for taking and putting [upon the horn of the altar]. If one ate [the congealed blood] of an internal sin-offering, one is not culpable, for the Divine Law says, And he shall dip . . . and sprinkle,[20] and such is not fit for dipping and sprinkling. And Rabbah on his own authority said, Even if one ate [the congealed blood] of an internal sin-offering one is culpable, since with external sin-offerings [blood] in such a condition is fit for the ritual purpose.[21] (Therefore, said R. Papa, If one ate the congealed blood of an ass one is culpable, since with external sin-offerings [blood] in such a condition is fit for the ritual purpose).[22]

R. Giddal said in the name of Ze'iri, Blood is regarded as an interposition,[23] whether it be moist or dry. An objection was raised: Blood, ink, honey and milk, if dry constitute an interposition; if moist, they do not constitute an interposition. — This is no difficulty, in one case [the blood] was viscid,[24] in the other it was not.

For what purpose does Scripture state, Thou shalt salt?[25] — For the following which was taught: [If the verse had only stated] 'with salt',[26] I might have thought that it meant tebonehu,[27] the verse therefore stated, Thou shalt salt. [And if the verse had only stated,] Thou shalt salt, I might have thought that it meant even with salt water, the verse therefore stated, 'With salt'. Neither shalt thou suffer the salt to be lacking,[28] that is, bring that salt which has no Sabbath,[29] and that is the salt of Sodom. And whence do we know that if one cannot obtain the salt of Sodom one may bring salt of Istria?[30] Because the verse states, 'Thou shalt offer':[26] 'Thou shalt offer', whatever [salt] it is; 'thou shalt offer', from whatever place it comes; 'thou shalt offer', even on the Sabbath;[31] 'thou shalt offer', even in conditions of uncleanness.[31]

What is the meaning of tebonehu? — Rabbah b. 'Ulla said, This is what was meant: I might have thought that one should heap the salt upon it as straw in clay. If so, said to him Abaye, it should have said yetabnenu![32] Rather said Abaye: I might have thought that one should pile up the salt like a

building. If so, said Raba to him, it should have said yibnenu![33] Rather said Raba: I might have thought that it meant tebonehu. And what does tebonehu mean? R. Ashi explained: I might have thought that one should apply to it [salt] only to give it a taste,[34] just as the understanding,[35] the verse therefore stated, Thou shalt season. How should one do it? One takes the limb, spreads salt over it, turns it over and again spreads salt over it, and then offers it. Abaye said, And so, too, it should be done for [cooking meat in] the pot.[36]

---

(1) Since according to Rabbi the wood like the meal-offering requires salting.

(2) For the principle enunciated by the Rabbis, namely that every offering for which other things (sc. wood) are requisite must be seasoned with salt, assuredly applies to the incense. V. supra p. 129.

(3) Sc. the meal-offering, expressly mentioned in Lev. II, 13.

(4) That the blood does not require salting.

(5) And is certainly not fit for sprinkling. ‘

(6) For once it has been cooked it has lost the character of blood.

(7) According to the principle that whatsoever is salted is counted as hot i.e., as roasted or cooked. V. Hul. 97b.

(8) And are not acceptable. Similarly cooked blood would not be acceptable.

(9) He rendered it into a solid mass by much cooking.

(10) So that it has lost entirely its character as blood, and therefore Ze'iri maintains that no transgression is committed when one eats thereof.

(11) I.e., once it has lost the character of blood during coagulation, it cannot again assume that character when melted down, on the principle that once a thing has been rejected it can no more be fit again.

(12) And whosoever eats thereof — it being assumed that the congealed blood was not of a consecrated animal-does not commit a transgression.

(13) Raba.

(14) I.e., sin-offerings whose blood must be applied to the horns of the altar which stood in the Temple Court.

(15) The blood of these sin-offerings, even though hardened in the sun, is still fit for its ritual purpose, and it still retains its character as blood. Likewise the blood of non-consecrated animals when hardened by the sun is also counted as blood, and therefore whosoever eats thereof commits a transgression.

(16) Ze'iri's case.

(17) I.e., sin-offerings whose blood must be sprinkled upon the veil and upon the golden altar, e.g., the bullocks and the he-goats which were to be wholly burnt, v. Lev. IV, ff.

(18) In this case the coagulated blood is absolutely unfit for its purpose. as is soon to be explained.

(19) Lev. IV, 30.

(20) Ibid. 6.

(21) It is therefore regarded as blood.

(22) This passage is omitted in all MSS.

(23) Blood adhering to the body interposes between the body and the water so that the immersion is not valid. For immersion to be valid no part of the body may be untouched by the water.

(24) And almost dry; it therefore interposes.

(25) Ibid. II, 13.

(26) Lev. II, 13.

(27) תבונהו. This word is explained in the text presently.

(28) Ibid. Heb. לא תשבית, the verb being interpreted as of the same root as שבת,

(29) I.e., is generated at all times and is cast up by the sea, both in winter and summer. This is identified with salt of Sodom, which is a fine sea salt.

(30) A town in Pontus where there were salt mines. This name is applied to all coarse rock salt.

(31) The offerings of the congregation may be brought on the Sabbath and in certain circumstances even in conditions of uncleanness. The salting of the offering is evidently a vital service and overrides the rules of Sabbath and of uncleanness.

(32) יתבננו (or יתבננו), denom. of תבן ‘straw’, meaning ‘to mix with straw’, ‘to put in much straw’, and then to apply a large quantity (of any substance)’.

(33) יבננו, implying building up row upon row.

(34) I.e., only a small quantity of salt, just a sprinkling in order to give it a taste.

(35) Just as the understanding gives 'taste' and distinction to man (Rashi). Or, that one might 'understand' that salt has been sprinkled on it (Aruch).
(36) I.e., the meat must be salted on both sides.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 21b

Our Rabbis taught: The salt which is upon the sacrificial limb is subject to the law of sacrilege,[1] but that which is upon the ascent or upon the head of the altar is not subject to the law of sacrilege.[2] R. Mattenah said, There is Scriptural authority for this, for it is written, And thou shalt present them before the Lord, and the priests shall cast salt upon them, and they shall offer them up for a burnt-offering unto the Lord.[3]

We have learnt elsewhere: [The Beth din ordained] concerning the salt and the wood [of the Temple stores] that the priests may use them freely.[4] Samuel said, They allowed this [use of salt] only for their offerings but not for eating. Now it was thought that 'for their offerings' meant for salting their [own] offerings,[5] and 'for eating' meant the eating of consecrated meat.[6] But surely if we provide them [with salt from the Temple stores] in order to salt the hides of the animal-offerings, shall we not provide them with salt to eat the consecrated meat? For it was taught: And so you find that salt was used in three places: in the salt chamber, on the ascent, and at the head of the altar. In the salt chamber where they used to salt the hides of animal-offerings;[7] on the ascent where they used to salt the sacrificial limbs; at the head of the altar where they used to salt the handful, the frankincense, the incense-offering, the meal-offering of the priests, the anointed [High] Priest's meal-offering, the meal-offering that is offered with the drink-offerings, and the burnt-offering of a bird! — We must therefore say that 'for their offerings' means for the eating of consecrated meat, and 'for eating' means the eating of unconsecrated food. Unconsecrated food! [you say], surely this is obvious, for how does it come to be there![8] — Although the Master stated:[9] 'They shall eat[10] signifies that [if the remainder of the meal-offering is insufficient] they should eat with it unconsecrated food and terumah, so that it should be eaten after the appetite is satisfied',[11] nevertheless we do not provide them with salt from the Temple.

Rabina said to R. Ashi, This indeed is most logical; for should you say that 'for their offerings' meant for salting their [own] offerings, so that [they are entitled to this] only because the Beth din granted them this concession, but had not the Beth din granted them this concession they would not be entitled to it, but surely if we provide the Israelites [with salt for their offerings], shall we not provide the priests too? For it was taught: I might have thought that if a man said, 'I take upon myself to offer a meal-offering', he must provide[12] the salt himself just as he must provide the frankincense himself. And the following argument [supports the contention]: It is enjoined that with a meal-offering there must be salt,[13] and it is also enjoined that with a meal-offering there must be frankincense; therefore just as the frankincense he must provide himself,[14] so the salt too he must provide himself. Or perhaps argue this way: It is enjoined that with a meal-offering there must be salt, and it is also enjoined that with a meal-offering there must be wood; therefore just as the wood is taken from the communal store[15] so the salt too is taken from the communal store. Let us then see to which it is most similar. We derive the law concerning a matter that is essential to all offerings from another matter which is essential to all offerings,[16] and let not the frankincense prove against this, since it is not a matter which is essential to all offerings. Or perhaps argue this way: we derive the law concerning a matter which is offered with the meal-offering in one vessel from another matter which is also offered with the meal-offering in one vessel[17] and let not the wood prove against this, since it is not a matter which is offered with the meal-offering in one vessel. Scripture therefore states [concerning the salt], it is a covenant of salt for ever,[18] and elsewhere [concerning the Shewbread] it says, It is on behalf of the children of Israel a covenant for ever;[19] as the one[20] was taken out of the supplies of the community, so the other[21] was also taken out of the supplies of the community! — Thereupon R. Mordecai said to R. Ashi, Thus said R. Shisha the son of R. Idi, It was

necessary to be stated only according to Ben Bokri's view.[22] For we have learnt:[23] R. Judah said, Ben Bokri testified at Jabneh that a priest who paid the shekel[24] has committed no sin.[25] — Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai said to him, Not so, but rather a priest who did not pay the shekel has committed a sin.[26] The priests, however, used to expound the following verse to their advantage, And every meal-offering of the priest shall be wholly burnt; it shall not be eaten;[27] since the 'Omer-offering and the Two Loaves and the Shewbread are ours, how can they be eaten?[28] But according to Ben Bokri, since they are not in the first instance liable to pay the shekel, when they do pay it they have surely committed a sin, for they have brought unconsecrated matter into the Temple! — They bring it and deliver it [whole-heartedly] to the public funds. Now[29] one might have thought that

---

(1) And no profane use may be made of this salt. For the law of sacrilege (i.e., the misappropriation of property of the Sanctuary) v. Lev. V, 15, 16.

(2) And it may be used for ordinary purposes since it is no longer fit for any sacred purpose.

(3) Ezek. XLIII, 24. The salt which is upon the limb is, in this verse, stated to be part of the burnt-offering.

(4) Shek. VII, 7.

(5) I.e., the offerings which the priests offer on their own behalf may be salted with salt from the Temple stores.

(6) I.e., the priests may not use this salt at table when eating consecrated meat (e.g., the breast and the thigh) which they receive as their portion from the sacrifices.

(7) Which belonged to the priests.

(8) For it is forbidden to bring unconsecrated food into the Temple precincts (Rashi).

(9) Tem. 23a.

(10) Lev. VI, 9.

(11) I.e., in order to appease their hunger they should first eat some unconsecrated food or terumah (v. Glos.) outside the Temple Court, and then enter the Temple Court where they would finish their meal to satisfaction with the remainder of the meal-offering.

(12) Lit., 'bring from his home'.

(13) Lit., 'bring a meal-offering and bring salt'.

(14) For it is written, ibid. II, 1: And put frankincense thereon, and then it says in the next verse, And he shall bring it to the sons of Aaron.

(15) V. infra.

(16) Salt and wood are essential to all offerings.

(17) The salt and the frankincense were placed together with the handful of the meal-offering in one vessel.

(18) Num. XVIII, 19.

(19) Lev. XXIV, 8.

(20) Sc. the Shewbread, which was in the nature of an offering on behalf of the community of Israel.

(21) Sc. the salt for the offerings.

(22) According to Ben Bokri's view the priests did not contribute the shekel to the Temple funds and therefore were not entitled to any of the Temple's supplies; hence it was necessary for the Beth din to grant them a concession that they may use the Temple's supplies of wood and salt for their own offerings.

(23) Shek. I, 4.

(24) The annual contribution, corresponding to the half shekel ordained in the Torah (Ex. XXX, 13), paid before the first of Nisan by every Israelite towards the upkeep of the public offerings in the Temple.

(25) According to law a priest is not liable to pay the shekel, for the expression 'every one that passeth among them that are numbered' (Ex. ibid.) does not apply to the priests (or the Levites), since these were not numbered together with the rest of the tribes of Israel, but separately.

(26) The expression in the verse (v. prec. n.) is accordingly interpreted thus: Every one that passeth, that is, every one that passed through the Red Sea; among them that are numbered, that is, however they were numbered, whether separately or with the other tribes of Israel. Hence the priests are Biblically liable to pay the shekel.

(27) Lev. VI, 16.

(28) If the priests were liable to contribute the shekel to the Temple funds, out of which the three named public meal-offerings were provided, it would follow that these meal-offerings should be wholly burnt and not eaten by the priests; and this would be contrary to Scripture. Hence, the priests argued, they were not to pay the shekel.

(29) This continues the argument as given above ‘It was necessary to be stated only according to Ben Bokri's view’. V. supra p. 139, n. 7.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 22a

the Divine Law granted this privilege[1] only to Israelites since they have a [share in the] chamber, but not to the priests as they have no [share in the] chamber; we are therefore taught [that this is not so].[2]

Now as to wood, concerning which the Tanna is certain that it is taken from the public supplies, whence does he know it? From the following: I might have thought that if a man said, ‘I take upon myself to offer a burnt-offering’, he must provide the wood himself[3] just as he must provide the drink-offerings himself; the verse therefore states, On the wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar:[4] as the altar was [set up] out of the public funds so the wood and the fire shall also come out of the public funds. So R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon. R. Eleazar b. Shammua’ said, As the altar has not been used by a layman, so the wood and the fire shall not have been used by a layman. What is the [practical] difference between them? — The difference between them is [as to whether] new[5] [wood is necessary or not].

And [can it be said that] old wood is not [allowed]? But it is written, And Araunah said unto David, Let my lord the king take and offer up what seemeth good unto him: behold, the oxen for the burnt-offering, and the morigim[6] and the furniture of the oxen for the wood![7] — These were also new.

What are morigim?[6] — ‘Ulla said, It is a ‘turbel bed’,[8] And what is a ‘turbel bed’? — Rab Judah said, A ‘goat with hooks’,[9] wherewith the threshers thresh. Said R. Joseph, What is the Scriptural [evidence]? It is written, Behold, I make thee a new morag having sharp teeth; thou shalt thresh the mountains.[10]

MISHNAH. IF THE HANDFUL OF ONE MEAL-OFFERING WAS MIXED WITH THE HANDFUL OF ANOTHER, OR WITH A PRIEST'S MEAL-OFFERING,[11] OR WITH THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED [HIGH] PRIEST,[11] OR WITH THE MEAL-OFFERING OFFERED WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS,[11] IT[12] IS VALID. R. JUDAH SAYS, IF [IT WAS MIXED] WITH THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED [HIGH] PRIEST OR WITH THE MEAL-OFFERING OFFERED WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS, IT IS INVALID, FOR SINCE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE ONE[13] IS THICK AND THE CONSISTENCY OF THE OTHER[14] IS THIN, EACH ABSORBS FROM THE OTHER.[15] GEMARA. We have learnt elsewhere:[16] If the blood [of a sacrifice] was mixed with water and it still has the appearance of blood, it is valid.[17] If it was mixed with wine, it must be regarded as though it was water.[18] If it was mixed with the blood of [unconsecrated] cattle or of a wild animal, it must be regarded as though it was water. R. Judah says, Blood cannot neutralize blood.[19] R. Johanan said, Both[20] [derived their views by] expounding the same verse, viz., And he shall take of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the goat.[21] Now it is well known that the blood of a bullock is more than the blood of a goat;[22] the Rabbis therefore conclude

---

(1) The use of the Temple supply of salt for their offerings.

(2) But the Beth din expressly granted them this concession. V. Shek. VII, 7.

(3) Lit., ‘he must bring from his house’.

(4) Lev. I, 12.

(5) I.e., new wood which had never been used for any other purpose. R. Eleazar b. Shammua’ insists upon new wood, whereas the first Tanna allows even used wood.

(6) מוריגים V. infra.

(7) II Sam. XXIV, 22.

(8) **, a threshing sledge consisting of a wooden platform studded with sharp pieces of flint or with iron teeth (Jast.)
(9) V. A.Z. 24b (Sonc. ed., p. 122, n. 1).
(10) Isa. XLI, 15. It is evident from this verse that מורג is a threshing instrument.
(11) These meal-offerings are wholly burnt and therefore correspond to the handful of an ordinary meal-offering.
(12) Sc. the handful, as well as the other meal-offering.
(13) Sc, the handful of the ordinary meal-offering. It had one log of oil to the tenth of an ephah of flour.
(14) The High Priest's meal-offering required three logs of oil to the tenth of an ephah of flour; while for the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings the mixture was one tenth of an ephah of flour and three logs of oil for a lamb, two tenths and four logs for a ram, and three tenths and six logs for a bullock.
(15) Both are therefore invalid; the handful because it sucked some oil from the other meal-offering so that it has had too much oil, and the other meal-offering because it has had too little oil.
(16) Zeb. 77b, Hul. 87b.
(17) For sprinkling upon the altar.
(18) And if an equal quantity of water when mixed with this blood would not alter the appearance of the blood, it is valid.
(19) So that the blood of a sacrifice, even though mixed in a considerably larger quantity of unconsecrated blood, still retains its identity and sacred character, and the mixture is valid for sprinkling. For R. Judah is of the opinion that in a mixture of like kinds, either liquids with liquids or solids with solids, one element cannot neutralize the other, irrespective of the quantities of each.
(20) I.e., the first Tanna (hereinafter referred to as 'the Rabbis') and R. Judah.
(21) Lev. XVI, 18, in connection with the service on the Day of Atonement. The priest had to mix the blood of both animals and sprinkle it upon the altar; cf. Yoma 53b.
(22) Nevertheless the goat's blood, whose quantity is considerably less than that of the bullock, has not 'lost itself' i.e., it has not become neutralized in the mixture, since Scripture expressly names each blood separately.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 22b

from this that in a mixture of things which are offered up one element cannot neutralize the other.[1] R. Judah, however, concludes from this that in a mixture of like kinds neutralization does not take place.

'The Rabbis conclude from this that in a mixture of things which are offered up one element cannot neutralize the other'. But perhaps the reason [why one does not neutralize the other] is because here is a mixture of like kinds![2] — Had this[3] been merely a mixture of like kinds and not of things which are offered up, it would be as you say; but since it is here a mixture of things which are offered up,it is clear that the reason is that it is a mixture of things which are offered up, perhaps then [we can conclude from this that] only in a mixture of like kinds of things which are offered up [one element cannot neutralize the other]! — This is a difficulty.

'R. Judah concludes from this that in a mixture of like kinds neutralization does not take place'. But perhaps the reason [why one does not neutralize the other] is because here is a mixture of things which are offered up! — Had this been merely a mixture of unlike kinds of things which are offered up, it would be as you say; but since it is a mixture of like kinds, it is clear that the reason is that here it is a mixture of like kinds. Perhaps then [we can conclude from this that] only in a mixture of like kinds of things offered up [one element cannot neutralize the other]! — This is a difficulty.

[An objection was raised.] We have learnt: R. JUDAH SAYS, IF [IT WAS MIXED] WITH THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED [HIGH] PRIEST OR WITH THE MEAL-OFFERING OFFERED WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS, IT IS INVALID, FOR SINCE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE ONE IS THICK AND THE CONSISTENCY OF THE OTHER IS THIN, EACH ABSORBS FROM THE OTHER. But what does it matter if one does absorb from the other? The mixture here is of like kinds![4] —

(1) E.g., the blood of two consecrated animals. On the other hand, if the blood of a consecrated animal was mixed with that of an unconsecrated animal or with water or wine, one would neutralize the other, according to the quantities of each.

(2) I.e., the blood of the goat mixed with the blood of the bullock.

(3) Sc. the case indicated in Lev. ibid.

(4) It is of no consequence even if the oil in the handful did absorb some of the oil from the other meal-offering, since the latter is not neutralized in the mixture; and therefore the handful cannot be reckoned to have had any addition in oil.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 23a

Raba answered, R. Judah is of the opinion that where an element is mixed with like kind and also with another kind, you must disregard the like kind as if it were not there, and the other kind, if more in quantity, will neutralize [the element].[1]

It was reported: If [the priest] poured oil on the handful taken from the sinner's meal-offering, R. Johanan maintains it is invalid; but Resh Lakish says, He should in the first instance wipe up with it the remains of the log of oil and then offer it.[2] But is it not written, He shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put any frankincense thereon?[3] — That verse means that one should not apportion for it a quantity of oil as for the other [meal-offerings].[4]

R. Johanan raised an objection against Resh Lakish. It was taught: If a dry meal-offering was mixed with one mingled with oil, it may be offered up.[5] R. Judah says, It may not be offered up. presumably the handful of a sinner's meal-offering was mixed with the handful of a freewill meal-offering![6] — No, the meal-offering that is offered with a bullock or with a ram was mixed with the meal-offering that is offered with a lamb,[7] But this is expressly stated, viz., If the meal-offering that is offered with a bullock or with a ram was mixed with the meal-offering that is offered with a lamb, or if a dry meal-offering was mixed with one mingled with oil, it may be offered up. R. Judah says, It may not be offered up.[8] — One [clause] merely illustrates the other.

Raba raised the question: What is the law if oil was squeezed out of the handful on to wood?[9] Do we say that whatsoever is joined to the thing offered is like the offering itself,[10] or not? Rabina said to R. Ashi, Is not this question similar to the case disputed by R. Johanan and Resh Lakish? For it was reported: If a man offered up [outside the Temple court] a limb which was not as large as an olive but the bone brought it up to an olive's bulk, R. Johanan says, He is liable [to the penalty of kareth]; but Resh Lakish says, He is not liable. 'R. Johanan says, He is liable', because what is joined[11] to the thing offered is like the offering itself; 'Resh Lakish says, He is not liable', because what is joined to the thing offered is not like the offering! — The question can indeed be asked, both according to R. Johanan and according to Resh Lakish. It can be asked according to R. Johanan, for [it may be that] R. Johanan held that view only in regard to the bone, since it is of the same kind as the flesh, but not in regard to [the wood] for it is not of the same kind as the handful. And Resh Lakish, too, perhaps he held that view only in regard to the bone, since it can become separated,[12] and if separated there is no obligation to put it back, but not in regard to the oil[13] for it cannot be separated. Or perhaps these differences do not count! — The question remains unanswered.

MISHNAH. IF TWO MEAL-OFFERINGS FROM WHICH THE HANDFULS HAD NOT YET BEEN TAKEN WERE MIXED TOGETHER, BUT IT IS STILL POSSIBLE TO TAKE THE HANDFUL FROM EACH SEPARATELY,[14] THEY ARE VALID; OTHERWISE THEY ARE INVALID. IF THE HANDFUL [OF A MEAL-OFFERING] WAS MIXED WITH A MEAL-OFFERING FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL HAD NOT YET BEEN TAKEN, IT[15] MUST NOT BE OFFERED. IF, HOWEVER, IT WAS OFFERED, THEN THE MEAL-OFFERING FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL HAD BEEN TAKEN DISCHARGES THE OWNER'S OBLIGATION

WHILST THE OTHER FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL HAD NOT BEEN TAKEN DOES NOT DISCHARGE THE OWNER'S OBLIGATION. IF THE HANDFUL WAS MIXED WITH THE REMAINDER OF THE MEAL-OFFERING OR WITH THE REMAINDER OF ANOTHER MEAL-OFFERING, IT MUST NOT BE OFFERED; BUT IF IT WAS OFFERED IT DISCHARGES THE OWNER'S OBLIGATION.

GEMARA. R. Hisda said, Nebelah[16] meat is neutralized in ritually slaughtered meat,[17] since slaughtered meat cannot assume the character of nebelah meat;[18] ritually slaughtered meat is not neutralized in nebelah meat, since nebelah meat can assume the character of slaughtered meat, for when it has putrified the uncleanness thereof has gone.[19] But R. Hanina said, Whatsoever can become like the other is not neutralized, and whatsoever cannot become like the other is neutralized.[20] According to whose view [do they differ]?[21] It cannot be according to the view of the Rabbis, for they have said that only things which are offered up do not neutralize one another, but in a mixture of like kinds neutralization takes effect.[22] Neither can it be according to R. Judah, for

---

(1) The case dealt with by R. Judah in our Mishnah is where the handful, which is made up of oil and flour, was mixed with one of the meal-offerings mentioned, which also contains oil. Now the oil in the handful is disregarded, so that the flour of the handful will neutralize the oil of the other meal-offering which it has absorbed, with the result that the handful has had too much oil and is therefore invalid.

(2) It is the proper thing, maintains Resh Lakish, to scrape up with the handful of the sinner's meal-offering any oil that may be found remaining in the log measure which had been used for some other meal-offering. Accordingly if he actually poured some oil on the handful it is certainly valid.

(3) Lev. V, 11.

(4) Before the taking of the handful. After that, however, he may add a little oil to it.

(5) This Tanna applies here the principle laid down by the Rabbis that things which are offered up do not neutralize one another; therefore in this mixture one is not affected by the other, and the whole is offered upon the altar.

(6) The former meal-offering being dry, and the latter mingled with oil. Now it is clear that the first Tanna permitted the offering of these meal-offerings only because he holds that things offered up when mixed together do not neutralize each other, so that each is considered as though it were by itself; where, however, oil was poured on to a dry meal-offering they would also declare it to be invalid, contra Resh Lakish.

(7) The meal-offering offered with a bullock or with a ram is called ‘dry’ as compared with that offered with a lamb, since the former had two logs of oil to each tenth of an ephah of flour, whereas the latter had three logs of oil to the same quantity of flour.

(8) Thus clearly showing that the second clause is a case quite different from the first, and ‘dry’ no doubt means the sinner's meal-offering which contains no oil at all.

(9) Consequently there would be too little oil in the handful.

(10) Since the wood with the oil on it will be later joined to the handful and together burnt on the altar it is as though the oil were still in the handful so that none of the oil can really be said to be lacking, consequently it is valid. V. Rashi and Tosaf. a.l. for further interpretations.

(11) Sc. the bone.

(12) I.e., the bone might spring off from the altar.

(13) According to the first interpretation of Rashi which has been adopted here it should read ‘the wood’, V. Sh. Mek. n. 6.

(14) There remained from each meal-offering a quantity sufficient for the taking of the handful that had not mixed with the other.

(15) Sc. the whole mixture.

(16) נבלה, an animal which had died a natural death or was slaughtered in any manner than that prescribed by Jewish ritual law. The carcass may not be eaten (Deut. XIV, 21), and it conveys uncleanness by carrying and by contact (Lev. XI, 39, 40).

(17) If a morsel of nebelah meat was confused with a large quantity of ritually slaughtered meat, it is neutralized in the mixture and is regarded as non-existent, so that whosoever touches this mixture in any part thereof remains clean.

(18) The latter conveys uncleanness, whilst the former does not; the mixture is therefore considered to be a mixture of

different kinds (in view of the difference between them as to the law of uncleanness), so that the one is neutralized in the other according to all views.

(19) And if a morsel of ritually slaughtered meat was confused with a large quantity of nebelah meat, the whole is regarded as a mixture of like kinds and no neutralization takes place. Consequently if terumah (v. Num. XVIII, 8ff) produce were to be brought into contact with this mixture it would not be unclean of a certainty, but would always be considered to be in a state of doubtful uncleanness, since it might only have touched the morsel of slaughtered meat in the mixture. R. Hisda is of the opinion that it is the neutralizer, i.e., the substance which is in the majority in the mixture, which is to be considered; and if it is, or can become, like the substance which is about to be neutralized, the mixture is then considered to be a mixture of like kinds.

(20) R. Hanina is of the opinion that it is the substance which is about to be neutralized, i.e., the substance which is in the minority in the mixture, which is to be considered, and if it can become like the neutralizer, only then is the mixture considered to be a mixture of like kinds and neutralization does not take place.

(21) Sc. R. Hisda and R. Hanina.

(22) So that it is immaterial whether the nebelah meat can become like the slaughtered meat or vice versa, for even if the mixture is a mixture of like kinds neutralization takes effect.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 23b

R. Judah adopts the criterion of appearance,[1] and [by that criterion] in either case it would be a mixture of like kinds! — Rather it is according to R. Hiyya's view, for R. Hiyya taught: In a mixture of nebelah meat and ritually slaughtered meat neutralization takes place.[2] And whose view does R. Hiyya follow? It cannot be that of the Rabbis, for they have said that only things which are offered up do not neutralize one another, but in a mixture of like kinds neutralization takes effect.[3] Neither can it be that of R. Judah, for according to R. Judah in any mixture of like kinds neutralization does not take effect! — In fact he follows the opinion of R. Judah, for R. Judah laid down the rule that in a mixture of like kinds neutralization does not take effect only in that case where it is possible for one kind to become like the other, but where it is not possible for one kind to become like the other, there neutralization does take effect. And they differ in this point: R. Hisda holds that we must consider the neutralizer,[4] but R. Hanina holds that we must consider what is to be neutralized.[5]

We have learnt: IF TWO MEAL-OFFERINGS FROM WHICH THE HANDFULS HAD NOT YET BEEN TAKEN WERE MIXED TOGETHER, BUT IT IS STILL POSSIBLE TO TAKE THE HANDFUL FROM EACH SEPARATELY, THEY ARE VALID; OTHERWISE THEY ARE INVALID, Now in this case we see that when the handful is taken from one, whereby the rest becomes the remainder, this remainder does not neutralize the other meal-offering from which the handful has not yet been taken.[6] Whose view is represented here? It cannot be that of the Rabbis, for they have said that only things which are offered up do not neutralize one another;[7] but in a mixture of like kinds neutralization takes effect. Obviously it is the view of R. Judah. Now this is well according to him who holds that we must consider what is to be neutralized, for here what is to be neutralized[8] can become like the neutralizer,[9] seeing that when the handful will have been taken from the other meal-offering there will be a remainder like that of the first meal-offering.[10] But according to him who holds that we must consider the neutralizer, [it will be asked here,] Can the remainder ever become like that from which the handful has not yet been taken?[11] Are we to say then that our Mishnah is not in accordance with R. Hiyya [as interpreted by R. Hisda]? — It is to be explained there according to R. Zera's dictum; for R. Zera said,[12] 'Burning' is stated with regard to the handful,[13] and 'burning' is also stated with regard to the remainder;[14] therefore as in the case of the handful, concerning which the expression 'burning' is used, [it is established that] one handful cannot neutralize the other,[15] so too in the case of the remainder, concerning which the expression 'burning' is also used, the remainder cannot neutralize the handful.[16]

Come and hear: IF THE HANDFUL [OF A MEAL-OFFERING] WAS MIXED WITH A MEAL-OFFERING FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL HAD NOT BEEN TAKEN, IT MUST NOT

BE OFFERED. IF, HOWEVER, IT WAS OFFERED, THEN THE MEAL-OFFERING FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL HAD BEEN TAKEN DISCHARGES THE OWNER'S OBLIGATION, WHILST THE OTHER FROM WHICH THE HANDFUL HAD NOT BEEN TAKEN DOES NOT DISCHARGE THE OWNER'S OBLIGATION. We see then that the meal-offering from which the handful had not been taken does not neutralize the handful. Whose view is this? It cannot be that of the Rabbis, for they have said that only things which are offered up do not neutralize one another; but in a mixture of like kinds neutralization takes effect. Obviously it is the view of R. Judah. Now it is well according to him who holds that we must consider the neutralizer, for here the neutralizer[17] can become like that which is to be neutralized, seeing that every particle thereof is appropriate to be taken up in the handful.[18] But according to him who holds that we must consider what is to be neutralized, [it will be asked,] Can the handful ever become like the meal-offering from which the handful has not yet been taken? Are we to say then that our Mishnah is not in accordance with R. Hiyya [as interpreted by R. Hanina]?[19] — This too must be explained in accordance with R. Zera's dictum.

Come and hear: IF THE HANDFUL WAS MIXED WITH THE REMAINDER OF THE MEAL-OFFERING OR WITH THE REMAINDER OF ANOTHER MEAL-OFFERING, IT MUST NOT BE OFFERED; BUT IF IT WAS OFFERED IT DISCHARGES THE OWNER'S OBLIGATION. Now here the neutralizer cannot become like that which is to be neutralized, nor can what is to be neutralized become like the neutralizer,[20] nevertheless the remainder does not neutralize the handful. Whose view is this? It cannot be that of the Rabbis, for etc.! — R. Zera answered, ‘Burning’ is stated with regard to the handful, and ‘burning’ is also stated with regard to the remainder; as in the case of the handful, concerning which the expression ‘burning’ is used, [it is established that] one handful cannot neutralize the other, so too in the case of the remainder, concerning which the expression ‘burning’ is also used, the remainder cannot neutralize the handful.[21]

Come and hear: If one seasoned it[22] with cumin or with sesame seed or with any other kind of spice, it is fit;[23] for it is unleavened bread, only that it is called seasoned unleavened bread. Now it was assumed that there were more spices than unleavened dough. According to him, then, who holds that we must consider what is to be neutralized, it is well, for what is to be neutralized[24] can become like the neutralizer, seeing that when it becomes mouldy it is like the spices.[25] But according to him who holds that we must consider the neutralizer, [it will be asked,] Can the spices become like the unleavened bread?[26] — We are dealing here with the case where there was not so much spices; indeed the larger part was the unleavened bread, and therefore it is not neutralized. This too is to be inferred [from the words of the Baraitha], for it reads, ‘It is unleavened bread, only that it is called seasoned unleavened bread’[27] This is conclusive.

When R. Kahana went up [to Palestine] he found the sons of R. Hiyya sitting and discoursing as follows: If one divided a tenth[28]

---

(1) V. supra 22a. Things that have the same appearance are regarded as of like kind; and nebelah meat and slaughtered meat would always be considered as of like kind, so that neutralization would not take effect.

(2) But only in one case, either where nebelah meat was confused with a larger quantity of slaughtered meat as R. Hisda would have it, or where slaughtered meat was confused with a larger quantity of nebelah meat as R. Hanina would have it.

(3) Whereas R. Hiyya holds that neutralization does take place in a mixture of nebelah meat and slaughtered meat, even though only in one case, v. prec. n.

(4) Sc. the substance which is in the majority in the mixture. If this substance can become like the substance which is in the minority, the mixture is deemed to be one of like kinds, and neutralization will not take place.

(5) Sc. the substance which is in the minority in the mixture. V. p. 147, n. 7

(6) It is certain that neutralization does not take place, for otherwise it would not be permitted subsequently (as stated in

the Mishnah) to take the handful from the second meal-offering.
(7) The remainder, however, is not a thing that is offered up, consequently it should neutralize the other meal-offering, even though the mixture is of like kinds.
(8) Sc. the other meal-offering from which the handful has not yet been taken.
(9) Sc. the remainder of the meal-offering from which the handful has been taken.
(10) And it is deemed to be a mixture of like kinds and neutralization does not take place.
(11) Obviously it cannot. The mixture is therefore one of unlike kinds and neutralization should take effect, so that it should not be permitted subsequently to take the handful from the second meal-offering.
(12) Infra, and Zeb. 110a,
(13) Lev, II, 2.
(14) Lev. II, 10, For whatever offering has a portion thereof burnt upon the altar comes under the law of 'ye shall not burn'.
(15) This is admitted even by R. Judah. V. supra p. 141.
(16) The effect of R. Zera's teaching is that the law of neutralization does not apply to any mixture of remainders and handfuls in any circumstances.
(17) Sc. the meal-offering from which the handful had not yet been taken.
(18) Consequently the mixture is deemed to be one of like kinds, and therefore neutralization does not take place. In cur. edd. this is added in the text. It is omitted in MS.M.
(19) This sentence is omitted in all MSS.
(20) Neutralization therefore should take effect.
(21) V. p. 149, nn. 1, 2 and 3.
(22) Sc. unleavened dough.
(23) To be used on the Passover night for fulfilling the command of eating unleavened bread.
(24) Here the unleavened dough.
(25) And it is no more unleavened bread.
(26) Of course not; consequently neutralization should take place and it should not be regarded as unleavened bread at all.
(27) Thus clearly showing that the main part is the unleavened bread and not the spices.
(28) The tenth part of an ephah of flour set aside for a meal-offering.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 24a

and put [the two halves] into the mixing vessel, and then a tebul yom[1] touched one of them, what would be the law?[2] Does the rule which we learnt that with consecrated things a vessel unites all that is therein,[3] apply only when they[4] are touching one another, but not when they do not touch one another; or perhaps this makes no difference? — Said he[5] to them, Did we learn, 'a vessel joins'?[6] We learnt 'a vessel unites'; that is, in all circumstances.[7]

If one placed another [half-tenth] between them, what is the law?[8] — He replied to them, [The rule is:] What stands in need of a vessel, the vessel unites; what does not stand in need of a vessel, the vessel does not unite.[9]

And what if a tebul yom inserted his finger between them?[10] — He replied: There is nothing other than earthenware vessels that can convey uncleanness through its air-space.[11]

He[5] then put to them this question: May the handful be taken from one [half] in respect of the other?[12] Is the principle of '[the vessel] uniting [its contents]' Biblical or only Rabbinical?[13] — They answered him, We have not heard of that, but we have heard of a similar case; for we have learnt: IF TWO MEAL-OFFERINGS FROM WHICH THE HANDFULS HAD NOT YET BEEN TAKEN WERE MIXED TOGETHER, BUT IT IS STILL POSSIBLE TO TAKE THE HANDFUL FROM EACH SEPARATELY, THEY ARE VALID; OTHERWISE THEY ARE INVALID. Now where it is possible to take the handful [from each separately, it states that] they are valid. But why? The rest

that is mixed together surely does not touch [the handful]?[14] — Raba, however, suggested that perhaps the masses were spread in the shape of a comb.[15]

What is then the ruling? Said Raba, Come and hear, for it has been taught: And he shall take up therefrom,[16] that is, from the whole; one may not therefore bring the tenth [divided] in two vessels and have the handful taken. It follows, however, that from one vessel which is like two vessels[17] the handful may be taken. Said Abaye to him, perhaps by 'two vessels' is meant, e.g., a kapiza-measure fixed in a kab-measure;[18] for although on top the contents are united, since the sides of the kapiza-measure form a partition below, one may not [bring the meal-offering therein]. And by one vessel which is like two vessels' is meant, e.g., a hen trough,[19] in which the contents, although separated by a partition, are nevertheless in contact. But in this case where they are not in contact the question still remains.

R. Jeremiah raised this question: How is it where the vessel unites [the two half-tenths within] and there is a connection by water [with another half-tenth lying outside]?[20] Does the rule which we learnt that with consecrated things a vessel unites all that is therein,[21] apply to what is inside but not to what is outside; or perhaps since there is a connection it is united thereby?[22] And if you were to decide that since there is a connection it is united thereby, this further question will arise: How is it where there is a connection by water [with one of the halves inside the vessel] and the vessel unites [the halves that are therein], and then a tebul yom touched the part that was outside?[23] Does the rule which

tacles, since the sides of the inner receptacle separate the contents of the one we have learnt that with consecrated things a vessel unites all that is therein, apply only to the case where [the uncleanness] came into contact with what was inside but not where it came into contact with what was outside; or perhaps this makes no difference? — These questions remain undecided.

Raba raised the following question: What is the position if a tenth was divided into halves and one of the halves became unclean; afterwards these two halves were placed in the mixing vessel[24] and a tebul yom touched that [half] which was already unclean? Do we say that it is sated with uncleanness[25] or not? Said Abaye to him, Do we then say that a thing can be sated with uncleanness? Surely we have learnt:[26] If a sheet which had contracted midras[27] uncleanness

---

(1) טבול יום, a person who, having been unclean, had immersed himself during the day and must await sunset before he is deemed fully clean. He suffers now only a slight degree of uncleanness; he is deemed to be unclean in the second degree and can affect with uncleanness terumah and consecrated things.

(2) Would the other part, not touched by the tebul yom, be unclean or not?

(3) And if only a part of the contents of the vessel becomes unclean, everything that is therein is unclean; v. Hag. III, 2; 20b.

(4) Sc. the contents of the vessel.

(5) R. Kahana.

(6) Which would imply that the contents of the vessel were in contact.

(7) Even when they are not in contact.

(8) I.e., after having divided a tenth into halves he added another half-tenth, placing it between the two previous halves, and then this extra half was touched by a tebul yom. The question is whether the other halves are affected with uncleanness or not.

(9) This extra half-tenth has no need of this vessel, and indeed could not be used together with the other halves in this vessel; consequently the other halves are not affected with uncleanness.

(10) Without having touched either the vessel or its contents.

(11) And therefore the contents of this vessel are clean.

(12) I.e., when taking the handful is it necessary to take some from each half, or may it be taken entirely from one half in respect of the whole vessel? It must be noted that there was no contact whatsoever between the two halves of the

meal-offering.
(13) If the principle is Biblical then it is to be applied to all cases, even though the result would be one of leniency, as here with the taking of the handful. On the other hand, were it only Rabbinical, it would be applied only to such cases as would result in a stringent ruling, as in the case of uncleanness.
(14) For only the quantities sufficient for the taking of the handfuls stand apart by themselves, the remainders of each meal-offering being mixed together, so that the remainder of one meal-offering is entirely separate from the handful of that same meal-offering. Nevertheless the offering is valid, presumably because all parts are united by the vessel; thus proving that the principle of 'uniting' is Biblical.
(15) Like the teeth of a comb, joined at one end and separate at the other. In our Mishnah, the two meal-offerings were lying side by side and separated only at the ends wherefrom the handfuls might be taken. Where, however, the two halves were quite apart the question still remains.
(16) Lev. VI, 8.
(17) I.e., where the flour is divided into halves in the one vessel and there is no contact at all between them.
(18) I.e., the kab vessel was constructed with a kapiza vessel fixed in its hollow, the two forming in fact only one vessel but with two separate receptacles. The result is that when both receptacles are filled to the brim with the flour of a meal-offering there is no contact between the contents of the two recepfrom the other. And even if the flour was heaped up to cover the sides of the kapiza or inner vessel, so that ostensibly there is contact between the contents of both receptacles, it is still invalid, for the contact between the contents is not made in the vessel, but outside the vessel. Kapiza is a small measure; for kab v. Glos.
(19) I.e., a vessel separated into two divisions by a low bar placed at the bottom of the vessel (Rashi). According to Maim. the division of the bar is at the top only, so that the contents, although appearing divided, are really united below; v. Yad. Pesule ha-Mukdashim, XI, 22.
(20) There were two half-tenths in the vessel not in contact, and another half-tenth lying outside the vessel was connected by water (i.e., a pipe or conduit running from the vessel to the place where the outside half-tenth lay) with one of the halves inside the vessel. Now the other half-tenth that lay in the vessel and which was in no wise connected with the outside half-tenth was rendered unclean; and the question is whether or not the uncleanness can be passed on to the half-tenth that is lying outside in the following stages: first the uncleanness is passed on by reason of the uniting force of the vessel to the other half-tenth that is with it in the vessel, and then the latter passes on the uncleanness to what is lying outside by reason of the water connection.
(21) Hag. III, 2.
(22) And the half-tenth that is outside becomes unclean too,
(23) The question is whether in the reverse process, where the uncleanness is to be brought in from the outside into the vessel, the connection mentioned would serve as a link so as to convey the uncleanness within.
(24) And there was no contact between them. At this stage there is no doubt at all that the other half-tenth is not unclean, since at the time when one half-tenth contracted uncleanness it was not in the vessel with the other half-tenth.
(25) I.e., once it has been rendered unclean it cannot suffer any further uncleanness, so that the other half-tenth that is now with it in the vessel remains clean.
(26) Kel. XXVII, 9.
(27) Heb. מדרם. That degree of uncleanness arising when an unclean person, of those mentioned in Lev. XV, 4 and 25, lies or sits or treads upon or leans with the body against an object, provided that such object was fit and generally used for one of the above purposes.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 24b

was used as a curtain, it becomes free of midras uncleanness[1] but remains unclean by reason of contact with midras uncleanness. R. Jose said, What midras uncleanness has it touched? If, however, one that had an issue had touched it,[2] it would be unclean by reason of contact with one that had an issue.[3] At any rate, it says, if one that had an issue had touched it, it would be unclean, presumably even though [this contact was] subsequent [to the midras uncleanness], that is to say, it first had contracted midras uncleanness and then further uncleanness by reason of contact with one that had an issue. Now why is this? Should we not say it was sated with uncleanness?[4] — He replied, Whence do you know to say that this contact by one that had an issue was subsequent [to the midras

uncleanness]? Perhaps it was prior to the midras uncleanness, so that it was a case of a graver uncleanness being imposed upon a lighter uncleanness.[5] Here, however, since at each [contact] there is only a light uncleanness, it is not so![6] One might prove it, however, from the subsequent [Mishnah] which reads: R. Jose agrees that where two sheets lay folded one above the other and one that had an issue sat upon them, the upper has contracted midras uncleanness, and the lower has contracted midras uncleanness and also uncleanness by reason of contact with midras uncleanness. Now why is this? Should we not say it was sated with uncleanness? — There they[7] come simultaneously, whilst here they come one after another.

Raba said, Where a tenth was divided [into halves] and one [half] was lost so that another was brought as a substitute, and then it was found again, and now all three [half-tenths] are in the mixing vessel — if that which had been lost became unclean, then it is united with the first half-tenth,[8] but not with the substituted half-tenth.[9] If the substituted half-tenth became unclean, then it is united with the first half-tenth but not with the lost half-tenth. If the first half-tenth became unclean, then it is united with each of the others.[10] Abaye said, Even if any one of the half-tenths became unclean, it is united with each of the others, since they all belong together.[11]

And so it is with regard to the taking of the handful. If the handful was taken from the half-tenth which had been lost, then what was left of it and the first half-tenth may be eaten[12] but not the substituted half-tenth. If it was taken from the substituted half-tenth, then what was left of it and the first half-tenth may be eaten but not the half-tenth which had been lost. If it was taken from the first half-tenth, then [what was left of it may be eaten but] the others may not be eaten.[13] Abaye said, Even though the handful was taken from any one half-tenth, the other two may not be eaten, since they all belong together.

R. Papa demurred, [You say that] what was left of it may be eaten, but one third of the handful has not been offered![14] R. Isaac the son of R. Mesharsheya also demurred, How may the handful be offered, is not one third thereof unhallowed? — R. Ashi answered, The taking of the handful rests with the mind of the priest, and clearly when the priest takes the handful he does so only in respect of a tenth.[15] [

---

(1) Since it is no longer intended to be used for any of the purposes (specified in the prec. n.) which make it susceptible to midras uncleanness.

(2) Before it was used as a curtain. At this stage the sheet bears two kinds of uncleanness: midras uncleanness and the uncleanness from contact with one that had an issue.

(3) For as soon as it is used as a curtain the midras uncleanness vanishes and there remains now the uncleanness from contact with one that had an issue.

(4) And once it has contracted midras uncleanness it was no more susceptible to any further uncleanness.

(5) And it is admitted by all that a thing which had contracted a lighter uncleanness (i.e., one which can only convey uncleanness to foodstuffs and liquids) cannot be so sated with uncleanness as to preclude any graver uncleanness (i.e., one which can convey uncleanness even to men and vessels).

(6) For foodstuffs can only suffer light uncleanness. In our case, therefore, since the half-tenth has already contracted a light uncleanness it cannot suffer a further similar uncleanness.

(7) The two kinds of uncleanness.

(8) I.e., the half-tenth which had not been lost will also be unclean for these two originally formed the tenth.

(9) And this half remains clean; for at no time was it contemplated that what was lost and what was substituted for it should together make up the tenth.

(10) For the first half-tenth was intended to be taken in the first place together with what was lost, and subsequently with what was substituted for it, so that a relation was set up between the first half-tenth and each of the others, and therefore all are unclean.

(11) Lit., ‘members of the same narrow house’; i.e., they all were intended to be used for the one meal-offering.

(12) Since originally these two made up the tenth for the meal-offering.

(13) The first half-tenth was intended to go with each of the other half-tenths and, inasmuch as the handful can serve only in respect of one tenth, there is one half-tenth which has not been rendered permissible by the handful; and as it is not known which it is, both may not be eaten.
(14) Presumably when the handful was taken out and offered up it was intended to serve everything that was in the vessel, so that one third of the handful should not have been offered, since that represented the superfluous half-tenth. Consequently the handful must be regarded as having been incomplete so that what was left of it cannot be permitted to be eaten. The reading 'one third' in the text is supported by MS.M. and Sh. Mek. In cur. edd. the text states 'one sixth'; the meaning, however, is identical with the foregoing explanation, and is arrived at in this way. Since it is not known which of the two remaining half-tenths is the superfluous one which causes one third of the handful to be nullified, this result is therefore attributed in equal shares to each of the half-tenths, so that each is responsible for the nullification of one sixth of the handful,
(15) The third half-tenth is disregarded by the priest when he takes the handful; therefore, the residue of that half-tenth from which the handful was taken may be eaten, whilst the two remaining half-tenths may not, since we do not know which was the half-tenth disregarded by the priest. Quaere: where the priest expressly declared which half-tenth he disregarded and which he took account of, would the latter be permitted to be eaten? V. Likkute Halakoth. a.l.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 25a

MISHNAH. IF THE HANDFUL HAD BECOME UNCLEAN AND YET WAS OFFERED, THE PLATE[1] RENDERS IT ACCEPTABLE,[2] BUT IF IT HAD BEEN TAKEN OUT [OF THE TEMPLE COURT] AND WAS AFTERWARDS OFFERED, THE PLATE DOES NOT RENDER IT ACCEPTABLE; FOR THE PLATE ONLY RENDERS ACCEPTABLE THE OFFERING WHICH WAS UNCLEAN BUT NOT THAT WHICH WAS TAKEN OUT.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: It is written, And Aaron shall bear the iniquity of the holy things.[3] What iniquity is it that it atones for? Should you say it is the iniquity of piggul[4] — but it has already been said, it shall not be accepted.[5] Should you say it is the iniquity of nothar[6] — but it has already been said, Neither shall it be imputed unto him.[7] Hence it atones for nothing other than the iniquity of uncleanness, since an exception to the general rule has been made for the community.[8] R. Zera demurred, Perhaps it is the iniquity of an offering having been taken outside [that the plate atones for], since an exception to the general rule had been made in the case of the high places?[9] — Abaye answered, It is written, That they may be accepted before the Lord,[10] that is, the iniquity committed before the Lord[11] [is atoned for by the plate], but not the iniquity of an offering having been taken outside.[12] R. Ela'a demurred, perhaps it is the iniquity of [a service being performed with] the left hand [that is atoned for by the plate], since an exception to the general rule has been made on the Day of Atonement?[13] — Abaye answered him, The verse states 'iniquity', that is, the iniquity that was incurred is set aside;[14] on the Day of Atonement, however, it is proper to serve with the left hand. R. Ashi answered thus, The verse says, 'The iniquity of the holy things', but not the iniquity of them that offer the offering.[15] R. Sima the son of R. Idi said to R. Ashi (others report: R. Sima the son of R. Ashi said to R. Ashi): perhaps it is the iniquity of a blemish in the offering [that is atoned for by the plate], since an exception to the general rule has been made in the case of bird-offerings, for a Master has said, The unblemished state and the male sex are prerequisite in animal-offerings but not in bird-offerings?[16] — He replied, It is for your sake that it is written, It shall not be accepted;[17] and also, For it shall not be acceptable for you.[18]

Our Rabbis taught: If the blood of an offering became unclean and yet was sprinkled inadvertently[19] it is acceptable, if deliberately it is not acceptable. This is the rule only with a private offering, but in the case of an offering of the community it is acceptable, whether inadvertently or deliberately. In the case of an offering by a gentile[20] [the rule is] whether inadvertently or deliberately, whether accidentally or intentionally,

---

(1) The High Priest's plate of pure gold worn on the forehead (v. Ex. XXVIII 36-38). Its function was to secure the

Divine acceptance of a sacrifice which was offered although it had been rendered unclean.
(2) The meal-offering is valid and the remainder may be eaten.
(3) Ex. XXVIII, 38. This verse intimates that the High Priest's plate atones for some fault in connection with the offering.
(4) Heb. פיגול 'abomination', v. Glos. Here meaning: the intention expressed during one of the services of the sacrifice of eating the flesh thereof outside the prescribed place.
(5) Lev. XIX, 7. The text adopted in the translation is in accordance with the Sifra which is supported by Rashi (Pes. 16b s.v. אי זה) and Sh. Mek. But v. Tosaf. s.v. ונשא.
(6) Heb. נותר 'left over'; v. Glos. Here meaning: the intention expressed during one of the services of the sacrifice of eating the flesh thereof outside the prescribed time.
(7) Ibid., VII, 18.
(8) A sacrifice on behalf of the community may be offered even in a state of uncleanness.
(9) Although the prohibition against taking out the offering was already in force at the Tabernacle in the wilderness (v. Pes. 82a) it did not apply later on when the Tabernacle was housed at Nob and at Gibeon, for then it was permitted for every individual to set up a high place or altar in any place and offer sacrifices there.
(10) Ex. XXVIII, 38.
(11) I.e., whilst the offering is within the Temple Court.
(12) An iniquity which is not committed 'before the Lord',
(13) When the High Priest performed service with his left hand too; v. Yoma 47a.
(14) Lit., 'I have set it aside'. Now the uncleanness of an offering is admittedly a defect, but since it is of no consequence in the case of the community, such defect in the offering of an individual will be atoned for by the plate.
(15) The plate therefore cannot atone for the guilt of a service performed with the left hand, for that is the guilt of the officiating priest and such guilt is expressly excluded.
(16) Supra 6a, Hul. 23a, and elsewhere.
(17) Lev. XXII, 23.
(18) Ibid, 20. These verses indicate that under no circumstances are blemished animals acceptable for an offering.
(19) V. infra as to the meaning of 'inadvertently', whether it refers to the contracting of the uncleanness or the sprinkling.
(20) Gentiles were also allowed to offer either freewill- or votive-offerings; v. infra 73b.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 25b

it is not acceptable.

A contradiction was pointed out, for it was taught: For what guilt does the plate atone? For the blood or the flesh or the fat of an offering which became unclean, whether inadvertently or deliberately, whether accidentally or intentionally, whether in a private offering or in an offering of the community![1] — Said R. Joseph, There is no contradiction, for one[2] [Baraitha] states the view of R. Jose, the other the view of the Rabbis. For it has been taught: One must not set aside unclean produce as terumah[3] for clean produce; if one did so inadvertently the terumah is valid, but if deliberately the terumah is not valid.[4] R. Jose says, Whether one did it inadvertently or deliberately the terumah is valid.[5] But perhaps all that R. Jose said was that we do not penalize him; have you heard him say that the plate atones for [the uncleanness of] the eatable portions of the offering?[6] Has it not been taught: R. Eliezer says, The plate atones for [the uncleanness of] the eatable portions; but R. Jose says, The plate does not atone for [the uncleanness of] the eatable portions? You must reverse [the authorities and read thus]: R. Eliezer says, The plate does not atone for [the uncleanness of] the eatable portions; but R. Jose says, The plate does atone for [the uncleanness of] the eatable portions. But how can you reverse [the authorities]? Behold, it has been taught: I might have thought that [an unclean person who ate[7] of] the flesh of a sacrifice which had become unclean before the sprinkling of the blood would be culpable[8] on the ground of uncleanness,[9] it is therefore written, Every one that is clean shall eat the flesh; but the soul that eateth of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, that pertain unto the Lord, having his uncleanness upon him, that soul shall be cut

off from his people,[10] signifying that [the unclean person who eats of] what has been rendered permitted to those that are clean is culpable on account of uncleanness, but [the unclean person who eats of] what has not been rendered permitted to those that are clean[11] is not culpable on account of uncleanness. But perhaps it is not so, but rather it signifies that [the unclean person who eats of] what may now be eaten by those that are clean is culpable on account of uncleanness, but [the unclean person who eats of] what may not now be eaten by those that are clean[12] is not culpable on account of uncleanness, and so I would exclude those parts of the offering which had been left overnight and which had been taken out [of the Temple court], since they may not be eaten by those that are clean.[13] The verse therefore states, That pertain unto the Lord, an inclusive expression. I might then include the flesh that was piggul and that which was left over — but is not that which was left over identical with that which had been left overnight? Read therefore: [I might then include] the flesh that was piggul, that it shall be like that which was left over[14] — the verse therefore states, Of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, an exclusive expression. And why do you prefer to include the one class and exclude the other? Since the verse uses an inclusive and also an exclusive expression, I include those which were at one time permitted,[15] but I exclude those which were at no time permitted.[16] If you now ask, Why is [an unclean person] culpable on the ground of uncleanness for eating after the sprinkling of the blood flesh which had become unclean before the sprinkling?[17] [I reply], It is because the plate atones for it.[18] Now [one is culpable] only for that which became unclean but not for that which was taken out.[19] And whom have you heard say that where the offering had been taken out [of the Temple court] the sprinkling is of no effect? It is R. Eliezer[20] ; and yet it states [in the Baraitha] that the plate atones for [the uncleanness of] the eatable portions![21] — R. Hisda then said, There is no difficulty at all; for one [Baraitha] states the view of R. Eliezer,[22] the other the view of the Rabbis. But perhaps all that R. Eliezer said was that the plate atones for [the uncleanness of] the eatable portions; have you heard him say that we do not impose any penalty?[23] — Indeed we have, for just as we assumed that to be R. Jose's view[24] so we may assume it to be R. Eliezer's view too; for it has been taught: R. Eliezer says, Whether one [set apart unclean produce as terumah for clean produce] inadvertently or deliberately, the terumah is valid. But perhaps R. Eliezer said so[25] only in the case of terumah which is less grave; have you heard him say so in the case of holy things which are more grave? — Then to whom will you attribute that [Baraitha]?[26]

Rabina said, As to its uncleanness, whether [it was rendered unclean] inadvertently or deliberately, [the offering] is acceptable; but as to its sprinkling, if [it was sprinkled] inadvertently it is acceptable, but if deliberately it is not acceptable.[27] R. Shila said, As to its sprinkling, whether [it was sprinkled] inadvertently or deliberately it is acceptable; but as to its uncleanness,if [it was rendered unclean] inadvertently it is acceptable, but if deliberately it is not acceptable. And how does R. Shila explain the Baraitha which reads, ‘Which became unclean, whether inadvertently or deliberately’? — It means, it was rendered unclean inadvertently, and it was sprinkled either inadvertently or deliberately.

---

(1) It is manifest that the plate effects atonement for uncleanness, even though deliberately caused, in the case of a private offering; thus in conflict with the first quoted Baraitha.

(2) The latter Baraitha.

(3) V. Glos.

(4) For the Rabbis penalized the one who acted deliberately in defiance of the law. As to the effect of this act, whether it is absolutely null and void or only that it does not render the rest of the produce permitted although what was set aside is terumah, v. Yeb. 89a.

(5) Accordingly the latter Baraitha which states that even if part of the offering was deliberately made unclean the plate atones for it represents the view of R. Jose.

(6) As opposed to the sacrificial portions, for the uncleanness of which all agree that the plate atones. For that is what the latter Baraitha, attributed to R. Jose, teaches when it says, inter alia, that the plate atones for the flesh which became unclean. But this view is not generally held, and on what grounds therefore do we attribute such a view to R. Jose?

(7) Before the sprinkling of the blood.
(8) Incurring the penalty of kareth.
(9) MS.M., reads: 'I might have thought that (an unclean person who partook of the clean flesh of the offering) before the sprinkling of the blood would be liable on the ground of uncleanness.' This reading is preferred by Rashi.
(10) Lev. VII, 19, 20.
(11) I.e., flesh of an offering before the sprinkling of the blood.
(12) Even though it had once been rendered permitted to them, as in the case where the flesh, having been rendered permitted after the sprinkling of the blood, became unfit subsequently by being left overnight or by being taken out of the Temple court.
(13) And therefore whosoever eats of such flesh whilst in a state of uncleanness does not incur the penalty of kareth.
(14) And whosoever eats of the offering that became piggul (v. Glos.) whilst in a state of uncleanness incurs the penalty of kareth, as is the case with the flesh that had been left overnight.
(15) Sc. the offering which had been left overnight or had been taken out of the Sanctuary after the sprinkling; for these had been rendered permitted with the sprinkling.
(16) Sc. the offering which was rendered piggul through a wrongful intention expressed at the sprinkling of the blood, in which case the offering was never rendered permitted.
(17) For that flesh was at no time permitted to be eaten; nevertheless one is liable for eating it whilst in a state of uncleanness, v. Zeb. 106a and Hul. 101a, for only piggul is excluded in the above Baraitha as being the only case of an offering at no time permitted.
(18) And the sprinkling of the blood is perfectly valid, so that the offering is 'rendered permitted', even though it may not be eaten, and therefore one is culpable.
(19) Thus if an unclean person ate, after the sprinkling, the flesh of the offering which had become unclean before the sprinkling he would be liable, but not if he ate after the sprinkling the flesh which had been taken out before the sprinkling, for in the former case the sprinkling is valid but not in the latter.
(20) V. Me'il. 6b.
(21) But according to the answer given above ('Reverse the authorities') R. Eliezer holds the opposite view!
(22) The Baraitha (p. 159) which teaches that the plate atones for the uncleanness deliberately caused even in a private offering represents the view of R. Eliezer, since therein is also taught that the plate atones for the uncleanness of the eatable portions, which is clearly R. Eliezer's view.
(23) I.e., that the plate secures atonement where one deliberately sprinkled the blood which had become unclean.
(24) From R. Jose's ruling in the case of terumah it was inferred that in all cases an act deliberately done in defiance of the law is valid and no penalty is to be imposed.
(25) That a wrongful act though deliberately done is nevertheless valid.
(26) Which teaches that even deliberately it is acceptable. It must be R. Eliezer.
(27) Rabina in this way explains away the contradiction between the two statements. The first Baraitha which states with regard to the private offering. 'If inadvertently it is acceptable, if deliberately it is not acceptable', deals with the sprinkling of the unclean blood. The second Baraitha which states that the plate atones for the blood which became unclean 'whether inadvertently or deliberately', obviously deals with the uncleanness; the sprinkling, however, would be acceptable only if done inadvertently.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 26a

Come and hear: It was taught: If the blood became unclean and It was sprinkled inadvertently, it is acceptable, if deliberately it is not acceptable![1] — It means, If the blood became unclean and it was sprinkled, whether it was sprinkled inadvertently or deliberately, if it was rendered unclean inadvertently it is acceptable, but if deliberately it is not acceptable.

MISHNAH. IF THE REMAINDER OF THE MEAL-OFFERING BECAME UNCLEAN OR WAS BURNT OR LOST, ACCORDING TO THE RULE OF R. ELIEZER[2] IT IS LAWFUL [TO BURN THE HANDFUL], BUT ACCORDING TO THE RULE OF R. JOSHUA[3] IT IS UNLAWFUL.

GEMARA. Rab said, That is so provided the whole of the remainder became unclean,[4] but not if only a part of it became unclean. Now it was assumed[5] that this provision applied only to the case where it became unclean but not to the case where it was burnt or lost.[6] But what could be [Rab's] view? If he holds that what is left thereof is something of consequence, then the same should be the case where it was burnt or lost. And if he holds that what is left thereof is of no consequence, but that in the case where it became unclean the reason[7] is that the plate atones [for the uncleanness of the eatable portions], then the same should be the case[7] even where the whole of the remainder [became unclean]! — Indeed he holds that what is left thereof is something of consequence, and as it is in the case where it became unclean, so it is where it was burnt or lost; the only reason, however, why [Rab] dealt with the case where it became unclean was that it was the first [mentioned in our Mishnah]. And so it was taught [in the following Baraitha]: R. Joshua says, If of any animal-offering mentioned in the Torah there remained an olive's bulk of the flesh or an olive's bulk of the fat, [the priest] may sprinkle the blood; if there remained a half-olive's bulk of the flesh and a half-olive's bulk of the fat, he may not sprinkle the blood. In the case of a burnt-offering, however, even if there remained a half-olive's bulk of the flesh and a half-olive's bulk of the fat, he may sprinkle the blood, since it is wholly burnt. And in the case of a meal-offering, even if all of it still remains, he may not sprinkle the blood.[8] How does the meal-offering come in here? R. Papa explained that it referred to the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings. For one might have thought that since it accompanies the animal-offering it is deemed to be part of the animal-offering; we are therefore taught [that it is not so].

Whence do we know this?[9] — R. Johanan said in the name of R. Ishmael (while some trace the tradition further back to R. Joshua b. Hananiah), The verse says, And he shall burn the fat for a sweet savour unto the Lord;[10] hence [the blood is sprinkled on account of] the fat even if there is no flesh,[11] We thus know it of the fat, but whence do we know it of the caul of the liver and of the two kidneys?[12] — For it has been stated [in the abovementioned Baraitha], ‘And in the case of a meal-offering, even if all of it still remains, he may not sprinkle the blood’; that is, on account of the meal-offering he may not sprinkle the blood, but it is to be inferred that he may sprinkle on account of the caul of the liver or of the two kidneys. Whence do we know it? — R. Johanan explained on his own authority, It is written, ‘For a sweet savour,’ signifying that [the blood may be sprinkled on account of] everything that is offered up for a sweet savour.

And it was absolutely necessary for the verse to have written ‘the fat’ as well as "for a sweet savour’. For if only ‘the fat’ were written, I should have said that only on account of the fat [may the blood be sprinkled] but not on account of the caul of the liver or the two kidneys; the Divine Law therefore stated ‘for a sweet savour’. And if only ‘for a sweet savour’ were written, I should have said that even on account of the meal-offering [may the blood be sprinkled]; the Divine Law therefore stated ‘the fat’.[13]

MISHNAH. IF [HE DID] NOT [PUT THE HANDFUL] INTO A VESSEL OF MINISTRY[14] IT IS INVALID; BUT R. SIMEON DECLARES IT VALID, IF HE BURNT THE HANDFUL TWICE,[15] IT IS VALID.

GEMARA. R. Judah the son of R. Hiyya said, What is the reason for R. Simeon's view? It is written, It is most holy as the sin-offering and as the guilt-offering;[16] that is to say, if he is about to perform the service[17] with his hand,[18] he must do so with his right hand as the sin-offering; but if he is about to offer it in a vessel, he may do so with his left hand as the guilt-offering.[19] R. Jannai said,[20] Since he took the handful from a vessel of ministry he may offer it up and burn it even in his girdle and even in a potsherd. R. Nahman b. Isaac said, All agree that the handful must be sanctified.[21]

An objection was raised: If the fat, the limbs and the wood were brought up to be burnt [upon the

altar] with the hand or with a vessel, with the right hand or with the left, they are valid. If the handful, the incense-offering and the frankincense were brought up [upon the altar] with the hand or with a vessel, with the right hand or with the left, they are valid. Is this not a refutation of the view of R. Judah the son of R. Hiyya?[22] — R. Judah the son of R. Hiyya could answer you: It is to be taken as separate cases thus, If [brought up] with the hand, it must be with the right hand only; if with a vessel, it may be either with the right hand or with the left.

Come and hear: If he took out the handful from[23] a vessel of ministry but neither sanctified it in a vessel of ministry nor offered it up to be burnt in a vessel of ministry, it is invalid. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon declare it valid if only it had been put into a vessel![24] — Render: After it had been put into a vessel.[25]

Come and hear: But the Sages say, The handful requires vessels of ministry; thus he takes out the handful from a vessel of ministry, sanctifies it in a vessel of ministry and offers it up to be burnt in a vessel of ministry. R. Simeon says, As long as he has taken out the handful from a vessel of ministry he may offer it and burn it not in a vessel of ministry and that suffices![26] — Render: As long as he has taken out the handful from a vessel of ministry and also sanctified it in a vessel of ministry he may offer it and burn it and that suffices.

Come and hear: If he took out the handful with his right hand and transferred it into his left hand, he should transfer it back again to his right hand. If while it was in his left hand

---

(1) This obviously means that if the unclean blood was sprinkled deliberately it is not acceptable; contra R. Shila.

(2) Who holds (Pes. 77a) that the blood of a sacrifice may be sprinkled even though the flesh is not available (either because it became unclean or was burnt or lost); likewise the handful of the meal-offering may be burnt upon the altar even though the remainder is not available.

(3) Who holds that where the flesh was not available it is not lawful to sprinkle the blood; similarly here, where the remainder is not available it is not lawful to burn the handful.

(4) Then only does R. Joshua maintain that it is unlawful to burn the handful.

(5) Since Rab only dealt with the case where it became unclean.

(6) I.e., even though only a part of the remainder was burnt or lost R. Joshua still maintains that it is unlawful to burn the handful.

(7) That it is lawful to burn the handful.

(8) V. supra p. 51 and the notes thereon.

(9) That the blood may be sprinkled even though only an olive's bulk of the fat remained.

(10) Lev. XVII, 6.

(11) For the verse reads: And the priest shall sprinkle the blood . . . and burn the fat for a sweet savour, which clearly shows that the sprinkling is performed on account of the fat.

(12) That the blood may be sprinkled even though only these parts of the offering remained.

(13) The result is that the blood may be sprinkled on account of anything that is offered up for a sweet savour provided it is part of the animal like the fat.

(14) But the priest immediately emptied his handful upon the altar.

(15) I.e., he divided the handful into halves and burnt a half at a time.

(16) Lev. VI, 10, in reference to the meal-offering.

(17) I.e., burn the handful,

(18) Like the sin-offering whose blood is sprinkled with the finger of the right hand.

(19) The blood of which is dashed from the vessel against the altar, and such service, according to R. Simeon (v. Zeb. 24b), may be performed with the left hand, and in the case of the leper's guilt-offering must be performed with the left hand (v. Sh. Mek.).

(20) R. Jannai interprets R. Simeon's view as he understands it.

(21) I.e., it must be put into a vessel of ministry. All that R. Simeon permits is to take out the handful after it had been sanctified in a vessel of ministry and offer it with the hand upon the altar.

(22) This Baraitha evidently represents R. Simeon's view since it declares valid the offering of the handful with the hand, yet it also permits the use of the left hand; contra R. Judah.

(23) The word שלא 'not', found in cur. edd., is struck out by Sh. Mek. and is wanting in MS.M.

(24) Though not necessarily a vessel of ministry; contra R. Nahman.

(25) The meaning is, after the handful had been sanctified in a vessel of ministry the services which follow, as the bringing nigh and the burning, do not, according to R. Eleazar and R. Simeon, require a vessel.

(26) Contra R. Nahman.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 26b

he expressed the intention [of eating the remainder] outside the prescribed place or outside the prescribed time it is invalid, but there is no penalty of kareth; if[1] while it was in his right hand he expressed the intention [of eating the remainder] outside the prescribed place it is invalid but there is no penalty of kareth, but if [he intended to eat it] outside the prescribed time it is piggul and there is also the penalty of kareth. This is the opinion of R. Eleazar and R. Simeon. But the Sages say, As soon as he transferred it into his left hand the transfer rendered it invalid, the reason being that it still required sanctification in a vessel, and since it has been transferred into the left hand it is on the same footing as when the blood of an offering had poured out from the throat on to the ground and had been gathered up, in which case it is invalid.[2] Hence it is clear that according to R. Eleazar and R. Simeon the putting into the vessel of ministry is not essential. This surely refutes R. Nahman's view, and supports the view of R. Judah the son of R. Hiyya.[3] Is it also a refutation of R. Jannai's view?[4] — R. Jannai can answer, I am in agreement with the Tanna who taught the Baraitha concerning the burning [of the fat etc.], and the terms thereof are not to be taken as separate cases.[5]

IF HE BURNT THE HANDFUL TWICE IT IS VALID. R. Joshua b. Levi said, Twice but not more than twice. But R. Johanan said, Twice and even more than twice. What is the issue between them? — R. Zera answered, The issue between them is as to whether the handful may be less than the quantity of two olives' bulk and whether the burning of a quantity less than an olive's bulk counts as an offering.[6] R. Joshua b. Levi is of the opinion that the handful may not be less than two olives' bulk and also that the burning of a quantity less than an olive's bulk does not count as an offering;[7] but R. Johanan maintains that the handful may be less than the quantity of two olives' bulk and that the burning of a quantity less than an olive's bulk counts as an offering.[8]

It was stated: From what time does the handful render the remainder permissible to be eaten? R. Hanina says, As soon as the fire has taken hold of it;[9] and R. Johanan says, Only when the fire has burnt the greater part of it. Rab Judah said to Rabbah b. R. Isaac, I will explain to you the reason for R. Johanan's view; for it is written, And lo, the smoke of the land went up as the smoke of a furnace,[10] and a furnace does not send up smoke until the fire has burnt up the greater part.[11]

Rabin b. R. Adda said to Raba, Your pupils report that R. Amram pointed out [the following difficulty]: It was taught: I only know that things that are usually offered by night, e.g., the limbs and the fat parts of the offering, may be offered up and burnt after sunset and are allowed to continue burning throughout the night; but whence do I know that things that are usually offered by day, e.g., the handful, the frankincense, the incense-offering, the meal-offering of the priests,the anointed High Priest's meal-offering and, the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings, may also be offered up and burnt after sunset? — But have you not said, 'Things that are usually offered by day'?[12] Say rather: at sunset,[13] — whence then do I know that these also are allowed to continue burning throughout the night? From the verse, This is the law of the burnt-offering,[14] an inclusive expression. Now if it is offered up at sunset it can hardly be possible that the fire will have burnt the greater portion of it [by sunset]![15] — This is no difficulty, for here [in the latter case] it deals with the handful being taken up, and there with it rendering the remainder permissible.[16] R. Eleazar reads [in the above]: 'after sunset', and explains it as referring to the pieces that have burst off the altar,[17] And

so, too, when R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he explained it in the name of R. Jannai as referring to the pieces that had burst off the altar. But could R. Jannai have said so? Surely R. Jannai has said, Any part of the incense which had burst off the altar, even if it was a whole grain, may not be put back! Moreover, R. Hanina b. Minyomi taught at the school of R. Eliezer b. Jacob: It is written, Whereto the fire hath consumed the burnt-offering on the altar,[18] that is, you may put back unconsumed parts of the burnt-offering [if they had burst off the altar], but you must not put back unconsumed parts of the incense! — Omit 'incense'.[19]

R. Assi said, When R. Eleazar was studying the laws of the meal-offering he raised the following question: How is it if he placed the handful [upon the altar] and then put the wood-pile on top of it?[20] Is this regarded as a way of burning or not? — This question remains undecided.

Hezekiah raised the question: How is it if he placed the limbs [of an offering upon the altar] and then put the wood-pile above them? [Shall we say,] since the Divine Law says, Upon the wood,[21] then they must actually be upon the wood; or, since there is another verse which reads, Whereto the fire hath consumed the burnt-offering on the altar,[22] he may do it either the one way or the other? — This, too, remains undecided.

R. Isaac Nappaha raised the question: How is it if he placed the limbs by the side of the wood-pile? Of course according to him who maintains[23] that 'upon' must be taken in its literal meaning, there can be no question here,

---

(1) This passage is omitted in many MSS. The translation is based upon the text as emended by Sh. Mek.

(2) For did it not require sanctification in a vessel then the placing of the handful in the left hand would be regarded on the same footing as when the blood of an animal-offering had poured out from the vessel on to the ground, in which case all agree that it may be gathered up again and it is valid. Cf. Yoma 48a.

(3) For the Baraitha states that he must transfer it back again to the right hand which conforms with R. Judah's teaching that if the hand is used it must be the right hand only.

(4) For R. Jannai who allows the offering of the handful in a potsherd would surely allow it to be offered in the left hand, nevertheless this Baraitha insists upon its being transferred back again into the right hand.

(5) V. supra p. 166. According to that Baraitha it is permitted to offer the handful in the left hand.

(6) Lit., 'there is a burning of less than an olive's bulk'.

(7) So that if the handful, which must not be less than two olives' bulk, was divided equally into two parts there would be an olive's bulk for each burning, but this would not be so if it were divided into more than two parts.

(8) It is therefore immaterial whether it is divided into two or more parts.

(9) Even if only a part thereof.

(10) Gen. XIX, 28.

(11) And of the handful it is written והקטיר (Lev. II, 2), which would mean, and he shall cause the smoke (קיטור) to go up.

(12) And there can be no doubt at all that such may not be offered after sunset.

(13) I.e., just before sunset.

(14) Lev. VI, 2. 'The law' is a comprehensive and all-inclusive expression, and here teaches that one law applies to all things that are brought up on the altar.

(15) And if the handful has not been offered before the sunset of that day it becomes invalid; consequently, since it may be placed upon the altar just before sunset, as soon as the fire has taken hold of it it is deemed to be offered, which is contrary to R. Johanan.

(16) It is true that as soon as the fire has taken hold of it it is deemed to be offered, but only in the sense that it has been taken up and accepted by the altar as an offering on the same day before sunset, so that it is valid. But, maintains R. Johanan, it will only render the remainder permissible to be eaten when the fire has burnt the greater part of it.

(17) And these may be put back upon the altar throughout the night. The handful, however, had been placed on the altar before sunset.

(18) Ibid. VI, 3.

(19) From the Baraitha quoted by R. Amram according to which portions of incense which had burst off the altar may be put back.
(20) Normally the wood-pile is arranged upon the altar and the parts of the offering are put on top of the wood.
(21) Lev. I, 8: And Aaron's sons, the priests, shall lay the pieces . . . in order upon the wood . . . which is upon the altar.
(22) Ibid VI, 3, which verse shows that the burnt-offering was put actually upon the surface of the altar and not necessarily upon the wood.
(23) V. infra 96a.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 27a

for here is written, Upon the wood. The question arises only according to him who maintains that 'upon' may mean 'near to'. How is it then? Do we also explain 'upon' here as 'near to'; or perhaps, since the phrases 'upon the wood' and 'upon the altar' are in juxtaposition, as in the latter phrase 'upon' is taken in its literal meaning so in the former 'upon' is to be taken in its literal meaning? — This, too, remains undecided.

MISHNAH. OF THE HANDFUL THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE.[1] OF THE TENTH[2] THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE. OF THE WINE[3] THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE. OF THE OIL[4] THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE. OF THE FINE FLOUR AND THE OIL THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE HANDFUL AND THE FRANKINCENSE THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER.

GEMARA. [OF THE HANDFUL THE ABSENCE OF THE SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE.] Why is it so? — Because Scripture stated his handful twice.[5]

OF THE TENTH THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE. Why? — Because it is written, Of the fine flour thereof,[6] [signifying that] if any part thereof was lacking it is invalid.

OF THE WINE THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE. [Because it is written,] Thus.[7]

OF THE OIL THE [ABSENCE OF THE] SMALLEST PART INVALIDATES THE WHOLE. [As to the oil] of the drink-offerings, [because it is written], Thus, and of the freewill meal-offering, because it is written, And of the oil thereof,[6] [signifying that] if any part thereof was lacking it is invalid.

OF THE FINE FLOUR AND THE OIL THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER, [Because it is written,] Of the fine flour thereof and of the oil thereof,[6] and further, Of the bruised corn thereof and of the oil thereof.[8]

OF THE HANDFUL AND THE FRANKINCENSE THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. [Because it is written,] With all the frankincense thereof,[9] and further, And all the frankincense which is upon the meal-offering.[10]

MISHNAH. OF THE TWO HE-GOATS[11] OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE TWO LAMBS[12] OF THE FEAST OF WEEKS THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE TWO LOAVES[13] THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE TWO ROWS[14] [OF THE SHEWBREAD] THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE TWO

DISHES[14] [OF FRANKINCENSE] THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE ROWS AND THE DISHES THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER. OF THE TWO KINDS [OF CAKES] USED IN THE OFFERING OF THE NAZIRITE,[15] OF THE THREE KINDS USED FOR THE RED COW,[16] OF THE FOUR KINDS [OF CAKES] USED IN THE THANK-OFFERING,[17] OF THE FOUR KINDS [OF PLANTS] USED FOR THE LULAB,[18] AND OF THE FOUR KINDS USED FOR THE [PURIFICATION OF THE] LEPER,[19] THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS. OF THE SEVEN SPRINKLINGS [OF THE BLOOD] OF THE RED COW[20] THE [OMISSION OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS. OF THE SEVEN SPRINKLINGS BETWEEN THE STAVES OF THE ARK,[21] AND OF THOSE TOWARDS THE VEIL AND UPON THE GOLDEN ALTAR,[22] THE [OMISSION OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS. GEMARA. OF THE TWO HE-GOATS OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT THE [ABSENCE OF ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER — for the term 'statute' is used therewith.[23]

OF THE TWO LAMBS OF THE FEAST OF WEEKS THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER — for the expression 'shall be' is used therewith.[24]

THE TWO LOAVES — for the expression 'shall be' is used therewith.[24]

THE TWO ROWS — for the term 'statute' is used therewith.[25]

THE TWO DISHES — for the term 'statute' is used therewith.[25]

THE ROWS AND THE DISHES — for the term 'statute' is used therewith.

THE TWO KINDS [OF CAKES] USED IN THE OFFERING OF THE NAZIRITE — for it is written, So he must do.[26]

THE THREE KINDS USED FOR THE RED COW — for the term 'statute' is used therewith.[27]

THE FOUR KINDS OF CAKES USED IN THE THANK-OFFERING — for [the thank-offering] has been placed side by side with the offering of the Nazirite, in the verse, With the sacrifice of his peace-offerings for thanksgiving,[28] and the Master said, Of his peace-offerings, includes the peace-offering of the Nazirite.[29]

THE FOUR KINDS USED FOR THE LEPER — for it is written, This shall be the law of the leper.[30]

THE FOUR KINDS USED FOR THE LULAB — for it is written, And ye shall take,[31] signifying the taking of them all. R. Hanan b. Abba said, This[32] was taught only in the case where he did not have them at all, but where he had them all one does not invalidate the other.[33] An objection was raised against him. It was taught: Of the four kinds used for the lulab two are fruit-bearing[34] and two are not;[35] those which bear fruits must be joined to those which bear no fruits and those which bear no fruits must be joined to those which bear fruits. And a man does not fulfil his obligation unless they are all bound in one band. And so it is with Israel's conciliation with God, [it is achieved] only when they are all in one band, as it is said, That buildeth his chambers in the heaven, and hath founded his band upon the earth.[36] — This is a matter of dispute between Tannaim. For it was taught: The lulab is valid whether it be bound with the others or not; but R. Judah says, If it is bound with the others it is valid, and if it is not so bound it is not valid. What is the reason for R. Judah's view? — He draws an analogy by means of the expression 'taking' used [both here and] also in connection with the bunch of hyssop:[37] as there the kinds must be bound in one bunch, so here they must be bound in one band. The Rabbis, however, do not draw this analogy by means of the

expression ‘taking’. With whose view then would the following Baraitha agree? For it was taught: It is a meritorious act to bind the lulab with the other species; nevertheless if one did not bind it, it is valid! If with R. Judah's view, why then is it valid if one did not bind it? And if it agrees with the view of the Rabbis, why does it say ‘It is a meritorious act’?[38] — Indeed it agrees with the view of the Rabbis, and it is a meritorious act only on the principle of This is my God and I will beautify him.[39]

OF THE SEVEN SPRINKLINGS [OF THE BLOOD] OF THE RED COW, THE [OMISSION OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS — for the term ‘statute’ is used therewith.[40]

OF THE SEVEN SPRINKLINGS BETWEEN THE STAVES OF THE ARK, AND OF THOSE TOWARDS THE VEIL AND UPON THE GOLDEN ALTAR, THE [OMISSION OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS. As for the offerings of the Day of Atonement, because the term ‘statute’ is used therewith;[41] and as for the bullock offered when the anointed High Priest sinned in error, and the bullock offered when the whole community sinned in error, and the he-goats offered on account of the sin of idolatry, because of the following teaching: It is written, Thus shall he do with the bullock, as he did with the bullock of the sin-offering.[42] Wherefore is it written?[42] In order to repeat thereby the laws of the sprinkling,[43]

---

(1) Lit., ‘the smaller part hinders the larger part’. The offerings mentioned must be absolutely whole, but if they were lacking even the smallest quantity they are invalid as offerings.

(2) The tenth of an ephah of flour prescribed for the meal-offering.

(3) Which formed part of the drink-offerings offered with most sacrifices, cf. Num. XV, 4ff: a half-hin for a bullock, a third-hin for a ram, and a quarter-hin for a lamb.

(4) Offered with the drink-offerings in the same quantity as prescribed for the wine (v. prec. n.), or the log of oil required for the freewill meal-offering.

(5) Cf. Lev. II, 2 and V, 12. This repetition signifies that it must be absolutely whole and that every part thereof is indispensable.

(6) Ibid. II, 2. This rule is derived from the superfluous suffix ה in the word, corresponding to the Eng. ‘thereof’.

(7) Num. XV, 11. The term ‘thus’ indicates that it must be offered in the manner prescribed without any variations whatsoever.

(8) Lev. II, 16. According to Rabbinic interpretation ‘bruised corn’ and ‘fine flour’ are identical save that the former is applied to the ‘Omer-offering. Hence there is a repetition of the items to indicate their indispensability.

(9) Lev. II, 2.

(10) Ibid. VI, 8.

(11) Ibid. XVI, 5.

(12) Ibid. XXIII, 19.

(13) Offered with the lambs on the Feast of Weeks, cf. ibid. 17.

(14) Cf. ibid. XXIV, 5ff.

(15) Unleavened leaves and unleavened wafers; v. Num. VI, 15.

(16) Cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet wool; v. ibid. XIX, 6.

(17) Unleavened cakes, unleavened wafers, cakes of soaked fine flour, and leavened cakes; v. Lev. VII, 12, 13.

(18) לולב, the palm-branch, which with the citron, the myrtle and the willow branches, was used in the Temple and Synagogue service on the Feast of Tabernacles; v. ibid. XXIII, 40.

(19) Cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet wool, and the two living birds; v. ibid. XIV, 6.

(20) Num. XIX, 4.

(21) Of the blood of the bullock and of the he-goat on the Day of Atonement; v. Lev. XVI, 14, 15.

(22) Of the blood of the abovementioned offerings (v. p. 172, n. 13) and also of the blood of the bullock offered when the whole community sinned in error (Lev. IV, 17,18). and of the bullock offered when the anointed High Priest sinned in error (ibid 6, 7).

(23) Lev. XVI, 34. The term ‘statute’ used in connection with any law or ceremony implies the absolute indispensability of the rites connected therewith.

(24) Ibid. XXIII, 17. The expression ‘shall be’ invariably indicates indispensability.
(25) Ibid. XXIV, 9.
(26) Num. VI, 21.
(27) Ibid. XIX, 2.
(28) Lev. VII, 13.
(29) V. infra 78a.
(30) Ibid. XIV, 2.
(31) Ibid. XXIII, 40. The Heb. ולקחתם is interpreted as though divided into two words: ולקח, ‘and he shall take’, and תם, ‘wholly’ ‘completely’; hence all the four kinds must be taken together.
(32) That the absence of any one kind invalidates the others.
(33) I.e., for the purposes of the precept they need not be taken bound together in one hand.
(34) The ethrog (the citron) and the lulab (the palm branch).
(35) The myrtle and the willow.
(36) Amos IX, 6. The people are founded and established on earth only when they are in one band — that is, when all the sections of the community are united, the righteous (the fruit-bearing) and the unrighteous (the non-fruit-bearing); this is symbolized by the taking and binding together in one band of the four species. It is evident therefore from this Baraitha that the four species must be bound together, contra R. Hanan.
(37) Used in the purification rites of the leper, v. Lev. XIV, 4.
(38) Since according to the Rabbis it is immaterial whether they are bound together or not.
(39) Ex. XV, 2. Thus it is a meritorious act generally to perform the precepts in the most beautiful manner possible.
(40) Num. XIX, 2.
(41) Lev. XVI, 34.
(42) Ibid. IV, 20. This verse is stated in connection with the bullock offered when the whole community sinned in error, and its purport apparently is to direct that the service of this offering be performed in the same manner as the offering of the anointed High Priest mentioned in the foregoing paragraph. On examination, however, it will be seen that this injunction is superfluous, since all the details of the service, as stated in connection with the foregoing offering, are repeated here in full.
(43) Thus rendering the sprinklings indispensable.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 27b

so that if one sprinkling was omitted the whole is invalid.[1]

Our Rabbis taught: If the seven sprinklings of the blood of the Red Cow were made under the name of some other [offering] or were not directed rightly,[2] they are invalid; but as for those [sprinklings which must be performed] inside[3] or [the sprinklings in the purification rites] of a leper,[4] if they were made under the name of some other [offering], they are invalid, but if they were not rightly directed, they are valid. But has it not also been taught, with regard to the sprinklings of the blood of the Red Cow, that if they were sprinkled under the name of another they are invalid, whilst if they were not rightly directed they are still valid? — Said R. Hisda, This is no difficulty; for one[5] [Baraitha] states the view of R. Judah and the other that of the Rabbis. For it was taught: If a man that lacked atonement[6] unwittingly entered the Temple court he is liable to bring a sin-offering, but if he entered deliberately he has incurred the penalty of kareth;[7] and, needless to say, this is so of a tebul yom[7] and others that were unclean. If a man that was clean overstepped the boundary[8] and entered the Temple he has thereby incurred forty [stripes]; and if he entered within the veil[9] or towards the front of the mercy-seat[10] he has thereby incurred death [at the hands of heaven]. R. Judah says, If he entered into the Temple or within the veil he has thereby incurred forty [stripes], and if he entered towards the front of the mercy-seat he has thereby incurred death. Wherein do they differ? — In the interpretation of the following verse: And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the veil, towards the front of the mercy-seat which is upon the ark; that he die not.[11] The Rabbis[12] maintain that [against entering] into the holy place there is the prohibition ‘that he come not’,[13] and [against entering]

within the veil or towards the front of the mercy-seat there is the warning 'that he die not'; whereas R. Judah maintains that [against entering] into the holy place or within the veil there is the prohibition 'that he come not', and [against entering] towards the front of the mercy-seat there is the warning 'that he die not'. What is the reason for this view of the Rabbis? — If the law is as R. Judah maintains, the Divine Law should only have stated 'into the holy place' and 'towards the front of the mercy-seat', but not 'within the veil', for I should have said, If for entering the holy place one incurs stripes, how much more so for entering within the veil! Why then did the Divine Law also state 'within the veil'? That you might infer that there is the penalty of death for it. And R. Judah, [how does he reply to this]? — Had the Divine Law only stated 'into the holy place' and not' within the veil' I might have thought that by the expression 'into the holy place' only 'within the veil' was meant, so that [against entering] into the Temple there is not even a prohibition! And the Rabbis? — You could not possibly have thought so, since the entire Temple is referred to as 'the holy place', as it is written, And the veil shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy.[14] And what is the reason for R. Judah's view? — If the law is as the Rabbis maintain, the Divine Law should only have stated 'into the holy place within the veil', but not 'towards the front of the mercy-seat', for I should have said, If for entering within the veil one incurs death, how much more so for entering towards the front of the mercy-seat! Why then did the Divine Law also state 'towards the front of the mercy-seat'? That you might infer that only [for entering] towards the front of the mercy seat is there the penalty of death, whereas [for entering] within the veil there is only a prohibition. And the Rabbis, [how do they reply to this]? — Indeed it was unnecessary, and the only reason why the Divine Law stated 'towards the front of the mercy-seat' in this verse was in order to exclude [from the prohibition] entering by the side.[15] As it was taught by a Tanna in the school of R. Eliezer b. Jacob: The verse, Towards the front of the mercy-seat on the east,[16] establishes the principle that wherever Scripture says 'the front' it means the east side. And R. Judah?[17] — [He says,] The verse should then have only stated [here] 'the front', why does it also state 'towards'? To teach that 'towards' must be interpreted with exactness.[18] And the Rabbis? — [They say,] 'Towards' need not be interpreted exactly. Now[19] since R. Judah maintains that the expression 'towards the front of the mercy-seat' must be interpreted with exactness, similarly he would hold that the expression 'and he shall sprinkle towards the front' must also be interpreted exactly;[20] whilst the Rabbis hold that just as the one need not be interpreted exactly so the other need not be interpreted exactly.[21] R. Joseph, however, demurred, saying, Then according to R. Judah, if 'towards' must be interpreted exactly, 'upon'[22] would also have to be interpreted exactly, would it not? And it would follow therefore that during the second Temple, inasmuch as there was no ark nor mercy-seat,[23] no sprinklings were to be made [on the Day of Atonement]! — Rabbah b. 'Ulla answered, It is written, And he shall make atonement for the holy sanctuary,[24] that is, for the place that is sanctified for the holy sanctuary.[25]

Raba said, Both[26] state the view of the Rabbis, [yet here is no contradiction]

---

(1) Lit., 'he has done nothing'. It appears from Rashi that at this point in the text there followed a lengthy argument exactly as found in Zeb. 39a. The addition is also found in MS.M. and it reads as follows: I only know this of the seven sprinklings upon the veil, since whenever seven sprinklings are ordained it is established that the omission of one renders the whole invalid; but whence do I know this also of the four sprinklings upon the altar? Because Scripture says. So he shall do with this (Lev. IV, 20). The expression 'the bullock' (ibid.) includes the bullock of the Day of Atonement; the expression 'as he did with the bullock' (ibid.) includes the bullock offered by the anointed High Priest; and the expression 'of the sin-offering' (ibid.) includes the he-goats offered on account of the sin of idolatry. V. Rashi.

(2) In accordance with Num. XIX, 4, the blood of the Red Cow had to be sprinkled in the direction of 'the entrance of the tent of meeting'.

(3) E.g., the offerings of the Day of Atonement or the sin-offering of the anointed High Priest.

(4) The officiating priest sprinkled of the oil that was in the palm of his hand seven times in the direction of the Holy of Holies; v. Lev. XIV, 16.

(5) The latter Baraitha.

(6) A person who had duly immersed after his uncleanness, had awaited sunset, but had not yet brought the prescribed offerings. Such a person still retains a slight measure of uncleanness.
(7) V. Glos.
(8) A non-priest was not permitted to enter into the Temple Hall beyond the first eleven cubits from the entrance on the east side. Cf. Yoma 16b.
(9) I.e., into the Holy of Holies.
(10) This is still further in the Holy of Holies; he stepped close to the mercy-seat which formed the cover for the Ark.
(11) Lev. XVI, 2.
(12) I.e., the first Tanna in the foregoing Baraitha whose view is expressed anonymously as being the general accepted view of the Rabbis.
(13) An ordinary prohibition for the transgression of which the punishment of forty stripes is incurred.
(14) Ex. XXVI, 33.
(15) I.e., any entry into the Holy of Holies not made in the ordinary way through the door on the east with the face looking westward; e.g., by breaking through the north wall or the south wall of the Holy of Holies and entering thereby, or by entering through the door on the east but with the face looking either northward or southward. For such an entry one would not incur any penalty.
(16) Lev. XVI, 14.
(17) Is not the expression 'towards the front of the mercy-seat' required to show that the east side was meant?
(18) The expression 'towards the front of the mercy-seat' is not stated (argues R. Judah) merely to indicate that the east side is meant, since for that purpose 'the front', without 'towards', would have been sufficient. Its true purpose is to teach that only for entering towards the front of the mercy-seat is the penalty of death at the hands of heaven incurred, but not for merely entering within the veil.
(19) The Gemara now proceeds to elaborate the answer proposed by R. Hisda supra that one Baraitha states the view of R. Judah and the other that of the Rabbis.
(20) And therefore if the blood of the Red Cow was not sprinkled quite in the direction towards the front of the Holy of Holies, it is invalid.
(21) And the sprinklings are valid even though made not quite in the proper direction.
(22) In connection with the sprinkling of the blood of the bullock on the Day of Atonement it is written, And he shall sprinkle with his finger upon the mercy-seat (Lev. XVI, 14); and therefore unless the sprinkling is made actually upon the mercy-seat it is invalid.
(23) According to tradition these were hidden away by Josiah (v. Yoma 52b), and so were not in use during the Second Temple.
(24) Lev. XVI, 33.
(25) The High Priest shall 'make atonement', i.e., sprinkle the blood on to the place sanctified for the ark.
(26) Sc. the two teachings which were shown above to be contradictory.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 28a

for in the one case [the priest] stood facing the west with his back to the east[1] and sprinkled, whereas in the other he stood facing the south with his back to the north[2] and sprinkled.

The Master said, 'But as for those [sprinklings which must be performed] inside, or [the sprinklings in the purification rites] of a leper, if they were made under the name of some other [offering], they are invalid, but if they were not rightly directed, they are valid'. But it has been taught: Whether they were made under the name of some other [offering] or were not rightly directed, they are valid! Said R. Joseph: This is no contradiction; one Baraitha states the view of R. Eliezer, the other that of the Rabbis. R. Eliezer who likens the guilt-offering to the sin-offering[3] likens also the log [of oil of the leper] to the guilt-offering;[4] the Rabbis, however, do not liken one with the other.[5] But according to R. Eliezer is it permitted to deduce a law by analogy from another law which has itself been deduced by analogy?[6] — Raba therefore answered, Both teachings state the view of the Rabbis; one deals with the validity[7] [of the offering], whereas the other deals with the acceptance[8] [of the offering in fulfilment of the owner's obligation].

MISHNAH. OF THE SEVEN BRANCHES OF THE CANDLESTICK,[9] THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS. OF THE SEVEN LAMPS THEREOF, THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS. OF THE TWO PORTIONS OF SCRIPTURE IN THE MEZUZAH,[10] THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER; INDEED EVEN ONE [IMPERFECT] LETTER CAN INVALIDATE THE WHOLE. OF THE FOUR PORTIONS OF SCRIPTURE IN THE TEFILLIN,[11] THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS; INDEED EVEN ONE [IMPERFECT] LETTER CAN INVALIDATE THE WHOLE. OF THE FOUR FRINGES,[12] THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS, SINCE THE FOUR TOGETHER FORM ONE PRECEPT. R. ISHMAEL SAYS, THE FOUR ARE FOUR SEPARATE PRECEPTS.

GEMARA. [OF THE SEVEN BRANCHES OF THE CANDLESTICK etc.] Why is it so? — Because the expression 'shall be' is used therewith.[13]

Our Rabbis taught: The candlestick had to be made from one mass and of gold; if it was made from scraps [of gold] it is invalid, but if made from any other metal it is valid. Now why is it invalid if made from scraps? It is, presumably, because Scripture says 'beaten work' and also 'shall be';[14] then when made from other metals too it should be invalid, should it not, since Scripture says, 'of gold' and also 'shall be'? — The verse also says, Shall the candlestick be made, to include other metals. Perhaps it is to include scraps! — You cannot think so, for the expression 'shall be' refers to 'beaten work'.[15] But does not the expression 'shall the candlestick be made' also refer to 'beaten work'?[16] — Scripture stated, Of beaten work, Of beaten work, twice,[17] signifying that this condition is indispensable. But is it not also written, Gold, Gold, twice,[17] so that this too is indispensable? — What is this that you say? It is well if you hold that if made out of scraps it is invalid and if out of other metal it is valid, for then the repetition of the terms 'gold' and 'beaten work' is made use of in the exposition [which follows]. But if you hold that if made out of scraps it is valid and if out of other metals it is invalid, what use then will you make of the repetition of the terms 'gold' and 'beaten work'?[18]

What is the exposition [referred to]? — It was taught: Of a talent of pure gold shall it be made, with all these vessels:[19] if made of gold it must be a talent [in weight], if not of gold it need not be a talent. Its cups, its knops, and its flowers:[20] if made of gold there must then be cups, knops and flowers, if not of gold there need be neither cups nor knops nor flowers. Perhaps I ought also to say, If made of gold there must then be branches, if not of gold there need be no branches! — That would be called a lamp.[21] And this was the work of the candlestick, beaten work of gold:[22] if of gold it must be beaten work, if not of gold it need not be beaten work. And what use is made of the [second] expression 'beaten work' in this last [verse]? — It serves to exclude the trumpets.[23] For it was taught: The trumpets had to be made [each] from one mass and of silver; if made from scraps [of silver] they are valid, if from other metals they are invalid. Now why are they invalid if made from other metals? presumably because it is written 'of silver'[24] and also 'shall be';[24] then when made from scraps they should also be invalid, should they not, since it is written 'beaten work'[24] and 'shall be'? Scripture therefore stated in connection with the candlestick, It was beaten work,[22] 'it' [was beaten work] but not the trumpets.

Our Rabbis taught: All the vessels

---

(1) This was the right and proper position for sprinkling the blood of the Red Cow, and it is valid even though the sprinklings were not quite in the direction of the Holy of Holies.

(2) In which case both the position of the priest who sprinkled the blood and the direction in which it was sprinkled were wrong, and therefore it is invalid.

(3) By reason of the juxtaposition of these two kinds of offering in one verse, Lev. VII, 7: As is the sin-offering so is the

guilt-offering, the laws of each are placed on the same footing; and as the sin-offering is rendered invalid if any vital service was performed under any other name but its own, so it is with the guilt-offering too. V. Zeb. 10b.
(4) By the juxtaposition of the log of oil and the guilt-offering of the leper in one verse, ibid. XIV, 21, the further analogy is made: as the guilt-offering is rendered invalid by the performance of any of its vital services under another name (by analogy with the sin-offering, v. prec. n.), so it is too with the service of the sprinkling of the oil in the purification rites of the leper.
(5) So that the ruling in the latter Baraitha is in accordance with the view of the Rabbis.
(6) V. supra p. 179, nn. 7 and 8. It is absolutely disallowed to deduce any law in connection with holy things by the process of double analogy. Cf. Zeb. 49b.
(7) The latter Baraitha implied that the offering was valid, but only to this extent, that the remainder of the log of oil was thereby rendered permitted to the priests.
(8) The former Baraitha by ruling 'they are invalid' merely wished to convey that the sprinklings were not accepted in fulfilment of the leper's obligation; and therefore he is still prohibited from entering the camp of Israel and from eating consecrated food.
(9) Cf. Ex. XXV, 31ff.
(10) V. Glos. The two portions are: Deut. VI, 4-8, and XI, 13-21.
(11) V. Glos. The four portions are: Deut. VI, 4-8; XI, 13-21; Ex. XIII, 1-10 and 11-16.
(12) Cf. Num. XV, 38.
(13) Ex. XXV, 36: Their knops and their branches shall be of one piece with it.
(14) The term 'beaten work' implies hammered out of one piece, and since the expression 'shall be' is added in the verse, this condition of 'beaten work' is indispensable. The expressions used in this exposition are in Ex. XXV, 31: And thou shalt make a candlestick of pure gold: of beaten work shall the candlestick be made . . . its cup', its knops and its flowers shall be of one piece with it.
(15) Thus ruling out the use of broken pieces.
(16) And therefore by reason of the general and comprehensive expression 'shall the candlestick be made' it should also be permitted if made out of broken pieces, or scraps of gold.
(17) Ibid. vv. 31 and 36.
(18) The force of the argument centres around the term 'beaten work' which is used four times in connection with the candlestick: twice in Ex. XXV (in vv. 31 and 36) and twice in Num: VIII, 4. If it is held that it is invalid if made out of scraps, then this term was stated twice to indicate that this condition was indispensable, and on two more occasions for the purposes given in the following exposition. If, however, it is valid if made out of scraps, then at least in one instance this term is superfluous. V. Sh. Mek a.l.
(19) Ex. ibid. 39.
(20) Ex. XXV, 31.
(21) But not a מנורה, a branched candlestick.
(22) Num. VIII, 4.
(23) Cf. ibid. X. 2ff. Thus the two silver trumpets need not be beaten work.
(24) Ibid.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 28b

which Moses had made were valid for him and valid also for future generations; the trumpets, however, were valid for him but invalid for future generations. What is the reason for the trumpets? Should you say because it is written, Make thee,[1] that is, for thyself only but not for future generations; then the verse, And make thee an ark of wood,[2] would also signify for thyself only but not for future generations.[3] But in fact the expression 'thee' [in the latter verse] means, according to one opinion,[4] of thine own, or according to another opinion, 'I would have preferred it to come from thine own rather than from theirs';[5] then here[6] too it means the same thing! — Here[7] it is different, since 'thee' is stated twice: 'Make thee' and 'They shall be unto thee'.[8]

R. Papa the son of R. Hanin recited the following teaching before R. Joseph: The candlestick had to be made from one mass and of gold; if it was made of silver it is still valid; if of tin or lead or

gasitron,[9] Rabbi declares it to be invalid, but R. Jose b. Judah declares it to be valid. If it was made of wood or of bone or of glass, all agree that it is invalid. Thereupon he said to him,[10] What can be the reason for this?[11] He replied, Both masters interpret [the verse] by the principle of 'general proposition and specification',[12] but they differ in this: one[13] concludes, as the thing specified is clearly a metal, so all metals are permitted; but the other concludes, as the thing specified is a valuable [metal], so only valuable [metals] are permitted.[14] Then said [R. Joseph] to him, Set aside your teaching in view of mine, for it has been taught: If vessels of ministry were made of wood, Rabbi declares them invalid, but R. Jose b. Judah declares them valid. In what do they differ? Rabbi interprets [the verse] by the principle of 'general proposition and specification', whereas R. Jose b. Judah interprets it by the principle of 'amplification and limitation'. Rabbi interprets the verse by 'general proposition and specification' thus, And thou shalt make a candlestick[15] is a general proposition, 'of pure gold' is a particular specification, 'of beaten work shall the candlestick be made' is another general proposition; we thus have two general propositions separated by a particular specification, in which case you may only include such things as are similar to the thing specified, and as the thing specified is clearly a metal so all metals are included. R. Jose b. Judah on the other hand interprets the verse by 'amplification and limitation' thus, 'And thou shalt make a candlestick' is an amplifying proposition, 'of pure gold' is a limitation, 'of beaten work shall the candlestick be made' is another amplifying proposition; we thus have two amplifying propositions separated by a limitation, in which case they include [well-nigh] everything. What do they include? Everything.[16] And what do they exclude? Earthenware.[17] On the contrary, Set aside your teaching because of mine! — You cannot say so,[18] for it was taught: If there was no gold available for it,[19] it may be made of silver, of copper, of iron, of tin or of lead. R. Jose b. Judah allows it even of wood. And another Baraitha also taught: A man may not make a house after the design of the Temple, or a porch after the design of the Temple porch, or a courtyard after the design of the Temple court, or a table after the design of the table [in the Temple], or a candlestick after the design of the candlestick [in the Temple]. He may, however, make one with five, six or eight [branches], but with seven he may not make one, even though it be of other metal.[20] R. Jose b. Judah says, He should not make one even of wood, for thus did the Hasmonean kings make it.[21] But [the Rabbis] said to him, Is any proof to be deduced from that? In fact it was made of iron bars which they overlaid with tin;[22] when they [the Hasmoneans] grew richer they made one of silver, and when they grew still richer they made one of gold.

Samuel said in the name of an old scholar, The height of the candlestick was eighteen handbreadths: three handbreadths for the base and the flower upon it,[23] two handbreadths plain,[24] one handbreadth for cup, knop and flower, again two handbreadths plain, one handbreadth for a knop out of which two branches come forth, one on each side, extending and rising to the same height as the candlestick, then one handbreadth plain, one handbreadth for a knop out of which two branches come forth, one on each side, extending and rising to the same height as the candlestick, then again one handbreadth plain, and one handbreadth for a knop out of which two branches come forth, one on each side, extending and rising to the same height as the candlestick, and then two handbreadths plain; there now remained[25] three handbreadths, in which space were three cups, a knop and a flower. The cups were like Alexandrian goblets,[26] the knops like Cretan apples, and the flowers like the blossoms around the capitals of columns. It will be found, therefore, that there were twenty-two cups, eleven knops, and nine flowers. Of the cups the [omission of] one invalidates the others, of the knops the [omission of] one invalidates the others, and of the flowers the [omission of] one invalidates the others; moreover, of the cups, the knops and the flowers, the [omission of] one kind invalidates the others. It is quite clear that there were twenty-two cups, for it is written, And in the candlestick were four cups,[27] and it is also written, Three cups like almond-blossoms in one branch, a knop and a flower;[28] so that its own four[29]

---

(1) Ibid.

(2) Deut. X, 1.

(3) But this was not the case, for the same ark which Moses had made was used in the future generations.
(4) V. Yoma 3b.
(5) If only this were possible; but it is not since it is the duty of the whole community to provide it. In cur. edd. the expression 'as though it were possible' (the usual expression used when referring to God in anthropomorphic terms) is here inserted, but it is not found in any MS., and indeed it is quite unnecessary here.
(6) In the case of the trumpets.
(7) In the case of the trumpets.
(8) Num. X, 2.
(9) גסיטרון, prob. ** tin; perhaps of a special kind, as distinguished from צעין, ordinary tin.
(10) R. Joseph said to R. Papa.
(11) This distinction in R. Jose b. Judah, according to which it is valid if made of lead or of tin, but invalid if made of wood.
(12) V. infra.
(13) R. Jose b. Judah.
(14) Rabbi therefore excludes lead and tin, and also wood.
(15) Ex. XXV, 31.
(16) All substances, even wood.
(17) Since it is of little value. This Baraitha, according to which R. Jose allows all substances except earthenware, and Rabbi allows all metals, overrides the former Baraitha quoted by R. Papa.
(18) For according to R. Papa's teaching R. Jose does not allow wood, but this is in conflict with the two Baraithas which follow.
(19) Sc. the candlestick.
(20) Since the seven-branched candlestick of the Temple was permitted to be made of other metals too, and even of wood according to R. Jose b. Judah.
(21) Sc. the Temple candlestick, after they had retaken and purified the Temple.
(22) Many MSS. read: 'with wood'.
(23) V. infra, p. 185, n. 6.
(24) I.e., without any ornamentation.
(25) In the central or main shaft of the candlestick.
(26) Which were wide at the top and tapered down towards the base.
(27) Ex. XXV, 34; the reference being to the central shaft.
(28) Ibid. 33.
(29) I.e., of the central shaft.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 29a

and the eighteen of the [six] branches make twenty-two. It is also clear that there were eleven knops, for the knops thereof implies two, and six of the [six] branches and the knop [from which the first pair of branches rose], and the knop [from which the second pair rose], and the knop [from which the third pair rose], thus making a total of eleven. But how do we arrive at nine flowers? Its own two and the six of the [six] branches make only eight? — R. Salmon said, It is written, Unto the base thereof, and unto the flowers thereof, it was beaten work.[1]

Rab said, The height of the candlestick was nine handbreadths. Thereupon R. Shimi b. Hiyya raised the following objection to Rab. We have learnt:[2] There was a stone before the candlestick in which were three steps; on this the priest stood to trim the lamps.[3] He answered, You, Shimi![4] I meant only from the point where the branches begin [to rise] and upwards.[5]

It is written, And the flowers, and the lamps and the tongs, of gold, of finished gold.[6] What is meant by 'finished gold'? R. Ammi said, They finished up all Solomon's fine gold.[7] For Rab Judah said in Rab's name, Solomon had made ten candlesticks, and for each one he had used one thousand talents of gold; each had been cast in the furnace one thousand times so that it was reduced to one

talent.[8] But surely it is not so, for it is written, And all King Solomon's drinking vessels were of gold, and all the vessels of the house of the forest of Lebanon were of pure gold; none were of silver; it was nothing accounted of in the days of Solomon![9] — We said Solomon's fine gold [was finished up]. And would it lose so much?[10] Surely it has been taught: R. Jose b. Judah said, It once happened that the candlestick which was used in the Temple was found to be larger than that made by Moses by a Gordian[11] golden denar; thereupon it was cast eighty times into the furnace so that it was brought down to a talent! — Since it had been made long ago it would remain in that condition.[12]

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Jonathan, What is the meaning of the expression, 'Upon the pure candlestick'?[13] It signifies that its pattern came down from the place of purity.[14] Will you then say that the expression 'Upon the pure table'[15] also signifies that its pattern came down from the place of purity? One would rather say that 'pure' [in the latter case] implies that it can contract uncleanness; then [in the former case] too 'pure' implies that it can contract uncleanness? — [This does not follow at all,] for it is right to say so there [in regard to the table] because of Resh Lakish's exposition. For Resh Lakish said, What is the meaning of the expression 'upon the pure table'? It signifies that it can contract uncleanness. But is not [the table] an article of wood made to rest, and an article of wood made to rest cannot contract uncleanness? This proves that they used to lift it up and exhibit the Shewbread on it to those who came up for the festivals, saying to them, Behold, God's love for you![16] (Wherein is seen 'God's love for you'? — It is as R. Joshua b. Levi had stated. For R. Joshua b. Levi had stated, A great miracle was wrought in regard to the Shewbread, for at its removal it was as [fresh as when] it was set,[17] as it is written, To put hot bread in the day that it was taken away.)[18] But in this case [of the candlestick], to say that the term 'pure' implies that it can contract uncleanness is too obvious [and unnecessary], for it is a metal vessel and metal vessels certainly contract uncleanness! We must therefore say that its pattern came down from the place of purity.

It was taught: R. Jose b. Judah says, An ark of fire and a table of fire and a candlestick of fire came down from heaven; and these Moses saw and reproduced, as it is written, And see that thou make them after their pattern, which is being shown thee in the mount.[19] Will you then say the same [of the tabernacle], for it is written, And thou shalt rear up the tabernacle according to the fashion thereof which hath been shown thee in the mount![20] — Here it is written 'according to the fashion thereof', whilst there 'after their pattern'.[21]

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan, The angel Gabriel had girded himself with a kind of belt[22] and demonstrated unto Moses the work of the candlestick, for it is written, And this was the work of the candlestick.[23]

A Tanna of the school of R. Ishmael stated, Three things presented difficulties to Moses, until the Holy One, blessed be He, showed Moses with His finger, and these are they: the candlestick, the new moon,[24] and the creeping things.[25] The candlestick, as it is written, And this was the work of the candlestick. The new moon, as it is written, This month shall be unto you the beginning of months.[26] The creeping things, as it is written, And these are they which are unclean.[27] Others add, Also the rules for slaughtering [beasts], as it is written, Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar.[28]

OF THE TWO PORTIONS OF SCRIPTURE IN THE MEZUZAH THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHER; INDEED EVEN ONE [IMPERFECT] LETTER CAN INVALIDATE THE WHOLE. Is not this obvious?[29] — Rab Judah answered in the name of Rab, The law had to be taught in respect of the tittle of the letter yod.[30] And is not this, too, obvious?[31] — It had to be taught in regard to the other statement of Rab Judah in the name of Rab. For Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, Any letter that is not surrounded on all four sides by a margin of parchment is invalid.[32]

Ashian b. Nidbak said in the name of Rab Judah, If the inner [leg] of the letter he[33] was perforated, it is still valid; if the [right] leg was perforated it is invalid. R. Zera said, This was explained to me by R. Huna — and R. Jacob said, This too was explained to me by Rab Judah — as follows: If the inner [leg] of the he was perforated, it is still valid; if the [right] leg was perforated and there still remained thereof the size of a small letter,[34] it is valid; otherwise it is invalid.

It once happened to Agra, the father-in-law of R. Abba,

---

(1) Num. VIII, 4. The flower (in the Heb. פרחה, in the sing.) in this verse is in addition to those mentioned in Ex. XXV, 31ff; hence there were nine. This extra flower was placed at the foot of the candlestick close to the pedestal.

(2) Tam. III, 9.

(3) And if the entire height of the candlestick was only nine handbreadths, then surely the priest had no need of stone or steps to reach it.

(4) Rab expresses surprise at his pupil Shimi who puts to him a question whose answer is only too obvious.

(5) And as this point was in the centre of the candlestick, there were nine handbreadths from it to the top, and similarly from this point to the base; so that Rab's view is entirely in accord with Samuel's supra.

(6) II Chr. IV, 21. The Heb. expression מכלות זהב, in E.VV. 'perfect gold', is very difficult; hence the suggestion in the Gemara.

(7) Deriving מכלות from כלה 'to complete, exhaust, finish up'.

(8) This lavish and extravagant use of gold would naturally exhaust all his gold, however great his supply was.

(9) I Kings X, 21. It is evident that Solomon had an unlimited supply.

(10) By repeated refinings to be reduced from one thousand talents to one talent.

(11) Cur. edd. קורדיקני; v. Jast. s.v. גורדייני. The word is omitted in MS.M.

(12) I.e., since it had been well wrought and refined in Solomon's days, when centuries later it was cast eighty times into the furnace it would not then have lost very much.

(13) Lev. XXIV, 4.

(14) I.e., from Heaven. The pattern of the candlestick was shown by God unto Moses; v. infra.

(15) Ibid. 6.

(16) The table was therefore mobile and not regarded as a vessel made to rest; consequently it could contract uncleanness. It is right therefore that the term 'pure' in connection with the table should mean free from uncleanness.

(17) When the Shewbread was removed after having remained seven days upon the table it was as fresh as on the day when it was placed thereon.

(18) I Sam. XXI, 7. The Heb. חם 'hot' is interpreted as referring to the bread that was taken away, thus indicating that it was still fresh and hot.

(19) Ex. XXV, 40.

(20) Ibid. XXVI, 30.

(21) The latter expression signifies that a model or picture was actually shown to Moses, whereas the former expression signifies merely that the tabernacle was to be constructed in accordance with the instructions and directions received by Moses.

(22) After the manner of artificers who tie up their clothes with a belt or girdle when engaged upon delicate work so as not to be hampered in their work.

(23) Num. VIII, 4. The term 'this' implies that something was held up as a pattern or model to illustrate the instructions given.

(24) The proper observance of the first appearance of the new moon.

(25) The identification of the clean and unclean reptiles.

(26) Ex. XII, 2.

(27) Lev. XI, 29.

(28) Ex. XXIX, 38. And as the first act of the offering is the slaughtering the expression 'this' clearly refers to an actual demonstration unto Moses of the rules and regulations of slaughtering.

(29) That one imperfect letter can invalidate the whole. For the law insists upon perfect writing in Scrolls of the Law, tefillin, and mezuzah.

(30) I.e., even if the lower (according to Tosaf. 'the upper') stroke of the letter yod was missing, it is invalid.
(31) Since without the stroke it is no yod and it would not be recognizable as such.
(32) The letter must not be joined to or run into either the preceding or following letters, but must be surrounded by a blank margin of the parchment.
(33) I.e., the left or detached leg of the letter ה. It is referred to as inner for in early MSS. this leg was almost in the middle of the letter. Aliter: the inner space of the letter.
(34) I.e., the upper part of the leg was still joined to the roof of the letter, thus ה, so that it can be read as a he, although reduced in size.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 29b

that the [right] leg of the letter he in the word ha'am[1] had been severed by a perforation; whereupon he came to R. Abba who ruled that if there still remained thereof the size of a small letter it is valid, otherwise it is invalid.

It once happened to Rami b. Tamre, also known as[2] Rami b. Dikule, that the leg of the letter wow in the word wa-yaharog[3] had been severed by a perforation; whereupon he came to R. Zera who said, Go, fetch a child that is neither too clever nor too foolish; if he is able to read the word as wa-yaharog, it is valid; otherwise, the word is yaharog[4] and it is invalid.

Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, When Moses ascended on high he found the Holy One, blessed be He, engaged in affixing coronets to the letters.[5] Said Moses, 'Lord of the Universe, Who stays Thy hand?'[6] He answered, 'There will arise a man, at the end of many generations, Akiba b. Joseph by name, who will expound upon each tittle heaps and heaps of laws'. 'Lord of the Universe', said Moses; 'permit me to see him'. He replied, 'Turn thee round'. Moses went and sat down behind eight rows[7] [and listened to the discourses upon the law]. Not being able to follow their arguments he was ill at ease, but when they came to a certain subject and the disciples said to the master 'Whence do you know it?' and the latter replied 'It is a law given unto Moses at Sinai' he was comforted. Thereupon he returned to the Holy One, blessed be He, and said, 'Lord of the Universe, Thou hast such a man and Thou givest the Torah by me!' He replied, 'Be silent, for such is My decree'.[8] Then said Moses, 'Lord of the Universe, Thou hast shown me his Torah, show me his reward'. 'Turn thee round', said He; and Moses turned round and saw them weighing out his flesh at the market-stalls.[9] 'Lord of the Universe', cried Moses, 'such Torah, and such a reward!' He replied, 'Be silent, for such is My decree'.

Raba said, There are seven letters which require each three strokes, and these are they: shin, 'ayin, teth, nun, zayin, gimmel, and zadde.[10]

R. Ashi said, I have observed that scribes who are most particular add a vertical stroke to the roof of the letter heth,[11] and suspend the [inner] leg of the letter he. They add a vertical stroke to the roof of the letter heth, signifying thereby that He lives in the heights of the word.[12] And they suspend the [inner] leg of the letter he for the reason given in the following discussion. For R. Judah the patriarch asked R. Ammi, What is the meaning of the verse, Trust ye in the Lord for ever; for in Yah the Lord is an everlasting rock?[13] He replied, It implies that if one puts his trust in the Holy One, blessed be He, behold He is unto him as a refuge in this world and in the world to come. This, retorted the other, was my difficulty: why does the verse say in Yah and not Yah? The reason is as was expounded by R. Judah b. R. Ila'i. [Yah, he said,] refers to the two worlds which the Holy One, blessed be He, created, one with the letter he and the other with the letter yod. Yet I do not know whether the future world was created with the yod and this world with the he or this world with the yod and the future world with the he; but since it is written, These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth when they were created:[14] read not be-hibare'am,[15] when they were created, but be-he bera'am,[16] He created them with the he; hence I may say that this world was created with the

he and the future world with the yod. And wherefore was this world created with the he? — Because it is like an exedra[17] and whosoever wishes to go astray[18] may do so. And wherefore is the [left] leg [of the he] suspended? — To indicate that whosoever repents is permitted to re-enter.[19] And why should he not re-enter by the same [way as he went out]? — Such an opportunity would not arise;[20] and this is consistent with Resh Lakish's view. For Resh Lakish said, What is the meaning of the verse, If it concerneth the scorners, He scorneth them, but unto the humble He giveth grace?[21] If a man comes to purify himself, they assist him; but if he comes to defile himself, they open the door for him. And wherefore has [the letter he] a coronet? — Because the Holy One, blessed be He, says, If a man repents I will set a crown upon him. And why was the future world created with the letter yod? — Because the righteous men therein are but few.[22] And why is its head bent low? — Because the righteous men therein hang their heads low, for the good deeds of one are not like [the good deeds of] the other.[23]

R. Joseph said, Rab gave two rulings in connection with scrolls [of the Law] but to each there is a refutation. The first is this: Rab said, If a scroll of the Law has two mistakes in every column it may be corrected, but if three, it must be hidden away. And the refutation [is from the following]. It was taught: If three it may be corrected, but if four it must be hidden away.

A Tanna taught: If there was one column free from mistakes it saves the whole scroll.[24] R. Isaac b. Samuel b. Martha said in the name of Rab, provided only the scroll was for the most part written correctly. Abaye asked R. Joseph, How is it if in that column there were three mistakes?[25] — He replied, Since it is permitted to correct them they are regarded as already corrected.

This rule[26] applies only when letters are missing, but when there are too many letters it does not matter.[27] And why is it not so when letters are missing?[28] — R. Kahana answered, Because it would look speckled.[29] Agra, the father-in-law of R. Abba, had a scroll in which there were additional letters, so he came to R. Abba who told him the law: This rule applies only when letters are missing,

---

(1) העם, Ex. XIII, 3, in connection with the tefillin (Rashi).

(2) So in all MSS. and early edd. and so emended by Sh. Mek. Cur. edd. 'the father-in-law of'.

(3) I.e., the initial waw in ויהרג (meaning 'and he killed'), occurring in one of the Scriptural portions of the Tefillin, in Ex. XIII, 15.

(4) יהרג. Strictly speaking ייהרג which would be read as yehareg (meaning 'will be killed') and being followed by 'the Lord' would have a blasphemous connotation.

(5) These are the Taggin, i.e., three small strokes written on top of the letters שעטנזגץ in the form of a crown. V. infra Raba's statement, and note thereon.

(6) I.e., is there anything wanting in the Torah that these additions are necessary?

(7) Of R. Akiba's disciples.

(8) Lit., 'so it has come to My mind'.

(9) R. Akiba died a martyr's death at the hands of the Romans during the Hadrianic persecution. V. Ber. 61b.

(10) שעטנזגץ. V. supra n. 2. There is diversity of opinion as to the proper placing of these strokes. V. Tosaf a.l. In the Scrolls of the Law used at the present time in Ashkenazic communities the form of ornamentation is this, e.g., ש.

(11) Here, too, there are diverse opinions as to the form. The word חטרי which has been translated in the text, following Rashi, by 'add a vertical stroke' from חוטרא, 'a stick', may also mean 'make hump-like', from חטרתא 'the camel's hump'. The form of this letter in Scrolls of the present day is ח.

(12) The letter heth is the initial letter of the word חי, 'He lives', and the stroke or tower above indicates that the abode of the living God is on high.

(13) Isa. XXVI, 4. The latter half of the verse reads כי ביה ה צור עולמים and this is interpreted as meaning 'for with Yah (i.e., with the letters yod and he) the Lord formed the worlds.'

(14) Gen. II, 4.

(15) בהבראם.

(16) בהי בראם.

(17) The world is like an exedra, i.e., closed on three sides and open on the fourth (v. B.B. 25a and b); and so, too, is the letter he. Hence it was most appropriate for this world to be created by the letter he.
(18) Sc. from the right path; i.e., to be rebellious.
(19) Through the small opening at the side.
(20) The repentant sinner requires encouragement and support, so that an additional entrance is made ready for him.
(21) Prov. III, 34.
(22) The letter yod is the smallest letter of the alphabet, and in shape its head droops downwards.
(23) So that each feels a certain sense of shame in the presence of the other.
(24) Even though in the other columns there are very many mistakes. Of course the mistakes have to he corrected.
(25) Is this column to be regarded as free from mistakes since the three mistakes in it may be corrected?
(26) That a scroll with four mistakes in each column must be hidden away.
(27) Since the additional letters can easily be erased.
(28) The missing letters can surely be inserted.
(29) The insertion of missing letters above the lines would make the whole look irregular.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 30a

but when there are additional letters it does not matter.

The other ruling of Rab is this: Rab said, He who is writing a scroll of the Law and has reached the end may finish off even in the middle of the column. And an objection is raised from the following: He who is writing a scroll of the Law and has reached the end may not finish off in the middle of the column as one does with other books, but he should reduce each line as he goes on until he reaches the end of the column! — Rab was referring to other books. But he says 'a scroll of the Law'! — He meant the books of the Law.[1] But this cannot be so, for R. Joshua b. Abba cited R. Giddal who said it in the name of Rab, The words 'in the sight of all Israel'[2] are to be written in the middle of the column! — He means the middle of the line.[3]

It was stated: The Rabbis say, [One may finish] even in the middle of the line;[4] but R. Ashi says, [One may finish] only in the middle of the line.[3] And the law is: Only in the middle of the line.

R. Joshua b. Abba cited R. Giddal who said it in the name of Rab, The last eight verses of the Torah must be read [in the Synagogue service] by one person alone.[5] Whose view is followed here? It surely is not R. Simeon's, for it was taught:[6] It is written, So Moses the servant of the Lord died there.[7] Now is it possible that Moses whilst still alive would have written, 'So Moses . . . died there'? The truth is, however, that up to this point Moses wrote, from this point Joshua the son of Nun wrote. This is the opinion of R. Judah, or, according to others, of R. Nehemiah. Said R. Simeon to him, Can we imagine the scroll of the law being short of one letter? Is it not written, Take this book of the Law, and put it etc.?[8] We must say that up to this point the Holy One, blessed be He, dictated and Moses repeated and wrote, and from this point the Holy One, blessed be He, dictated and Moses wrote[9] with tears [in his eyes], as it says of another occasion, Then Baruch answered them, He pronounced all these words to me with his mouth, and I wrote them with ink in the book.[10] Must we then say that the view stated is not in accordance with R. Simeon?[11] — You may even say that it follows the view of R. Simeon, for since they differ [from the rest of the Torah] in one way, they differ in another.[12]

R. Joshua b. Abba again cited R. Giddal who said in the name of Rab, He who buys a scroll of the Law in the market is regarded as one that has seized a precept in the market, but he who writes it, him the Scripture regards as if he had received it at mount Sinai. R. Shesheth said, Even if he corrected but one letter he is regarded as if he had written it.

(Mnemonic 'A.G.L.M.).[13] Our Rabbis taught: A man should use sheets [of parchment] which

contain from three to eight columns; he should not use one which contains less columns or more.[14] And he should not put in too many columns[15] for it would look like an epistle, nor too few columns[16] for the eyes would wander;[17] but [the width of the column should equal] the word lemishpehothekem written three times.[18] If a man happened to possess a sheet with nine columns, he should not divide it [into two sheets of] three and six columns, but [into sheets of] four and five columns.[19] These rules apply only [to sheets] at the beginning [or in the middle] of the scroll, but at the end of the scroll even one verse or one column [may take up the whole sheet]. One verse! Surely you cannot mean that![20] — Say rather: One verse in one column.[21] The width of the margin below shall be one handbreadth, above three fingerbreadths, and between one column and the other the space of two fingerbreadths. In books of the Law[22] the margin below shall be three fingerbreadths, above two fingerbreadths, and between one column and the other the space of a thumb-breadth. Between each line there must be the space of a line, between each word the width of a letter, and between each letter a hairbreadth. A man should not reduce the size of the script on account of the margin above or below,[23] or on account of the space between one line and another, or the requisite space between one section and another. If [when almost at the end of a line] he has to write a word of five letters he must not write two letters in the column and three outside,

---

(1) I.e., each of the first four books of the Torah may finish in the middle of a column, but the fifth book which would complete the scroll of the Law, Rab agrees, must be written in the form of a colophon gradually reducing the lines so as to reach the end of the column.

(2) These are the last words of the Torah.

(3) But at the end of the column. I.e., the last words in the last line of the column are written in the middle of the line.

(4) And also in the middle of the column (Rashi; but v. Sh. Mek. a.l.).

(5) These verses may not be divided into two portions to be read by two persons.

(6) B.B. 15a.

(7) Deut. XXXIV, 5.

(8) Ibid. XXXI, 26, said by Moses before he died. If then Moses did not complete the Torah he would not have referred to it as the book of the Law.

(9) But did not repeat the words as heretofore, because of his grief.

(10) Jer. XXXVI, 18. Baruch the scribe when writing down the Lamentations as spoken by Jeremiah did not repeat the words because of the grief they caused him.

(11) For since these verses were, according to R. Simeon, written by Moses they should in no wise be different from any other section in the Torah; accordingly it should be permitted to divide these verses into two portions.

(12) These verses have a special law since they were written in special circumstances.

(13) A mnemonic made up of the characteristic Hebrew letters of the rules which follow.

(14) As each sheet was sewn to the others it is advisable for the sake of utility not to have the seams too near or too far apart from each other.

(15) I.e., the maximum number of columns (8) in a small sheet.

(16) I.e., the minimum number of columns (3) in a large sheet.

(17) For the length of the line in each column would he unduly large and the eyes would stray so that the reader would be in doubt as to which line he must read next.

(18) למשפחותיכם. I.e., thirty letters.

(19) So as to make the sheets as far as is possible of similar width.

(20) Since it is necessary to end at the foot of the column, how is it conceivable to fill the whole sheet with one verse?

(21) I.e., the column may be made very narrow, perhaps with only one word on each line, or even enlarging the script, so as to fill up the whole column.

(22) חומשים, also written in scroll form but not intended to be used for the Synagogue service.

(23) The size of the script should be uniform in the column and should not be reduced on the first or last lines so as to obtain the proper marginal space above or below.

but three in the column and two outside.[1] If [when he has come to the end of the line] he has to 'write a word of two letters, he may not insert it between the columns but must write the word at the beginning of the next line.

If [the scribe] omitted the Name of God [and had already written the next word], he should erase the word that was written and insert it above the line, and should write the Name upon the erasure. This is the opinion of R. Judah. R. Jose says, He may even insert the Name above the line. R. Isaac says, He may even wipe away[2] [the word that was written] and write [the Name in its place]. R. Simeon of Shezur says, He may write the whole Name above the line but not a part of it. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says in the name of R. Meir, He may write the Name neither upon an erasure nor upon a word that has been wiped away, neither may he insert it above the line. What must he do then? He must remove the whole sheet and hide it away.

It was stated: R. Hananel said in the name of Rab, The halachah is that he may insert the Name above the line. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Isaac b. Samuel, The halachah is that he may wipe away [the written word] and write [the Name in its place]. Why does not R. Hananel say that the halachah follows this Master,[3] and Rabbah b. Bar Hanah say that it follows the other Master?[4] — Because there is another reading which reverses the names.[5]

Rabin b. Hinena said in the name of 'Ulla who had it from R. Hanina, The halachah is in accordance with R. Simeon of Shezur.[6] Moreover, wherever R. Simeon of Shezur stated his view the halachah is in accordance with it. In what connection was this ruling [of R. Hanina] stated? Should you say in connection with the above: 'R. Simeon of Shezur says, He may write the whole Name above the line but not a part of it'; but since it has been reported in that connection that R. Hananel said in the name of Rab, The halachah is that he may insert the Name above the line, and that Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Isaac b. Samuel, The halachah is that he may wipe away [the written word] and write [the Name in its place], if then [R. Hanina's ruling was stated in connection with the above Baraitha], he should have also stated his view [together with the others]![7] — Rather it was stated in connection with the following: 'R. Simeon of Shezur says, Even if it[8] is five years old and is ploughing in the field it is still rendered clean by reason of the slaughtering of its dam'.[9] But since it was reported in that connection that Ze'iri said in the name of R. Hanina, The halachah follows R. Simeon of Shezur, if this were so then he also should have said it there![10] — Rather it was stated in connection with the following: At first it was held: If a man whilst being led out in chains [to execution] said, 'Write out a bill of divorce for my wife', it was to be written and also to be delivered to her.[11] Later they laid down that the same rule applied to one who was leaving on a sea journey or setting out with a caravan. R. Simeon of Shezur says, It also applies to a man who was dangerously ill. Or [it was stated] in connection with the following:[12] If the terumah[13] which had been separated from the tithe of demai[13] produce fell back into its place,[14] R. Simeon of Shezur says, Even on a weekday one need only ask [the seller] about it and eat it by his word.[15] But since it was reported in that connection that R. Johanan said, The halachah follows R. Simeon of Shezur in the case of 'The dangerous ill man' and in 'The terumah separated from the tithe of demai produce',[16] if this were so then he too should have said it there. — Rather it was stated in connection with the following: R. Jose b. Kippar says in the name of R. Simeon of Shezur, If Egyptian beans had been sown only for seed[17] and part of them had taken root before the New Year and part after the New Year, one may not then separate terumah and the tithes from one part on behalf of the other, for one may not separate terumah and tithes from new produce on behalf of the old or from old produce on behalf of the new. What then should one do? One should collect the whole crop into one heap [and then separate the terumah and the tithes from it], so that the new produce in the terumah or tithe would be deemed to be taken in respect of the new produce that is left in the heap, and the old produce in the terumah or tithe would be deemed to be in respect of the old produce that is left in the heap. But since it was reported in that connection that R. Samuel b. Nahmani said In the name of R. Johanan, The halachah follows R. Simeon of Shezur, if this were so, then he too should have said it

there! — In fact, said R. Papa, it was stated in connection with the case of the ‘Chest’. R. Nahman b. Isaac said, It was stated in connection with the case of the ‘Wine’. R. Papa said

---

(1) If therefore there is sufficient space for three letters he may write the word allowing two letters to encroach upon the margin; but if there is not sufficient space for three letters he must write the whole word in the next line.

(2) Whilst the ink is still moist. The writing upon such a surface would not be as clear and distinct as upon an erased surface.

(3) Sc. R. Jose.

(4) Sc. R. Isaac.

(5) I.e., the opinions assigned to R. Jose and R. Isaac are reversed; hence it was necessary when stating the halachah to report the actual decision.

(6) In Upper Galilee.

(7) I.e., with R. Hananel and Rabbah b. Bar Hanah.

(8) Sc. an animal which was extracted alive out of the womb after the slaughtering of its dam.

(9) Hul. 74b.

(10) I.e., if R. Hanina's ruling was stated in connection with the above quoted Mishnah then Rabin b. Hinena should also have stated his tradition of the halachah alongside with Ze'iri in Hul. l.c.

(11) Even though he gave no instructions that it was to be delivered to his wife. It is assumed that he intended it to be delivered to her but omitted to say so owing to his perturbed state of mind. Git. 65b.

(12) Demai IV, 1.

(13) V. Glos.

(14) I.e., it was mixed up with ordinary ‘common’ produce. The mixture now may be eaten only by priests and would have to be sold to the priest at a low price, so that the loss to the owner is considerable.

(15) In the special circumstances, because of the loss involved and the produce being demai (i.e., produce that had been bought from an ‘am ha-arez who was not trusted with regard to the separation of the tithes), the Rabbis permitted the owner to enquire of the seller about it and to rely upon his word if the seller assured him that he had separated the various dues. If this occurred on the Sabbath it would certainly be permitted to ask the seller about the produce and to rely upon his word, for the honour of the Sabbath (v. Dem. l.c.), but according to R. Simeon of Shezur this is permitted even on a weekday.

(16) Keth. 55a, and Hul. 75b.

(17) In which case they become subject to terumah and tithes from the moment they take root; v. R.H. 13b.

in connection with the ‘Chest’, for we have learnt:[1] A chest, say Beth Shammai, should be measured on the inside;[2] but Beth Hillel say, On the outside.[3] They agree, however, that the thickness of the legs and the thickness of the rim should not be included in the measurement. R. Jose says, They agree that the thickness of the legs and the thickness of the rim should be included, but that the space between them should not be included. R. Simeon of Shezur says, If the legs were a handbreadth high the space between them should not be included, but if less, it should be included in the measurement. R. Nahman b. Isaac said in connection with ‘Wine’, for we have learnt:[4] R. Meir says, Oil [when rendered unclean] is always unclean in the first degree.[5] The Sages say, Honey also. R. Simeon of Shezur says, Wine also. Are ‘we to infer that the first Tanna holds that it is not so with wine?[6] — Render: R. Simeon of Shezur says, [Only] wine.

It was taught: R. Simeon of Shezur related, Once my untithed produce got mixed up with tithed produce,[7] so I went and asked R. Tarfon about it and he advised me, Go and buy some [demai[8] produce] in the market and separate the tithes from it on behalf of the mixture too.[9] He[10] evidently was of the opinion that[11] the majority of ‘amme ha-arez[8] separate the tithes, so that in this case he would be taking the tithe from what is exempt [from the tithe by the law of the Torah] in respect of what is also exempt [by the Torah]. But why did he not advise him, Go and buy produce from a gentile?[12] — Because he holds that a gentile cannot own land in the land of Israel so fully as to

release it from the obligation of tithe[13] so that he would be taking the tithe from what was subject [to tithe by the Torah] in respect of what was exempt.

Another version states: He advised him, Go and buy produce from a gentile. Evidently he was of the opinion that a gentile can own land so fully in the land of Israel as to release it from the obligation of tithe, so that in this case he would be taking the tithe from what is exempt [by the Torah] in respect of what is exempt too. And why did he not advise him, God and buy' [demai produce] in the market? — Because he holds that the majority of amme ha-arez do not separate the tithes.[14]

R. Yemar b. Shelemya sent the following question to R. Papa: Does the ruling of Rabin b. Hinena who cited 'Ulla in the name of R. Hanina, namely, that the halachah was in accordance with R. Simeon of Shezur; and moreover, that wherever R. Simeon of Shezur stated his view the halachah was in accordance with it, include that case where untithed produce got mixed up with tithed produce? He replied, It does. R. Ashi said, Mar Zutra told me that R. Hanina of Sura was puzzled at the question. It is obvious, said he;

---

(1) Kel. XVIII, 1.

(2) To determine its capacity. If it can hold forty se'ahs liquid or two kors dry ware it is not susceptible to uncleanness, for it is no longer deemed to be a 'vessel'.

(3) I.e., the sides of the chest and the top and bottom are to be included in the measurement.

(4) Toh. III, 2.

(5) For with whatever grade of uncleanness a liquid came into contact, whether with a primary source of uncleanness or with what was unclean in the first or second degree, it will always be unclean in the first degree. Cf. Pes. 14b.

(6) Surely all agree that wine is a liquid and the above principle (v. prec. note) applies.

(7) And since the greater part of this mixture was tithed produce the whole is deemed by the law of the Torah to be tithed produce, and is not subject to any further tithe at all. It is, however, subject to tithe by Rabbinic law. The interpretation adopted here is the second given by Rashi, which is indeed preferred by him.

(8) V. Glos.

(9) Demai produce, too, is exempt from tithe by the law of the Torah (because we adopt the majority principle and the majority of 'amme ha-arez separate the tithes), but is subject to it only by Rabbinic law. It is therefore identical with the produce of the mixture.

(10) R. Tarfon.

(11) The words 'According to the law of the Torah a substance loses its identity when mixed in a larger quantity' found here in the text are omitted in all MSS., and are struck out here by Sh. Mek.

(12) Produce grown in a field belonging to a gentile is, it is assumed for the present, exempt by the law of the Torah from the tithe, but is subject to it only 'by Rabbinic law.

(13) The produce of his field is therefore subject to the tithe by the law of the Torah.

(14) So he would then be taking the tithe from what was subject to tithe by the law of the Torah in respect of what was exempt by the law of the Torah

for does it say 'Wherever he stated his view in the Mishnah'? It simply says, 'Wherever he stated his view'.

R. Ze'ira said in the name of R. Hananel who said it in the name of Rab, If a rent [in a scroll of the Law] extended into two lines [of the script] it may be sown together; but if into three lines it may not be sewn together.[1] Rabbah the younger said to R. Ashi, Thus said R. Jeremiah of Difti in the name of Raba: The rule that we have laid down, namely, that if it extended into three lines it may not be sewn together, applies only to old scrolls; but in the case of new scrolls it would not matter.[2] Moreover 'old' does not mean actually old, nor 'new' actually new, but the one means prepared with gall-nut

juice[3] and the other means not so prepared. It is [permitted to sew it] only with sinews but not with thread.

R. Judah b. Abba raised the question: How is it if [the rent extended] between the columns[4] or between one line and another? — This remains unanswered.

R. Ze'iri said in the name of R. Hananel who cited it in the name of Rab, If a mezuzah[5] was written in lines consisting of two words each it is valid. The question was raised: How is it if the first line consisted of two words, the second of three, and the third of one word?[6] — R. Nahman b. Isaac answered, Certainly [it is valid], for it has merely been written like the song.[7] An objection was raised: If he wrote it like the song or the song like it, it is invalid! — That was taught in connection with a scroll of the Law.

It has also been reported: Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan (others say: R. Aha b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan), If the mezuzah was written [in lines of unequal length consisting of] two words, three words, and one word, it is valid, provided it was not in the form of a tent, nor tail-like.[8]

R. Hisda said, The words, 'above the earth'[9] must be [alone] in the last line. Some say [they must be written] at the end of the line, others say at the beginning. 'Some say, at the end of the line', for it is written, As the heaven is high above the earth.[10] 'Others say, at the beginning', as the heaven is far from the earth.[11]

R. Helbo said, I have seen R. Huna rolling up the mezuzah beginning at 'one' and finishing at 'hear';[12] moreover, he left [the space between] the sections closed.[13] An objection was raised: R. Simeon b. Eleazar said, R. Meir used to write [the mezuzah] on duksustus,[14] in the form of a column,

---

(1) But the whole sheet of parchment must be removed.

(2) And no matter how far the rent extended, it may be sewn together again.

(3) In that case even though old it is strong, and will withstand any rent, and therefore it may be sewn together again. This is the interpretation according to Alfasi, Hil. Sef. Tor., and Maim. Yad, Sef. Tor. IX, 15. Rashi explains: if treated with gall-nut juice it becomes darkened and is at once regarded as old. A very difficult explanation.

(4) I.e., to such an extent that had it been in a column it would have gone beyond three lines of script. The question is whether it may be sewn together or not.

(5) V. Glos.

(6) The lines were of unequal length thus: **

(7) Sc. the song of Moses, Ex. XV. In the first column of the song the lines are of unequal length, v. Meg. 16b.

(8) The words in the consecutive lines must not increase in a regular order, that is, like a tent, narrow above and wide below thus: ** nor decrease in a regular order, that is, tapering off like a tail thus: ** V. Sh. Mek. notes 5 and 6.

(9) Deut. XI, 22; the last words in the mezuzah.

(10) Ps. CIII, 11. The penultimate line in the mezuzah ends with 'the heaven', so that if 'above the earth' were written at the end of the last line it would be seen that 'the heaven' is directly above 'the earth', in conformity with the expression in Psalms.

(11) And the furthest distance between these words is obtained by placing 'the heaven' at the end of the penultimate line and 'the earth' at the beginning of the last line.

(12) The opening line of the mezuzah is: Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is One (Deut. VI, 4): and as Heb. is written from right to left, it is clear therefore that R. Huna used to roll up the mezuzah beginning at the left with the word 'one' and finishing at the right with the word 'hear'.

(13) I.e., he began the second passage in the mezuzah on the same line as that on which the first passage ended, allowing only a short blank space between the two passages.

(14) דוכסוסטוס. In making parchment it was the usual practice to split the thickness of the skin and divide it into two sheets, each sheet being treated and prepared. The parchment made from the inner sheet, i.e., the side next to the

flesh of the animal, was regarded as the best quality (this was known as קלף, and that made from the outer sheet, i.e., the side next to the hair, was an inferior quality (this was known as דוכסוסטום).

leaving a space above and a space below, and leaving [the space between] the sections open.[1] And I said to him, Master, what is the reason for this? And he answered, Because [the portions] are not close to each other in the Torah.[2] And R. Hananel said in the name of Rab that the halachah follows R. Simeon b. Eleazar. Now presumably [the halachah referred to the ruling] of leaving [the space between] the sections open? — No, it referred to the ruling of leaving a space [above and below]. And how much space must there be? — R. Menashya b. Jacob (others say: R. Samuel b. Jacob) said, The space taken up by the clasps of the scribes.[3]

Said Abaye to R. Joseph, And do you not hold that Rab's statement [of the halachah] referred to the leaving of the space [above and below]? But is it not the fact that Rab usually relies upon the practice of people, and the general practice is to leave [the space between] the sections closed?[4] For Rabbah said in the name of R. Kahana who had it from Rab, If Elijah were to come and say that halizah[5] may be performed with a covered shoe, he would be obeyed; [were he, however, to say] that halizah may not be performed with a sandal, he would not be obeyed, for the people have long ago adopted the practice [of performing it] with a sandal. R. Joseph, however, reported in the name of R. Kahana who had it from Rab, If Elijah were to come and say that halizah may not be performed with a covered shoe, he would be obeyed; [were he, however, to say] that halizah may not be performed with a sandal, he would not be obeyed, for the people have long ago adopted the practice [of performing it] with a sandal. And it was asked, What is the difference between them? And it was suggested that the practical difference between them was as to whether a covered shoe may be used in the first instance![6] — We must say therefore [that Rab's statement of the halachah referred] to the leaving of the space;[7] this proves it.

R. Nahman b. Isaac said, The precept is to leave [the space between the sections] closed, nevertheless if it was left open it is valid; for when R. Simeon b. Eleazar spoke of 'leaving the space between the sections open', he meant, even open.

Shall we say that the following supports his view? For it was taught:[8] Similarly, if scrolls of the Law or tefillin had worn out, one may not make out of them a mezuzah, for one may not bring down what is of a higher sanctity to a lower sanctity.[9] Now it follows that if it were permitted to bring down to a lower sanctity one would be allowed to make [a mezuzah out of tefillin or a scroll of the Law]; but how is this possible? Here the portions are closed but there they are open![10] — Perhaps [it would have been permitted] only to complete[11] [the mezuzah].

And if it were permitted to bring down what is of a higher sanctity to a lower sanctity, [you say that] one would be allowed to make [a mezuzah out of tefillin]? But it has been taught:[12] It is a law handed to Moses at Sinai that the [Scriptural portions in the] tefillin must be written on kelaf[13] and the mezuzah on duksustus.[13] Kelaf is the side [of the skin] next to the flesh, and duksustus is the side next to the hair![13] — This is only a recommendation. But it was taught: If one did otherwise, it is invalid! — That refers only to the tefillin. But it was taught that if one did otherwise in either case, it is invalid![14] — The two cases refer to the tefillin only, but in the one case he wrote the portions on that side of kelaf nearest to the hair, and in the other case

---

(1) I.e., the second passage is begun on a fresh line, leaving blank the rest of the line in which the first passage ended.

(2) The two passages of the mezuzah are not consecutive in the Torah, the one comes from Deut. VI, 4-9 and the other from XI, 13-21. The second passage is therefore to be begun on a separate line.

(3) Clasps were used by scribes to prevent the sheets of parchment from rolling up.

(4) Accordingly Rab would certainly not have ruled that the space between the sections must be left open which is contrary to the general practice. Hence his ruling could only refer to the space to be left above and below.

(5) חליצה lit., 'drawing off' sc. the shoe; v. Deut. XXV, 5-9. The adopted practice was for the widow to take off a

sandal from the foot of her brother-in-law. There was some doubt, however, whether the ceremony may be performed with a covered shoe instead of a sandal. Cf. Yeb. 102a.

(6) According to Rabbah's version it is not right nowadays to use a covered shoe for this ceremony in the first instance when a sandal is available, until there has been a definite ruling by Elijah that it is permitted. On the other hand, according to R. Joseph's version a covered shoe may be used nowadays even though a sandal is available, until we have a ruling to the contrary. It is thus evident that Rab relies upon the practice of the people.

(7) But on the question as to whether the space between the sections is to be left open or closed, Rab as usual follows the general practice, which is that it is to be closed.

(8) Shab. 79b.

(9) The mezuzah is deemed to be of a lesser sanctity since it contains only two Scriptural portions, whereas the tefillin contain four.

(10) For in the scroll of the Law the space after the שמע (i.e., Deut. VI, 4-9, the first passage in the mezuzah) is closed, and in the mezuzah it is to be left open. We must therefore say that R. Simeon b. Eleazar meant that it may even be left open, thus supporting R. Nahman's view!

(11) I.e., if a word or a line was missing in the mezuzah it would be permitted to patch it up with the same word or the same line cut out from the worn out scroll of the Law or from the tefillin, were it not for the general restriction against lowering the sanctity of a sacred object. But the space between the sections of the mezuzah must in fact be left open.

(12) Shab. 79b.

(13) V. supra p. 202, n. 5.

(14) Presumably the expression 'in either case' refers to the tefillin and the mezuzah, and we are here taught that any variation, e.g., writing the mezuzah on kelaf or the tefillin on duksustus, renders them invalid.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 32b

he wrote them on that side of duksustus nearest to the flesh.[1] Alternatively I can say that the ruling, 'If one did otherwise in either case[2] [it is invalid]', is dependent upon Tannaim. For it was taught: If one did otherwise in either case,[2] it is invalid; R. Ahai declares it valid on the authority of R. Ahai b. R. Hanina (others say, On the authority of R. Jacob b. R. Hanina).

Again, if it were permitted to bring down what is of a higher sanctity to a lower sanctity, [you say that] one would be allowed to make [a mezuzah out of tefillin]? But it must be written on ruled lines![3] For R. Minyomi b. Hilkiah said in the name of R. Hama b. Goria who said it in the name of Rab, A mezuzah that is not written on ruled lines is invalid. Moreover, R. Minyomi b. Hilkiah on his own authority said that [the rule for writing] the mezuzah on ruled lines is a law handed to Moses at Sinai! — Tannaim differ on this point, for it was taught: R. Jeremiah said in the name of our Master:[4] Tefillin and mezuzoth may be written from memory[5] and need not be written on ruled lines. The halachah[6] is: Tefillin need not be written on ruled lines, the mezuzah must be written on ruled lines, and both may be written from memory. What is the reason? — They are well known by heart.

R. Helbo said, I once saw R. Huna when he wished to sit down on a couch upon which lay a scroll of the Law, invert a vessel on the ground, place the scroll upon it, and then sit on the couch. For he was of the opinion that it was forbidden to sit on a couch upon which lay a scroll of the Law. This is at variance with the opinion of Rabbah b. Bar Hanah; for Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan, It is permitted to sit on a bed upon which lies a scroll of the Law. And if someone should whisper in your ear [seeking to contradict you] saying, It is related of R. Eleazar that once, while sitting on his bed, he remembered that a scroll of the Law lay on it, whereupon he slipped off and sat upon the ground, and it appeared as though he had been bitten by a serpent, [answer him that] there the scroll of the Law was actually lying upon the ground.[7]

Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel, If one wrote it[8] like a letter,[9] it is invalid. Why? — Because of the inference that is made by the expression 'writing', which is used here [in connection with the mezuzah] and also there in connection with the scroll.[10]

Rab Judah also said in the name of Samuel, If one hung it on a stick,[11] it is invalid. Why? Because it must be upon thy gates.[12] A Baraitha has also been taught to this effect: If one hung it on a stick, or attached it [to the wall] behind the door, it is a danger[13] and it is no fulfilment of the precept. The household of King Monobaz used to do so when staying at a hostel,[14] merely in remembrance of the mezuzah.

Rab Judah further said in the name of Samuel, The precept is to fix it within the space of the door.[15] Is not this obvious? Does not the Divine Law say, And upon thy gates?[16] — I might have thought that, since Raba stated that the [proper performance of the] precept is to fix it

---

(1) And in either case it is invalid, for the Scriptural portions of the tefillin must be written only on the internal side of kelaf, i.e., the side nearest to the flesh, and any variation would render invalid. On the other hand the mezuzah may be written on any kind of parchment, kelaf or duksustus.

(2) I.e., both as regards the tefillin and the mezuzah.

(3) Whereas the Scriptural portions of the tefillin are not written on ruled lines, so that the portions of the tefillin cannot serve for the mezuzah.

(4) Rabbi(?)

(5) Lit., 'not from the writing'; i.e., without a copy.

(6) I.e., the law which was given to Moses at Sinai; so Rashi Meg. 18b.

(7) And as an expression of his sorrow for the Scroll that was lying on the ground R. Eleazar also sat down on the ground. Had it, however, been on the bed, he would not have objected to anyone sitting on the same bed.

(8) Sc. the mezuzah. And so throughout this passage.

(9) I.e., it was written without having ruled the lines beforehand and without special care as to the spelling of the words (Rashi).

(10) In connection with the mezuzah it is written (Deut. VI,9): And thou shalt write them, and in connection with the Book of the Law it is written (Ex. XVII, 14): Write this for a memorial in the book; as the latter must be written with accuracy as to spelling and upon ruled lines, so the mezuzah too must be written with accuracy and upon ruled lines. Rashi also suggests the inference from the writing of' a divorce (lit., 'a book of divorcement, v. Deut. XXIV, 1), which must also be written with accuracy; but see Tosaf. s.v. כתבה.

(11) I.e., a stick was fastened to the door-post and the mezuzah was hung on the stick.

(12) Deut. VI, 9. It must be upon the actual door-post.

(13) For one might easily knock against it (Tosaf.).

(14) Since there is no obligation to affix mezuzoth to a temporary abode.

(15) I.e., upon that side of the door-post which faces the door but not upon the side which faces the street or the house within.

(16) Deut. VI, 9. It must be fixed on the side where the door shuts, which is on the inside of the framework of the door-post.

in the handbreadth nearest to the street, the further it is from the house the better, he therefore teaches us [that it is not so].

Rab Judah further said in the name of Samuel, If one wrote it on two sheets,[1] it is invalid. An objection was raised: It was taught: If one wrote it on two sheets and fixed it on the two door-posts, it is invalid. It follows, however, that if it was placed on one doorpost it is valid![2] — [The Baraitha] meant that it could be placed on two door-posts.[3]

Rab Judah further said in the name of Samuel, In the law of mezuzah one must be guided by the conclusiveness of the hinge. What is meant by 'the hinge'? — R. Adda said, The sockets [for the pin of the hinge]. In what circumstances?[4] — For example, where there is a door between two houses,

one house being for men and the other for women.[5]

The Exilarch once built a house and said to R. Nahman, 'Fix the mezuzoth for me'; whereupon R. Nahman replied, 'First put the door[-posts] in their places'.[6]

Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, If one fixed it in the manner of a bolt,[7] it is invalid. But this cannot be, for when R. Isaac b. Joseph came [from Palestine] he reported that all the mezuzoth in Rabbi's house were fixed in the manner of a bolt, and also that the door through which Rabbi used to enter the House of Study had no mezuzah! — This is no contradiction, for in the one case it was attached horizontally,[8] in the other it was bent at a right angle.[9] But this[10] too cannot be, for the door through which R. Huna used to enter the House of Study had a mezuzah! — That [door] was used more frequently [than the others]. And Rab Judah has said in the name of Rab that in the law of mezuzah one must decide upon the [door] most frequently used.[11]

R. Zera said in the name of R. Mattena who said it in the name of Samuel, The proper performance of the precept is to fix it at the beginning of the upper third of the door-post. But R. Huna said, It must be raised one handbreadth from the ground and it must be one handbreadth away from the lintel, otherwise the whole of the door-post is valid for the mezuzah. An objection was raised: It must be raised one handbreadth from the ground and it must be one handbreadth away from the lintel, otherwise the whole of the door-post is valid for the mezuzah. So R. Judah. R. Jose says, It is written, And thou shalt bind them,[12] and And thou shalt write them:[13] as the binding [of the tefillin] is high up,[14] so the writing must be placed high up.[15] Now according to R. Huna this is well, for he agrees with R. Judah; but with whom does Samuel agree? Neither with R. Judah nor with R. Jose! — R. Huna the son of R. Nathan answered, Indeed he agrees with R. Jose,

---

(1) So Tosaf. and Asheri. According to Rashi: 'in two columns'.

(2) Even though written on two sheets; contra Rab Judah.

(3) In the Baraitha cited, the two sheets were actually placed on one door-post, but it could have been placed on the two door-posts since there were separate sheets; thus it is in accordance with Rab Judah.

(4) Is one to be guided by the conclusiveness of the hinge.

(5) The mezuzah must be affixed to the right door-post as one enters the house; in this case, however, where one door communicates between two houses, whilst each house has its own door leading into the street, it is difficult to establish which house leads into the other, and on which door-post of this door is the mezuzah to be fixed. We are therefore taught the following test: that side of the door where the sockets for the door-pin are placed is considered to be the inside. Accordingly the mezuzah must be affixed to the right door-post as one enters that house on the inside of which the sockets are found.

(6) For only then arises the duty to fix the mezuzah.

(7) I.e., horizontally.

(8) In which case it is invalid.

(9) I.e., partly horizontal and partly vertical; like the thigh and the leg which form a right angle at the knee when sitting. In this case it is valid.

(10) The report that the door through which Rabbi used to enter the House of Study had no mezuzah.

(11) I.e., in a room which has more than one door the mezuzah must be affixed to that door which is most frequently used.

(12) Deut. VI, 8.

(13) Ibid. 9.

(14) At the top of the head; v. infra 37a.

(15) At the top of the door-post, close to the lintel.

for by 'the beginning of the upper third' he meant that as the furthest point, for one should not fix it

lower than a third of the door-post away from the lintel.

Raba said, The proper performance of the precept is to fix it in the handbreadth nearest to the street. Why? — The Rabbis say, So that one should encounter a precept immediately [on one's return home]; R. Hanina of Sura says, So that it should protect the entire house.

R. Hanina said, Come and see how the character of the Holy One, blessed be He, differs from that [of men] of flesh and blood. According to human standards, the king dwells within, and his servants keep guard on him from without; but with the Holy One, blessed be He, it is not so, for it is His servants that dwell within and He keeps guard over them from without; as it is said, The Lord is thy keeper; the Lord is thy shade upon thy right hand.[1]

R. Joseph the son of Raba stated in his discourse in the name of Raba, If one set it deep in the door-post, to the depth of a handbreadth, it is invalid. Shall we say that the following Baraitha supports him? For it was taught: If one set it in the post [of the door] or if one added another frame,[2] and there was the depth of a handbreadth,[3] another mezuzah is necessary, but if less, no other mezuzah is necessary! — That [first clause of the Baraitha] refers to a door behind a door.[4] But this is expressly stated further on, [thus,] If there was a door behind a door and there was a depth of a handbreadth, another mezuzah is necessary, but if less, no other mezuzah is necessary! — This is merely stated as illustrating [the cases mentioned].

A Tanna taught: If a man set up a door-frame of [hollow] reeds, he may cut away a length of reed and place [the mezuzah in the hollow]. R. Aha the son of Raba said, This was taught only if he first set up the door-frame and then cut away a length of reed and placed [the mezuzah] therein; but if he first cut away a length [of the reed] and placed therein [the mezuzah] and then set up [the whole as a door-frame], it is invalid, because of the principle 'Thou shalt make, but not [use] what is ready made'.[5]

Raba also said, Faulty[6] doors are exempt from mezuzah. What is meant by 'faulty doors'? — In this R. Rehumai and Abba Jose differ; one says, Those that have no upper beam;[7] and the other says, Those that have no side-posts.[8]

R. Hisda said, An exedra[9] is exempt from mezuzah, since it has no door-posts. It follows, however, that if it had door-posts it would require a mezuzah, but surely [the posts] were made only as supports for the ceiling! — He meant to say this: even though it has door-posts it is exempt, for they were made only as supports for the ceiling. Abaye said, I have seen that the halls in the Master's house, although they have posts, have no mezuzoth. Obviously he was of the opinion that they serve only as supports for the ceiling. An objection was raised: A lodge,[10] an exedra, and a balcony, each requires a mezuzah! — The reference here is to the exedra of a school-house.[11] But the exedra of a school-house is a proper room, is it not? — We must say that the reference is to a Roman exedra.[12]

Rehabah said in the name of Rab Judah, An entrance-lodge requires two mezuzoth. What is meant by 'an entrance-lodge'? — R. Papa the Elder said in the name of Rab, It is a lodge, with one door opening on to the courtyard and another leading to the dwelling-houses.

Our Rabbis taught: A lodge which leads into a garden and thence into an outhouse[13] is, according to R. Jose, considered as the outhouse.[14] But the Sages say, It is considered as the air space[15] [of the garden]. Rab and Samuel both said, If the door opens from the garden into the house,[16] there is no dispute at all that it requires a mezuzah, since it clearly admits into the house; they differ only where the door opens from the house into the garden,[17] the one maintaining that the outhouse is the main thing,[18] the other that the garden is the main thing.[19] But Rabbah and R. Joseph both said, If the door opens from the house into the garden[20] there is no dispute at all that it is exempt, since it is clearly

the door for the garden; they differ only where the door opens from the garden into the house, the one maintaining that it serves for entering into the house,[21] the other that it was entirely

---

(1) Ps. CXXI, 5. The mezuzah which is upon thy right hand protects the house.

(2) To the existing door-frame upon which there was already fixed a mezuzah.

(3) In the first clause, presumably this means that it was set in deep in the post to the depth of a handbreadth, and in the second clause this means that the thickness of the new frame was a handbreadth, so that the mezuzah on the original frame is now sunken in to the depth of a handbreadth.

(4) The post referred to in the first clause of the Baraitha was a post that served as the right door-post for two doors. Thus, through the first door one entered the house, and at right angles to this door and hard by it on the right there opened another door through which one entered into an inner room. If the thickness of this door-post was a handbreadth or more, then two mezuzoth are necessary, but if less, then one mezuzah serves for both doors. Similarly the framework spoken of in the second clause of the Baraitha refers also to this post, thus a jamb was added on each side of this door-post making the thickness of the whole more than a handbreadth. Another explanation is that the Baraitha refers to a small door that is made in a large door; if the width from the right edge of the small door to the right edge of the large door is a handbreadth or more, then each door requires a mezuzah; but if less, one mezuzah (i.e., the one on the doorpost of the large door) serves for both doors.

(5) The principle stated here, which is derived from the law of sukkah (v. Deut. XVI, 13) and of zizith (v. ibid. XXII, 12), where in both texts the expression ‘thou shalt make’ is used, is that one's duty is fulfilled only when the precept has been performed after the obligation for its performance has fallen due. In this case, however, the mezuzah was fixed to the door-post before the latter had been set in position and then there was no obligation for a mezuzah; therefore when later it is set in position the mezuzah is ‘ready made’ and cannot serve the purpose.

(6) ‘Semitic doors’ (R. Han. in Tosaf. ‘Erub. 11a, s.v. פתחי).

(7) Or ‘doors to a room which has no ceiling’. But v. Tosaf. a.l.

(8) Or ‘lintels’.

(9) A hall, closed on three sides and open on the fourth.

(10) The watchman's lodge at the entrance of a house.

(11) A hall having four walls but which do not reach to the roof.

(12) Which had sides only a few feet high and the rest of each side was made up of lattice-windows.

(13) Thus: Fig. 1 Fig. 2 The dispute is concerning that door which leads from the lodge into the garden.

(14) And requires a mezuzah.

(15) And does not require a mezuzah. This reading ‘as the air space’ is obviously the correct one and is supported by MSS. and Sh. Mek. Cur. edd. read ‘as the lodge’, which gives no sensible meaning.

(16) In the ensuing argument ‘house’, בית, stands for בית שער, the lodge; cf. Alfasi and Asheri, where the word בית is used at the beginning of the passage too. The interpretation as preferred by Rashi is as follows: if the hinges of the door in question are on the inside, so that the door opens inside (v. Fig. 1), this is conclusive evidence that the door belongs primarily to the lodge (v. supra p. 207), and therefore it requires a mezuzah. V. Rashi for other interpretations of this uncertain passage.

(17) I.e., the hinges are on the outside, so that the door opens outside into the garden (v. Fig. 2).

(18) This is R. Jose's view. He holds that the purpose of this door is not so much for the garden as for the outhouse which can be reached only through this door; and as the outhouse requires a mezuzah so does this door too require a mezuzah.

(19) The Sages’ view. It is therefore exempt from the mezuzah.

(20) V. p. 211, n. 8.

(21) Sc. the lodge. This is R. Jose's view.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 34a

made for the sake of the garden. Abaye and Raba decided in accordance with the views of Rabbah and R. Joseph, whilst R. Ashi decided in accordance with the views of Rab and Samuel, adopting the stricter ruling.[1] And the law is in accordance with the views of Rab and Samuel, adopting the stricter ruling.

It was stated: As for a staircase which leads from one room to an upper room,[2] R. Huna said, If it has but one door, it requires one mezuzah only, but if it has two doors, it requires two mezuzoth. R. Papa said, One can learn from R. Huna's dictum that a room that has four doors requires four mezuzoth. Is not this obvious? — It was necessary to be stated even though one [door] was mostly used.[3]

Amemar said, A door which is in the corner[4] requires a mezuzah. Thereupon R. Ashi said to Amemar, But it has no posts! — He replied, Here are its posts.[5]

R. Papa once came to Mar Samuel's house and saw there a door which had only one door-post, and that on the left side, to which was affixed a mezuzah. He said, Apparently this is in accord with R. Meir,[6] but might not R. Meir have said so only when [the post was] on the right side; did he say so when it was on the left side? What is [your authority for] this?[7] — It was taught: [Upon the doorposts of] thy house:[8] that is, upon the right side as you enter. You say, the right side, but perhaps it is not that but the left side? The verse therefore says, 'Thy house'. How is this derived [from the verse]? Rabbah explained, 'As you enter' implies the right side, for when a man steps [into his house] he steps in with his right foot first. R. Samuel b. Aha quoting Raba b. 'Ulla derived it in the presence of R. Papa from the following verse: And Jehoiada the priest took a chest, and bored a hole in the lid of it, and set it beside the altar, on the right side as one cometh into the house of the Lord; and the priests that kept the threshold put therein all the money that was brought into the house of the Lord.[9]

What is this view of R. Meir? — It was taught: A house that has only one door-post requires a mezuzah according to R. Meir; but the Sages exempt it. What is the reason for the Sages' view? — Because it is written The door-posts.[10] And what is the reason for R. Meir's view? — It was taught: It is written 'The door-posts', and I know that the minimum of 'door-posts' is two; since, however, in the second portion[11] the verse also says the doorposts,[12] which is unnecessary, we have then an inclusive term following another inclusive term, and whenever an inclusive term follows another inclusive term its effect is to restrict;[13] Scripture has thus brought down the law to one door-post.[14] This is the argument of R. Ishmael. R. Akiba says, This is unnecessary; for it is written, Upon the lintel and on the two side-posts.[15] Now there was no need for Scripture to say. 'two'; what then does it mean by 'two'? It lays down the principle that wherever' 'door-posts' are mentioned only one is meant unless the verse expressly says 'two'.

Our Rabbis taught: It is written, And thou shalt write them.[16] It is possible to think that this means that one should write [the portion] upon the stones [of the house], therefore it uses the expression 'writing' here and the expression 'writing' there,[17] and as in the latter case it means upon a scroll so here it means upon a scroll. Or perhaps argue this way: it uses the expression 'writing' here and the expression 'writing' there,[18] as there it means upon the stones so here it means upon the stones. Let us then see to which [of the two] is this case most similar. We may infer the 'writing' which is intended as a precept for all times from the 'writing' which is also intended as a precept for all times, but we may not infer the 'writing' which is intended as a precept for all times from the 'writing' which is not intended as a precept for all times.[19] And [it[20] must be written with ink] as it says elsewhere, Then Baruch answered them, He pronounced all these words unto me with his mouth, and I wrote them with ink in the book.[21]

R. Aha the son of Raba said to R. Ashi, But the Divine Law says upon the door-posts,[22] and you say we must infer the 'writing' here from the 'writing' there [that it shall be written on a scroll]! [He replied,] The verse says, 'And thou shalt write them', which implies a perfect writing,[23] and then [place it] upon the door-posts. But since then it is written, 'And thou shalt write them',[24] wherefore do I need the analogy of the common expressions? — Without the analogy I should have said that

one must write it upon a stone[25] and set it up upon the threshold [as the door-post], it therefore teaches us otherwise.

OF THE FOUR PORTIONS OF SCRIPTURE IN THE TEFILLIN, THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS; INDEED EVEN ONE [IMPERFECT] LETTER CAN INVALIDATE THE WHOLE. Is not this obvious?[26] — Rab Judah answered in the name of Rab, The law had to be taught in respect of the tittle of the letter yod. And is not this, too, obvious? — It was necessary to be taught in respect of the other statement of Rab Judah; for Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, Any letter that is not surrounded on all four sides by a margin of parchment is invalid.

---

(1) I.e., accepting R. Jose's ruling. So that in all the circumstances stated a mezuzah is necessary.

(2) It was usual to place a door at the foot of the staircase or at the top so as to afford privacy to the tenants of the upper and lower floors. Sometimes a door was placed both at the foot and at the top of the staircase.

(3) All four doors, nevertheless, must be provided with mezuzoth.

(4) I.e., the door was placed in a corner of the room at an angle to each of the adjoining walls (see drawing). According to Asheri the meaning is that the whole of one wall was taken up by the door.

(5) The extremities of the two walls to which the door is attached form the door-posts.

(6) Who holds that a door which has only one door-post must, nevertheless, have a mezuzah.

(7) That the right side only was meant.

(8) Deut. VI, 9. Heb. ביתך 'thy house' is interpreted as ביאתך 'thy entering'.

(9) II Kings XII, 10. Hence whatever is to be placed at the entrance of a house must be placed on the right side.

(10) Deut. ibid. The use of the plural implies a minimum of two.

(11) Inscribed in the mezuzah.

(12) Ibid. XI, 20.

(13) For here each expression by itself indicates plurality, and since it is repeated Scripture thereby intimates that the condition of plurality is no longer essential.

(14) That a door which has only one door-post requires a mezuzah.

(15) Ex. XII, 23.

(16) Deut. VI, 9.

(17) In the law of a bill of divorce; cf. ibid. XXIV, 1. So Rashi; Tosaf. suggest that the reference is to the scroll used in the case of a woman suspected of adultery, cf. Num. V, 23, or to the Book of the Law written by the king, cf. Deut. XVII, 18.

(18) With reference to the memorial of stones to be set up by the Israelites when they cross the Jordan, and upon which are to be written all the words of the law; cf. ibid. XXVII, 3ff.,

(19) The engraving upon the stones was an ordinance for that time only.

(20) The mezuzah as well as the bill of divorce and the other cases mentioned above in n. 3.

(21) Jer. XXXVI, 18.

(22) I.e., actually written upon the wood.

(23) The Heb. וכתבתם 'and thou shalt write them', is interpreted as though divided into two words: וכתב תם meaning, a perfect writing; and this is the case only when writing is applied with ink upon a scroll, for any writing with ink upon wood or stones would be imperfect and indistinct.

(24) Signifying that the writing must be upon a scroll.

(25) I.e., one must carve the words upon a stone, which would also be a perfect and distinct writing.

(26) V. supra 29a for this identical passage, p. 189 and the notes thereon.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 34b

Our Rabbis taught: It is written, Letotefeth, letotefeth, and letotafoth,[1] making four in all.[2] So R. Ishmael. R. Akiba says, There is no need of that interpretation, for 'tot' means two in Katpi[3] and 'foth' means two in Afriki.[4]

Our Rabbis taught: I might have said that one should write [the Scriptural portions] upon four

pieces of parchment and put them in four compartments made out of four pieces of leather; the verse therefore says, And for a memorial between thine eyes:[5] one memorial I commanded you, but not two or three memorials. How then should one do? One should write them upon four pieces of parchment and put them in four compartments made out of one piece of leather.[6] If, however, one wrote them upon one parchment and put them in the four compartments,[7] that is sufficient. There must be a blank space between each [portion]. So Rabbi; but the Sages say, This is not necessary. They agree, however, that between each there must be a line or a thread.[8] And if the divisions [between the compartments] were not noticeable,[9] they are invalid.

Our Rabbis taught: How must one write them? The portions for the hand-tefillah[10] one should write upon one piece of parchment; if one wrote them upon four pieces of parchment and put them in one compartment that is still valid. They must, however, be fastened together,[11] for it is written, And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thy hand[12] and as outside it is one sign, so inside, too, it must be one sign. This is the opinion of R. Judah. But R. Jose says, This is not necessary.[13] Moreover, said R. Jose, R. Judah Berabbi[14] concedes to me that if a man has no hand-tefillah but has two head-tefillahs, he may cover up one of them with a skin and place it [on his arm]. 'Concede', [you say,] but that is the very issue between them![15] — Raba answered, R. Jose's statement proves that R. Judah withdrew his opinion. Surely this cannot be, for R. Haninah sent [from Palestine] the following ruling in the name of R. Johanan: The hand-tefillah may be converted for use on the head but the head-tefillah may not be converted for use on the arm, for one may not bring down what is of a higher sanctity to a lower sanctity![16] — This is no difficulty, for one [ruling] refers to an old one[17] and the other to a new one.[18] And according to him who maintains that the mere designation [of a thing for a certain purpose] has a certain force,[19] [we must say that the owner] had made a reservation with regard to it from the very outset.[20]

Our Rabbis taught: What is the order [of the four Scriptural portions in the head-tefillah]? 'Sanctify unto Me'[21] and 'And it shall be when the Lord shall bring thee'[22] are on the right, while 'Hear'[23] and 'And it shall come to pass if ye shall hearken diligently'[24] are on the left. But there has been taught just the reverse? — Abaye said, This is no contradiction, for in the one case[25] the reference is to the right of the reader,[26] whereas in the other it is to the right of the one that wears them; the reader thus reads them[27] according to their order.[28]

R. Hananel said in the name of Rab, If a man reversed the order of the Scriptural portions, it is invalid. Abaye said, This is so

---

(1) The word לטטפת (frontlets, i.e., the tefillin) occurs three times in the Torah, twice (Deut. VI, 8 and XI, 18) defectively written, לטטפת so that in each instance the word might be read in the singular, and once (Ex. XIII, 16) written plene, לטטפות, which indicates the plural number,' thus making a total of four. It must be noted that this Talmudic statement does not agree with the Masoretic text, for לטטפות, written plene, is not to be found at all in our versions. V. Tosaf. s.v.לטטפת.

(2) Hence the rule that the tefillin worn on the head must be composed of four compartments, each containing a specified portion of Scripture.

(3) perhaps the Coptic language.

(4) The language of N. Africa.

(5) Ex. XIII, 9.

(6) This was constructed with the aid of a mould or frame over which the hide, flexible and moist, was tautly stretched and allowed to harden, thus assuming the required form.

(7) The four portions were written upon one long strip of parchment with large blank spaces between one portion and the other, and the parchment was so placed in the compartments that each portion occupied a separate compartment, and the blank spaces of the parchment corresponded with the spaces between the compartments.

(8) I.e., although the Sages do not insist upon the leaving of a blank space between one portion and the other, they nevertheless concede to Rabbi that each portion must be separated and marked off from the others at least by a thread.

Others explain: even when the four portions are in four separate compartments, each portion must be tied up with a thread. V. Sh. Mek. n. 4.
(9) Although consisting of four compartments they were so firmly united that the divisions were no longer noticeable from the outside.
(10) I.e., the tefillah (sing. of tefillin) that is put on the arm.
(11) Into one piece, either sewn together or joined together with glue.
(12) Ex. XIII, 9.
(13) Sc. to join the pieces of parchment into one.
(14) 'The eminent scholar' (Rashi). V. Nazir (Sonc. ed.) p. 64, n. 1.
(15) R. Judah maintaining that the hand-tefillah must be one inside as it is outside.
(16) The head-tefillah is deemed to be of a higher sanctity than that worn on the arm, since the former bears upon it two letters of the Name שדי 'Almighty', whereas the hand-tefillah bears only the last letter of this name; cf. infra 35b. In view of this ruling, then, how can it be said that both R. Judah and R. Jose agree that the head-tefillah may be converted for use upon the hand merely by covering it with a piece of leather?
(17) I.e., the head-tefillah had already been worn on the head, in which case its sanctity may not be lowered by converting it for use upon the arm.
(18) The tefillah had been made as a head-tefillah and also designated for that purpose but had not yet been worn; in that case it may be converted for use on the arm.
(19) V. Sanh. 47b, Meg. 26b, and Ber. 23b. The fact that it was intended to be used as a head-tefillah will debar it from being used upon the arm.
(20) Namely, that if he should require it for use as a hand-tefillah he will convert it to that use.
(21) Ex. XIII, 1-10.
(22) Ibid. 11-16.
(23) Deut. VI, 4-9.
(24) Ibid. XI, 13-21.
(25) In the first Baraitha.
(26) I.e., the person facing the one that wears the tefillin.
(27) When reading the portions from right to left (Rashi).
(28) Sc. as they are found in the Torah, and that is, the order as given in the first Baraitha (Rashi). According to R. Tam's interpretation of the first Baraitha, which states the order from the reader's point of view, the sections occupy the following places: 'Sanctify' is on the extreme right, to the left of it is 'And it shall be when the Lord shall bring thee', next to it is 'And it shall come to pass if ye shall hearken diligently', and on the extreme left is 'Hear'.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 35a

only [if he put] a portion that should be inside outside or what should be outside inside,[1] but if he put what should be inside also inside or what should be outside also outside,[2] it does not matter. Thereupon Raba said to him, Why is it that [the placing of] an inside portion outside or of an outside portion inside is not valid? It is, is it not, because that which should look out into the open does not do so, whilst that which should not look out into the open actually does so? Then, likewise, [the placing of] an outside portion also outside or an inside portion also inside [should also be invalid], since what should look out into the open on the right looks out on the left, and what should look out into the open on the left looks out on the right? We must rather say that there Is no such distinction.[3]

R. Hananel also said in the name of Rab, The underside[4] of the tefillin is a law given to Moses at Sinai. Abaye said, The duct[4] of the tefillin is also a law given to Moses at Sinai.

Abaye also said, The shin[5] of the tefillin is a law given to Moses at Sinai. The division [between the compartments] must reach as far as the stitches. But R. Dimi of Nehardea said, As long as it is noticeable it need not [reach as far as the stitches].

Abaye also said, The parchment [for the Scriptural portions] of the tefillin must be examined

against a flaw, since we require the writing to be perfect and it would not be so [if it had a flaw]. But R. Dimi of Nehardea said, This is not necessary, for the pen[6] would detect [any flaw].

R. Isaac said, That the straps [of the tefillin] must be black is a law given to Moses at Sinai. An objection was raised: The tefillin must be tied with straps of the same [material as the tefillin themselves.][7] The straps may be either green or black or white; but they should not be red because it is repellent,[8] and also for another reason.[9] R. Judah said, It is related of one of R. Akiba's disciples that he used to tie his tefillin with strips of blue wool, and R. Akiba made no comment. But is it possible that that righteous man actually saw his disciple do so and he did not prevent him? They said to him, He certainly did not see him do so, for had he seen him he would not have allowed him. It is related further of Hyrkanos the son of R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos that he used to tie his tefillin with strips of purple wool, and he [R. Eliezer] made no comment. But is it possible that that righteous man actually saw his son do so and he did not prevent him? They said to him, He certainly did not see him do so, for had he seen him he would not have allowed him. Now it is stated here, at all events, [that the straps may be] either green or black or white! — This is no contradiction, for here it speaks of the outside of the strap and there of the inside.[10] But if of the inside, how can it be repellent or give any ground for suspicion?[11] — It might sometimes become twisted.[12]

A Tanna taught: That the tefillin must be square is a law given to Moses at Sinai. R. Papa[13] said, [This refers to] the stitching[14] and the diagonal.[15] Shall we say that the following [Mishnah] supports this view? For we have learnt: If a man made his tefillin round, it is a danger[16] and it is no fulfilment of the precept![17] — R. papa said, That [Mishnah] deals with the case where they were made round like a nut.[18]

R. Huna said, As long as the surface of the sides[19] of the tefillin is whole they are valid. R. Hisda said, If two [sides][20] were split they are still valid; but if three, they are invalid. Said to him Raba, Your ruling that if two [sides] were split they are still valid is true only if [the rents were] not facing each other,[21] but if they were facing each other they are invalid. And even if they were facing each other [they are invalid] only if they were new[22] [tefillin], but if they were old it would not matter. Abaye asked R. Joseph, What is meant by new, and what by old? He replied, If when one stretches the leather it rebounds, it is old; otherwise it is new.

---

(1) I.e., the portions of the first and second compartments or of the third and fourth had been interchanged.

(2) I.e., the portions of the second and third compartments (both inner portions) or of the first and fourth compartments (both outer portions) had been interchanged.

(3) And any change in the order of the portions will render the tefillin invalid.

(4) Each tefillah, it must be remembered, is in the form of a square leather box upon a base, that of the hand consisting of one compartment and of the head of four compartments. In order to obtain the necessary shape (usually in the form of a cube) a mould or frame is used over which the skin whilst moist and pliable is tautly stretched. On being removed from the frame the skin is cut around to an equal length on three sides, whilst on the fourth side there is left a long strip of skin which, after allowing for a projection on this fourth side in order to provide a loop or a duct through which the straps are passed, is bent under the whole box so as to form the underside or the base of the tefillah. After inserting the necessary texts into the several compartments the base is stitched carefully to the extremities of the box on three sides.

(5) The letter shin must be embossed on the right and left sides of the head-tefillah. The shin on the right side (when worn by the person) is of the usual shape, whilst the shin on the left side has four heads, thus **.

(6) At the time of writing the Scriptural portions.

(7) I.e., of leather; but not with strips of wool or silk or linen.

(8) For it might be said that the straps had been stained with the blood of a sore or a wound.

(9) The suspicion that the wearer of these tefillin had had relations with his wife during her period of menstruation, and the straps had consequently been dyed red with blood.

(10) R. Isaac only stated that the outside of the strap must be black; the inside, however, may be of any colour as stated in the Baraitha, except red.

(11) Since the inside of the strap is not seen.
(12) And the inside would be seen.
(13) According to MS.M., 'Rab'. In the parallel passage in Meg. 24b, 'Raba'. So Alfasi.
(14) The stitching of the underside to the box (v. supra p. 218, n. 6) must be done very carefully so that the box should remain a perfect square; thus the stitches should not be pulled too much for fear that the leather will become creased and so lose its correct shape. V. Tosaf. s.v. תפילין and also Tosaf. Meg. 24b, s.v. בתפרן
(15) I.e., it must be an exact square so that the diagonal should be one and two-fifths times the length of the side.
(16) For if he knocks against anything the round head-tefillah would pierce his skull.
(17) Meg. 24b.
(18) I.e., the underside was convex and oval and did not lie flat on the head. In that case only is there a danger, but not where the base is flat and only the box is made round like a cylinder.
(19) I.e., the external sides of the box, or the sides which form the divisions between the compartments.
(20) According to Maim. (v. Yad, Tef. III, 18 and Kesef Mishneh a.l.) the reference is to the stitching of the tefillin, and the rules are here stated where two or more stitches had snapped.
(21) Or: next to each other, i.e., in adjoining compartments.
(22) For it is evident that the leather was of an inferior quality.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 35b

Or else, if when one holds up the strap, [the box] hangs on to it,[1] it is new; otherwise it is old.

Abaye was once sitting before R. Joseph when the strap of his tefillin suddenly snapped. He thereupon asked R. Joseph, May one tie it together? He answered, The verse says, And thou shalt bind them,[2] signifying that the binding shall be perfect. R. Aha the son of R. Joseph asked R. Ashi, May one sew it together, turning the seam on the inside?-He answered, Go and see how the people act.[3]

R. Papa said, Curtailed straps[4] are still valid. But this is not correct; for since R. Hiyya's sons stated, Curtailed blue threads[5] are valid, and curtailed hyssop twigs[6] are valid, it is clear that only there [are they valid] since they are only accessories of precepts, but it is not so here, as [the straps] are accessories of holy things.[7] Apparently there is a fixed length [for the strap], what then is the minimum length? — Rami b. Hama said in the name of Resh Lakish, To the middle finger.[8] R. Kahana explained it, [To the middle finger] when bent, but R. Ashi explained it, [To the middle finger] when extended.

Rabbah used to tie the knot at the back of his head and allow [the straps] to fall straight down [over his shoulders].[9] R. Aha b. Jacob used to tie the knot and then plait [the straps] together. Mar the son of Rabina used to do according to our custom.[10]

R. Judah the son of R. Samuel b. Shilath said in the name of Rab, The knot[11] of the tefillin is a law given to Moses at Sinai. R. Nahman said, Their ornamentation should be on the outside.[12]

Once as R. Ashi was sitting before Mar Zutra the strap of his tefillin twisted round, whereupon Mar Zutra said to him, Is not the Master of the opinion that their ornamentation should be on the outside? He replied, [Yes, but] I did not notice it.

It is written,' And all the peoples of the earth shall see that the name of the Lord is called upon thee; and they shall be afraid of thee.[13] It was taught: R. Eliezer the Great says, This refers to the tefillah of the head.[14]

And I will take away My hand, and thou shalt see My back.[15] Said R. Hana b. Bizna in the name of R. Simeon the Pious, This teaches that the Holy One, blessed be He, showed Moses the knot of

the tefillin.

Rab Judah said, The knot of the tefillin should be placed high up,[16] so that Israel be high up and not low down. Moreover, it should face the front, so that Israel be in front and not behind.

R. Samuel b. Bidri said in the name of Rab (according to some, R. Aha Arika said it in the name of R. Huna, whilst according to others, R. Menashya said it in the name of Samuel), When must one recite the blessing over the tefillin? As soon as they have been put on. But this cannot be, for has not Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel that with regard to all precepts the blessing must be recited prior to the performance thereof? — Abaye and Raba both said, It means, from the time they have been put on until they have been tied.[17]

---

(1) And does not snap.

(2) Deut. VI, 8. The Heb. וקשרתם 'and thou shalt bind them' is interpreted as two words, וקשר תם 'the binding shall be perfect', or 'the binder (i.e., the strap) shall be perfect'; the strap must therefore be whole and not tied together with a knot.

(3) And the people are not in the habit of sewing the straps together again; it is therefore forbidden to do so (Rashi). According to R. Tam it is permitted since the people do sew the straps together.

(4) I.e., the straps which usually hang down after the head-tefillah has been placed upon the head, had been cut short and only stumps of them remained.

(5) Of the zizith, v. infra 38b.

(6) Used in the purification rites of a leper; cf. Lev. XIV, 4.

(7) The accessories of holy things are of a higher sanctity and are treated with greater stringency than the accessories of precepts; v. Meg. 26b.

(8) The reference evidently is to the length of the strap of the hand-tefillah, and the rule is that it must reach from the place that the tefillah is laid upon the arm to the middle finger (either bent or extended). So 'Aruch, Maim., and Tosaf. According to Rashi the reference is to the length of the straps that hang down beyond the knot that is tied at the back of the head. And the answer given 'To the first finger', is explained by R. Kahana as that length corresponding to the greatest distance between the first and middle fingers, and by R., Ashi as that length corresponding to the greatest distance between the first finger and the thumb. The translation in the text follows the explanation of the 'Aruch.

(9) At the back (Rashi); or, in front over the shoulders (Tosaf.).

(10) I.e., he used to let the straps hang down over his shoulders in front.

(11) I.e., the special shape of the knot of the head-tefillah which must resemble the letter daleth and of the hand-tefillah which must resemble the letter yod. These two letters, together with the letter shin that is embossed on the sides of the head-tefillah, form the Name שדי, Almighty.

(12) The letters formed by the knots of the tefillin should be clearly seen from the outside. Another explanation: that side of the straps which is polished black should be on the outside.

(13) Deut. XXVIII, 10.

(14) Since the head-tefillah contains the greater part of the Divine Name.

(15) Ex. XXXIII, 23. V. Ber. 7a.

(16) This, according to Rashi, refers to the position of the knot of the head-tefillah, which must be placed high up at the back of the head and not low down at the nape of the neck. Asheri cites R. 'Amram Gaon that the reference here is to the position of the knot of the hand-tefillah, i.e., high up on the arm.

(17) For as long as they have not been tied the precept is not yet performed.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 36a

R. Hisda said, If a man spoke between the putting on of the [hand-] tefillah and the [head-] tefillah, he must make another blessing.[1] [Evidently] only if he spoke, he must [make another blessing], but not if he did not speak. But R. Hiyya the son of R. Huna sent [from Palestine] the following decision in the name of R. Johanan: Over the hand-tefillah one must say, 'Blessed [art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe,] who hast sanctified us by thy commandments and hast

commanded us to put on the tefillin'. Over the head-tefillah one must say, Blessed . . . who hast sanctified us by thy commandments and hast given us command concerning the precept of the tefillin!' — Abaye and Raba both said, It means, if he did not speak [between one tefillah and the other] he must only recite one blessing, but if he did speak he must recite the two blessings.[2]

One taught: If a man spoke between [the putting on of] one tefillah and the other tefillah, he has committed a transgression and returns home on account of it from the battle line.[3]

One taught: When a man puts on the tefillin, he should put on first the hand-tefillah and then the head-tefillah, and when he takes them off, he should take off first the head-tefillah and then the hand-tefillah. Now it is right that when he puts them on he should put on first the one on the hand and then the one on the head, since it is written, And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thy hand,[4] and then it says, And they shall be for frontlets between thine eyes;[4] but whence do we know that on taking them off he should first take off the one from the head and then the one from the hand? — Rabbah said, R. Huna explained it to me. The verse says, And they shall be for frontlets between thine eyes, that is to say, so long as they are 'between thine eyes' both shall be there.[5]

Our Rabbis taught: When must one recite the blessing over the tefillin?[6] At the time when it is proper to put them on.[7] Thus, if a man rises early to go out on a journey and is afraid his tefillin might get lost,[8] he should put them on, and as soon as the proper time arrives he should touch them[9] and recite the blessing over them. And until when must one keep them on? Until sunset. R. Jacob said, Until every foot has left the market.[10] But the Sages say, Until the time when people go to sleep. The Sages and[11] R. Jacob, however, admit that if a man took them off in order to enter a privy or a bath-house and in the meantime the sun had set, he has not to put them on again. R. Nahman said, The halachah agrees with R. Jacob, since R. Hisda and Rabbah b. R. Huna used to say the evening prayer while still wearing them.[12] Another version reads: R. Nahman said, The halacha does not agree with R. Jacob.[13]

---

(1) When putting on the head-tefillah.

(2) As reported by R. Hiyya. So that in ordinary circumstances only one blessing is recited, namely at the putting on of the hand-tefillah, which blessing serves for the head-tefillah too. If, however, one interrupted with talk between one tefillah and the other then the second blessing must be recited before putting on the head-tefillah. So Rashi and Alfasi, but v. Tosaf. s.v. לא.

(3) In accordance with the Biblical injunction, 'What man is there that is fearful and fainthearted? let him go and return unto his house (Deut. XX, 8), which is explained by R. Jose as alluding to the man who is afraid because of his transgressions. V. Sot. 44a.

(4) Deut. VI, 8.

(5) This teaching, according to Rashi, is inferred from the fact that the verse uses in connection with the head-tefillah the expression 'and they shall be', which is in the plural. Accordingly the head-tefillah must never be alone upon the person; therefore it should be put on last and taken off first.

(6) If one has put them on before daybreak.

(7) That is, the time in the early morning when a man can see a friend of his at a distance of four cubits and recognize him. V. Ber. 9b.

(8) If he were to carry them in his hand.

(9) As though he were putting them on at that moment.

(10) I.e., after darkness has fallen.

(11) So in many MSS. and in Alfasi, and so Sh. Mek. Cur. edd. read '(admit) to R. Jacob'.

(12) Hence they are worn after sunset.

(13) But the halachah follows the first Tanna's view that the tefillin are to be taken off at sunset (Tosaf.).

But did not R. Hisda and Rabbah b. R. Huna say the evening prayer while still wearing them? — They certainly differ [from the above ruling].

And could Rabbah b. R. Huna have said so? Did not Rabbah b. R. Huna say that if it was doubtful whether darkness had already fallen or not, one should not take them off[1] nor put them on? Now it follows from this that if it were certain that darkness had fallen one would have to take them off! — This was stated with regard to the eve of Sabbath.[2] But what can be his view? If he holds that the night is a time for tefillin, then the Sabbath is also a time for tefillin, and if, on the other hand, he holds that the night is not a time for tefillin, then the Sabbath, too, is not a time for tefillin, since the same passage which excludes the Sabbath [from the wearing of tefillin] also excludes the night. For it was taught:[3] It is written, And thou shalt observe this ordinance in its season from day to day.[4] 'Day', but not night; 'from day', but not all days; hence the Sabbaths and the Festivals are excluded. So R. Jose the Galilean; but R. Akiba says, This ordinance refers only to the Passover-offering![5] — He derives it from the text from which R. Akiba derives it.[6] For it was taught: One might have thought that a man should put on the tefillin on Sabbaths and on Festivals, Scripture therefore says, And it shall be for a sign upon thy hand, and for frontlets between thine eyes,[7] that is, [only on those days] which stand in need of a sign [are tefillin to be worn], but Sabbaths and Festivals are excluded, since they themselves are a sign.[8]

R. Eleazar said, Whosoever puts on the tefillin after sunset transgresses a positive precept.[9] R. Johanan said, He transgresses a negative precept.[10] Shall we say that they differ in the principle stated by R. Abin in the name of R. Ila'a? For R. Abin said in the name of R. Ila'a, Wherever the expression 'observe', 'lest', or 'do not', is used it indicates a negative precept. One[11] therefore accepts R. Abin's principle while the other[12] does not! — No, all accept the principle stated by R. Abin in the name of R. Ila'a, but they differ in this point: one[12] maintains that the expression 'observe' when used in connection with a prohibition has the force of a negative precept and when used in connection with a command has the force of a positive precept; but the other[11] maintains that the expression 'observe' even when used in connection with a command has the force of a negative precept.

R. Eleazar also said, If one's purpose is to guard them it is allowed.[13] Rabina related, I was once sitting before R. Ashi when darkness had already fallen and he put on his tefillin;[14] so I said to him, 'Is it my Master's purpose to guard them?' 'Yes', he replied. I saw, however, that his purpose was not to guard them. He was of the opinion that that was the law,[15] but one should not rule so [in actual practice].[16]

Rabbah b. R. Huna said, A man must from time to time touch his tefillin;[17] this may be inferred by an a fortiori argument from the plate.[18] If of the plate, which contains the Divine Name only once, the Torah says, And it shall be always upon his forehead,[19] implying that his mind must not be diverted from it; how much more is this to apply to the tefillin which contain the Divine Name so many times!

Our Rabbis taught: Thy hand,[20] that is the left hand. You say it is the left hand, but perhaps it is the right! It is written, Yea, My hand hath laid the foundation of the earth, and My right hand hath spread out the heavens.[21] And it is also written, Her hand she put to the tent-pin, and her right hand to the workmen's hammer.[22] And it is also written, Why withdrawest Thou Thy hand, even Thy right hand? Draw it out of Thy bosom and consume them.[23]

---

(1) If one was wearing the tefillin at the time.

(2) When Rabbah b. R. Huna agrees that the tefillin must be taken off by the time darkness has fallen, since Sabbath is not the proper time for the wearing of the tefillin.

(3) 'Er. 96a.

(4) Ex. XIII, 10, literally translated.
(5) Of which the preceding verse speaks. And the expression 'from day to day' would be translated as 'from year to year'.
(6) Rabbah b. R. Huna maintains that the night is a proper time for tefillin but the Sabbath is not, for only the latter is excluded in the verse.
(7) Ibid. 16.
(8) Of the relation of God to Israel. Cf. Ex. XXXI, 17.
(9) For the prohibition against wearing the tefillin at night is only inferred from the verse which states And thou shalt observe this ordinance... from day to day, thereby excluding the nights, and a prohibition derived from a positive precept has the force of a positive precept only.
(10) For the expression 'observe' indicates a negative precept.
(11) R. Johanan.
(12) R. Eleazar.
(13) To put on the tefillin (or, to keep them on, v. Sh. Mek, n. 1) after sunset, where the safety of the tefillin is concerned.
(14) According to MS.M., Alfasi, and Sh. Mek. the text should be: 'And he was still wearing the tefillin.
(15) That the night is also the time for tefillin.
(16) Lest one falls asleep whilst wearing the tefillin.
(17) With his hand while wearing them. I.e., they must constantly be in his mind.
(18) The plate of gold worn by the High priest upon the forehead upon which were engraved the words: Holy to the Lord (Ex. XXVIII, 36).
(19) Ex. XXVIII, 38.
(20) Heb. יָדָךְ; in Ex. XIII, 9, and also in a number of other verses, in connection with the tefillin.
(21) Isa. XLVIII, 13. Here יָד clearly means the left hand, in contradistinction from יָמִין, the right hand. This is also seen in the other verses quoted.
(22) Jud. V, 26.
(23) Psalms LXXIV, 11.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 37a

R. Jose ha-Horem[1] says, But we also find the right hand referred to as 'hand', for it is written, And when Joseph saw that his father was laying his hand, the right one![2] And the other? It is referred to as 'the hand, the right one', but never as 'the hand'. R. Nathan says, All this is unnecessary, for since it is written And thou shalt bind them[3] and And thou shalt write them,[4] as writing is with the right hand so the binding shall be with the right hand, and if the binding is to be with the right hand then obviously [the hand-tefillah] must be put on the left hand. Whence does R. Jose ha-Horem learn that it must be put on the left hand? — He derives it from that same passage from which R. Nathan derives it. R. Ashi said, He derives it from thy hand,[5] which, being written with the letter he at the end, indicates the weaker hand. Thereupon R. Abba said to R. Ashi, perhaps it means, the stronger hand?[6] — He replied, Is it written with the letter heth?

This is further disputed by Tannaim. It was taught. Thy hand, written with the he, indicates the left hand. Others say, Thy hand, includes a man that has but the stump of the arm.[7] Another [Baraitha] taught: One that has no [left] arm is exempt from tefillin. Others say, 'Thy hand', includes a man that has but the stump of the arm.

Our Rabbis taught: A left-handed man puts his tefillin on his right hand for that is his left.[8] But it has also been taught that he must put it on his left hand which is also the left of all people! — The latter was taught of a person who is ambidextrous.

A Tanna in the school of Manasseh taught: Upon thy hand,[9] that is, on the biceps muscle; between thine eyes,[9] that is, on the skull. On what part? It was said in the school of R. Jannai, Where the skull

of a babe is still tender.

Pelemo enquired of Rabbi, If a man has two heads on which one must he put the tefillin?' 'You must either leave',[10] he replied, 'or regard yourself under the ban'. In the meantime there came a man [to the school] saying, 'I have begotten a first-born child with two heads, how much must I give the priest?'[11] An old man came forward and ruled that he must give [the priest] ten sela's. But this is not so! For Rami b. Hama learnt: From the verse. The firstborn of man thou shalt surely redeem,[12] I might conclude that this would apply even when the firstborn was rendered trefah[13] within thirty days [of his birth]. Scripture therefore added,

---

(1) There are a number of variants to this word, and the meaning is extremely doubtful. In cur. edd. החורם, the net-maker (Jast.); others read החרום, the flat-nosed, being called by this epithet either because of his physical deformity or, more probably, because of the teaching he reported concerning a firstling that was flat-nosed; v. Bek. 43b. Other variants are ההרם and החרם, possibly place-names.

(2) Gen. XLVIII, 17. This destroys the argument of the first Tanna.

(3) Sc. the Tefillin; Deut. VI, 8.

(4) Sc. the Mezuzah; ibid. 9.

(5) Ex. XIII, 16. ידכה, with superfluous 'he', is interpreted as יד כהה, the weaker hand.

(6) Interpreting ידכה as יד כח, for the letters he and heth are frequently interchanged since they resemble each other so closely in form and pronunciation.

(7) 'The weaker hand' meaning also the broken arm or amputated arm with but a stump left. The tefillin must be put on this stump.

(8) I.e., the weaker hand.

(9) Ex. XIII, 9.

(10) Sc. the school. Rabbi thought that this question was put merely from a desire to scoff at him.

(11) For his redemption. The fixed sum for redemption was five shekels (sela's in the Rabbinic tongue), cf. Num. XVIII, 16.

(12) Ibid. 15.

(13) Heb. טריפה, afflicted with a fatal organic disease This is R. Tam's interpretation; according to Rashi, the child was killed.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 37b

Howbeit,[1] limiting thereby [the general application]![2] — In this case it is different since the Divine Law declared [the law of redemption] to be governed by the expression 'per head'.[3]

The Master said, 'Upon thy hand, that is, on the biceps muscle'. Whence is this derived? — Our Rabbis taught: Upon thy hand, that is, the upper part of the hand.[4] You say it is the upper part of the hand, but perhaps it means actually upon the hand?[5] Since the Torah ordains that one must put tefillin upon the hand and also upon the head, as in the latter case it is to be upon the upper part of the head so in the former it is to be upon the upper part of the hand. R. Eliezer says, This is unnecessary; for the verse says, 'And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thy hand', implying that the sign shall be unto thee but not unto others.[6] R. Isaac says, This too is unnecessary; for it is written, And ye shall lay up these My words in your heart . . . and ye shall bind them,[7] implying that it must be placed over against the heart.[8]

R. Hiyya and R. Aha the son of R. Ivia used to place it exactly over against the heart. R. Ashi was once sitting before Amemar. The latter had an injury on his arm and his tefillin were exposed;[9] whereupon R. Ashi said to him, Does not the Master hold 'it shall be for a sign unto thee but not unto others'? — That, he replied, was stated only to indicate the place, namely, where it is a sign unto thee only.[10]

Whence is it derived that it must be upon the upper part of the head? — Our Rabbis taught: 'Between thine eyes', that is, the upper part of the head. You say it is the upper part of the head, but perhaps it means actually between the eyes? It is written here, 'Between thine eyes', and it is written there, Nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead;[11] as in the latter case it means the upper part of the head where baldness can be made, so in the former case too it means the upper part of the head where baldness can be made. R. Judah says, This is unnecessary; for since the Torah ordains that one must put tefillin on the hand and also on the head, as in the former case it is put on a place which can be declared unclean as a leprous spot by one symptom only,[12] so in the former case it must be put on a place which can be declared unclean as a leprous spot by one symptom only;[12] one must therefore rule out the place between the eyes where flesh and hair are to be found, [and so can be declared unclean by two symptoms,] either by [the appearance of] white hair or yellow hair.

OF THE FOUR FRINGES, THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE INVALIDATES THE OTHERS, SINCE THE FOUR TOGETHER FORM ONE PRECEPT. [R. ISHMAEL SAYS, THE FOUR ARE FOUR SEPARATE PRECEPTS.] What is the practical difference between the two?[13] — R. Joseph said, They differ in respect of a linen garment with [woollen] fringes.[14] Rabbah b. Abina said, They differ in respect of a five-cornered garment.[15] Rabina said, They differ in respect of R. Huna's dictum. For R. Huna said, If a man went out in the street on the Sabbath wearing a garment not provided with proper fringes as required by law, he is liable to a sin-offering.[16]

R. Shisha the son of R. Idi said, If a man cut off [one corner of] his garment,[17] he has gained nothing, for he has simply made it into a five-cornered garment.[18]

R. Mesharsheya said, If a man folded up his garment,[19] he has gained nothing, for it is regarded as spread out.[20] We have also learnt:[21] Water-skins that [have been pierced and] have been tied up again are not susceptible to uncleanness,[22] excepting those tied up with an Arab knot.[23]

R. Dimi of Nehardea said, If a man sewed together [the folded corners of] his garment,[24] he has gained nothing, for if he has no use for the corners he should cut them off and throw them away.[25]

R. ISHMAEL SAYS, THE FOUR ARE FOUR SEPARATE PRECEPTS. Rab Judah said in Samuel's name that the halachah agrees with R. Ishmael.[26] The halachah, however, is not in accordance with him.

Rabina was once walking behind Mar son of R. Ashi [in the street] on one of the Sabbaths preceding the Festival,[27] when suddenly a corner of [Mar's] garment with its fringe had torn away, but Rabina told him nothing about it. When he came home and Rabina told him that it had torn away there [in the street], he said, 'Had you told me of it I should then and there have cast it off'.[28] But has not a Master said, Great is the dignity of man since it overrides a negative precept of the Torah?[29] — Rab b. Shabba explained it before R. Kahana

---

(1) Ibid. Heb. אך, having a limiting force, and so excluding certain cases.

(2) Accordingly in the case of a child with two heads, since it cannot continue to live, the father should be exempt entirely from the payment of redemption money!

(3) Num. III, 47. Consequently as this child has two heads and is now living there must be a payment of ten sela's for his redemption.

(4) Sc. the muscle of the arm.

(5) I.e., the palm of the hand.

(6) And if actually put on the hand it would immediately be noticeable by all. It must consequently be put high up on the arm which part is usually covered with the sleeve.

(7) Deut. XI, 18.

(8) I.e., upon the muscle of the arm, at a point nearest the heart.

(9) For his coat had been cut away around the arm so as to give greater freedom to his injured arm.
(10) I.e., on the upper part of the arm. It need not, however, be at all times covered and hidden from view.
(11) Deut. XIV, 1.
(12) A leprous spot on any part of the body that is free from hair, as the hand, is deemed to be unclean by the appearance of white hairs therein (Lev. XIII, 3), whilst a leprous spot on any part covered with hair, as the head, is deemed to be unclean by the appearance of yellow hairs therein (ibid. 30).
(13) Since the first Tanna and R. Ishmael are agreed that the four fringes are indispensable.
(14) In ordinary circumstances such a garment may not be worn, save where the precept of zizith is concerned. Where, however, one fringe was missing, the entire precept, according to the first Tanna has gone, and the cloak is therefore forbidden as containing diverse kinds, wool and linen; but according to R. Ishmael it is permitted, since each fringe is a separate precept.
(15) A five-cornered garment must be provided with fringes (v. infra 43a), but they differ as to the number of fringes necessary; according to the first Tanna there must be four fringes only, since four make up the precept, whilst according to R. Ishmael each corner must have a fringe, since each fringe is a separate precept.
(16) For bearing an unnecessary burden on the Sabbath, since the fringes were not in accordance with the law. Now if the garment had only three fringes, according to the first Tanna the precept is not thereby fulfilled, hence by reason of R. Huna's dictum the fringes are regarded as an unnecessary burden on the Sabbath; but according to R. Ishmael, the precept is thereby performed, so that R. Huna's ruling would not apply to this case.
(17) Either he cut away a square piece at the corner, leaving behind two right-angled corners, thus making the garment five-cornered; or, he cut away one corner diagonally, leaving two obtuse-angled corners.
(18) Which must also be provided with fringes.
(19) I.e., he turned up each corner of the garment in order to render the garment exempt from fringes (and in the subsequent case of R. Dimi, he sewed down these corners) (Rashi 2); or, he folded the garment (and according to R. Dimi he sewed the fold) and inserted the fringes in the new corners formed by the fold (Rashi 2).
(20) And therefore even now it must be provided ‘with fringes in its corners.
(21) Kel. XXVI, 4.
(22) Since the knot is only temporary and will be untied, the water-skin is regarded even now as a pierced vessel, and is therefore not susceptible to uncleanness.
(23) For these remain so permanently.
(24) V. supra n. 4.
(25) But as long as the corners are not cut off the garment must be provided with fringes.
(26) With all the practical results that follow from that view, as stated above.
(27) For it was usual to preach on the laws of the Festival four Sabbaths before the Festival. V. Pes. 6a.
(28) For since the garment was not now properly provided with fringes (R. Ishmael's view not being accepted as law) it is regarded as an unnecessary burden carried on the Sabbath.
(29) And as it would be undignified for a man of his eminence to remove his garment in the street he is permitted to carry it on the Sabbath.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 38a

as referring to the prohibition, Thou shalt not turn aside.[1] Another version states that [Rabina] told him of it there [in the street]; whereupon [Mar] said to him, ‘Do you think that I am going to cast it off here? Has not a Master said, Great is the dignity of man since it overrides a negative precept of the Torah?’ ‘But has not Rab b. Shabba explained it before R. Kahana as referring to the prohibition, Thou shalt not turn aside?’ ‘Here also it is only a karmelith,[2] so that the prohibition is only Rabbinic.

C H A P T E R I V

MISHNAH. THE [ABSENCE OF THE] BLUE [IN THE FRINGES] DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE WHITE, NEITHER DOES THE [ABSENCE OF THE] WHITE INVALIDATE THE BLUE[3] THE [ABSENCE OF THE] HAND-TEFILLAH DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE HEAD-TEFILLAH, NEITHER DOES THE [ABSENCE OF THE] HEAD-TEFILLAH

INVALIDATE THE HAND-TEFlllah.[4]

GEMARA. Must we say that our Mishnah is not in accordance with Rabbi? For it was taught: That ye may look upon it,[5] implies that the [absence of] one invalidates the other. So Rabbi. But the Sages say, The [absence of] one does not invalidate the other. What is the reason for Rabbi's view? — Because the text says, The corner,[6] [which implies that the fringes must be] of the same [colour] as that of the corner,[7] and it also says, A blue thread;[6] and then the Divine Law says. 'That ye may look upon it', that is, both must be there together as one. But the Rabbis [say]. 'That ye may look upon it', signifies each one by itself. Must we then say that [our Mishnah] is not in accordance with Rabbi? — Rab Judah answered in the name of Rab, You may even say that it follows Rabbi's view, for [our Mishnah deals here] only with the question of precedence. As it was taught: The [proper performance of the] precept is to insert[8] the white threads before the blue; but if a man inserted the blue before the white, it is indeed valid, but he has not fulfilled the precept. What is meant by 'has not fulfilled the precept'?

---

(1) Sc. from the sentence which they shall declare unto thee, Deut. XVII, 11. I.e., the principle is that only a Rabbinic prohibition, though having for its sanction this verse in the Torah, can be set aside on account of man's dignity.

(2) כרמלית, an area which is neither a public nor a private domain, in which, however, it is forbidden to carry anything on the Sabbath by Rabbinic decree.

(3) There should be, according to law, four threads inserted in each of the four corners of the garment, two white and two blue (or, three white and one blue); nevertheless the absence of one colour is of no consequence provided there was the proper number of threads in all. Consequently it is valid if there were four blue threads, or four white threads.

(4) And if a man has only one tefilah (sing. of tefillin) he should put on that one.

(5) Num. XV, 39.

(6) Ibid. 38.

(7) As garments were usually of white linen, there must therefore be white threads as fringes.

(8) Or, to twine, v. Sh. Mek. n. 3. The white threads, as derived above from 'the corner', precede the blue in the verse.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 38b

Should you say it means that he has not fulfilled the precept of the white [threads] but has fulfilled the precept of the blue, but according to Rabbi the absence of one invalidates the other![1] — Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, It means that he has not fulfilled the precept and yet has performed the precept, for 'has not fulfilled the precept' only means that he has not performed the precept in the best way. This then explains the clause, NEITHER DOES THE WHITE INVALIDATE THE BLUE;[2] but how can one explain the other clause, THE BLUE DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE WHITE?[3] Moreover,[4] it has been reported: Levi once said to Samuel, Arioch,[5] you are not to sit down[6] until you explain to me the following: THE BLUE DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE WHITE, NEITHER DOES THE WHITE INVALIDATE THE BLUE.

What does it mean? — He answered, This refers to the fringes in a [white linen] garment; for it is proper to insert the white threads first, since Holy Writ says 'the corner', [signifying that the fringes] of the same [colour] as the corner [must be inserted first]; nevertheless, if one inserted the blue first it does not matter. Well, this explains. NEITHER DOES THE WHITE INVALIDATE THE BLUE, but how can one explain, THE BLUE DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE WHITE? — Rami b. Hama answered, The latter rule refers to a garment that is entirely blue, in which case it is proper to insert the blue threads first, since Holy Writ says 'the corner', [signifying that the fringes] of the same [colour] as the corner [must be inserted first]; nevertheless, if one inserted the white threads first it does not matter. Raba objected, Does then the colour affect the law?[7] — Raba therefore explained that [our Mishnah] refers to the curtailment of the threads; thus whether the blue [threads] were curtailed and the white remained or the white were curtailed and the blue remained, it does not matter. As the sons of R. Hiyya said, Curtailed blue threads are valid; curtailed hyssop twigs are

valid. What is the minimum length of a curtailed thread? — Bar Hamduri stated in the name of Samuel, There must be sufficient to make a loop therewith. The question was raised: Does 'sufficient to make a loop' mean to make a loop of all the threads together,[8] or of each thread separately? — This remains undecided.

R. Ashi raised the question: How is it if [the curtailed threads] are so thick that one cannot make a loop with them, although had they been thinner one could have made a loop with them? — R. Aha the son of Raba answered R. Ashi, They are most certainly [valid], since the precept is all the more noticeable thereby.[9]

Who is the Tanna that disagrees with Rabbi?[10] — It is the Tanna of the following Baraitha. For it was taught: R. Isaac says in the name of R. Nathan who said it in the name of R. Jose the Galilean and who in turn said it in the name of R. Johanan b. Nuri, If a man has no blue threads he should insert all white threads.[11]

Raba said, You can infer from this[12] that one must make a knot after each joint;[13] for should you hold that this is not necessary, then how could the sons of R. Hiyya have said, Curtailed blue threads are valid, also curtailed hyssop twigs are valid? As soon as the upper knot[14] becomes loose it would all become undone![15] —

---

(1) Since it is considered as though the precept of the white threads had not been fulfilled at all, this omission according to Rabbi impairs the validity of the blue; how then can it be said that if the proper precedence was not adhered to it it is still valid?

(2) I.e., even though the blue was inserted first it is not invalid.

(3) Which would mean apparently that even though the white was inserted first it is not invalid. But that is the proper order of precedence!

(4) In cur. edd. is inserted here an answer by Rami b. Hama which is actually given below. It is omitted here in all MSS. and by Sh. Mek.

(5) A title of dignity applied to Samuel the contemporary of Rab; probably a Persian adaptation of 'judge' (Jast.) V. Rashi here, and in Shab. 53a and also in Hul. 76b. V. also Kid. (Sonc. ed.) p. 189, n. 11.

(6) Lit., 'sit on your legs', with reference to their custom of sitting on the ground with their legs crossed under them.

(7) Once it is established that the white threads must be inserted first — established by reason of the fact that most garments were of white linen and the rule that the fringes similar in colour to the corner of the garment must be inserted first-this law stands and is not altered by reason of the colour of the garment.

(8) In which case the curtailed thread would have to be longer than where the loop was to be made by the curtailed thread by itself.

(9) For there is here the minimum length for curtailed threads, and moreover they are thicker and therefore more noticeable.

(10) I.e., whose view is put forward by the Sages in the Baraitha supra p. 233.

(11) For the omission of one colour does not prevent the use of the other. This Tanna clearly disagrees with Rabbi.

(12) From the statement of R. Hiyya's sons.

(13) Each fringe is in part wound around with thread (גדיל), and in part hangs loose (עגף). After the threads have been inserted in the hole at the corner of the garment and folded over double, one thread is taken and wound around the others, and after several windings a knot is made and then the windings begin over again. Each series of windings is called a joint (חוליא), and at the end of each joint a knot (קשר) is made to prevent the windings from becoming undone.

(14) I.e., the uppermost and first knot when holding up the garment by the fringe; or the last or nethermost knot when the garment is worn.

(15) Since a thread has snapped close to the last knot it would inevitably follow that this knot would become undone, and if there were no other knots at each joint, the entire fringe would become undone, in which case it certainly cannot be valid.

Perhaps [they said so only where] there were knots [after each joint].[1]

Raba also said, You can infer from this that the upper knot[2] is an ordinance of the Torah;[3] for should you say it is a Rabbinic ordinance,[4] then why was it necessary for the Torah to permit the insertion of [woollen] fringes in a [linen] garment?[5] One would have no doubt about it, for if one merely fastens together [two pieces] with one fastening[6] no connection is thereby formed![7] You can therefore infer from this that it is an ordinance of the Torah.

Rabbah son of R. Adda said in the name of R. Adda who said it in the name of Rab, If a thread had snapped at the top,[8] it is invalid. R. Nahman was sitting and repeating the above rule when Raba raised the following objection against him: This[9] applies only at the outset,[10] but later on[11] the remnants thereof and the curtailed threads thereof may be of any length whatsoever. Now what is meant by 'remnants' and what by 'curtailed threads'? Presumably 'remnant' means that a part [of the thread] had broken off and a part had remained, and 'curtailed' means that [the thread] had entirely broken away![12] — No, both terms must be taken together thus, the remnants of the curtailed threads may be of any length whatsoever. Then it should have mentioned only 'the curtailed threads'; why does it add 'the remnants'? — It teaches us that there must be left a remnant of the curtailed threads sufficient to make a loop therewith.

Rabbah was sitting and reciting the following in the name of Rab: The thread that is used for winding is included in the number of threads.[13] Whereupon R. Joseph said to him, It was Samuel who said it and not Rab. It has also been reported: Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said, R. Josiah of Usha told me that the thread used for winding is included in the number of threads.

Rabbah again was sitting and reciting the following in the name of Samuel: If the greater part of the fringe[14] was wound around,[15] it is still valid. Whereupon R. Joseph said to him, It was Rab who said it and not Samuel. Indeed it has been reported: R. Huna b. Judah said in the name of R. Shesheth who said it in the name of R. Jeremiah b. Abba who in turn said it in the name of Rab, If the greater part of the fringe was wound around, it is still valid.

R. Hiyya the son of R. Nathan reports it as follows: R. Huna said in the name of R. Shesheth who said it in the name of R. Jeremiah b. Abba who said it in the name of Rab, If the greater part of the fringe was wound around, it is still valid. And even if only one joint[16] was made, it is valid. It is most becoming, however, for the fringe to be wound around[17] for a third [of its length] and the remaining two thirds [to hang loose] as locks.[18]

What is the minimum length of a joint? — It was taught: Rabbi says, [In a joint] the thread must be wound once, twice and a third time. It was taught: If a man wishes to make few,[19] he should not make less than seven, and if many, he should not make more than thirteen. If few, he should not make less than seven, to correspond to the seven heavens;[20] and if many, he should not make more than thirteen, to correspond to the seven heavens plus the six intervening spaces.

A Tanna taught: At the start one begins to wind with the white thread, since Holy Writ says 'the corner' [signifying that the thread] of the same [colour] as the corner [must be used first], and at the end one finishes the winding with a white thread, since what is holy we may raise [to a higher degree of sanctity] but not bring down.[21]

Once Rab and Rabbah b. Bar Hanah were sitting together when a man passed by wearing a garment entirely blue, to which were attached fringes

---

(1) Where, however, there were no knots after each joint, a curtailed thread would render the whole invalid. Hence there is no proof that there must be a knot after each joint.
(2) Here Rashi suggests, either the last knot (as above) that is furthest from the garment at the end of all the windings, or (v. Tosaf. s.v. קשר) the first knot that is made as soon as the threads have been inserted in the corner of the garment.
(3) I.e., a law given to Moses at Sinai.
(4) But by Biblical law it is not necessary to tie the threads together, not even to the garment.
(5) This is established by the juxtaposition of the texts, viz., (Deut. XXII, 12) Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and limen together, and (12) Thou shalt make thee twisted cords, intimating that the former prohibition is superseded by the precept of zizith.
(6) I.e., joining cloths of wool and of linen with a single stitch or knot.
(7) So that by merely threading the woollen strands through the linen garment there is no infringement of the law of 'mixed stuffs'; hence there was no necessity for an express permission by Holy Writ.
(8) Close to the garment; the entire thread had thus broken away.
(9) That the fringes must be of a prescribed minimum length; cf. infra 41b.
(10) I.e., in the first instance when attaching the fringes to the garment.
(11) l.e., if at one time the fringes had been of the prescribed length, but had later been reduced.
(12) And yet it is valid, contra R. Nahman.
(13) To make up the requisite number of eight threads.
(14) Lit., 'the blue'.
(15) Contrary to the prescribed requirement of two thirds hanging loose as locks, v. infra.
(16) חוליא, a section of the fringe around which a thread has been wound several times, and bounded at each end by a knot.
(17) This part is termed גדיל.
(18) Lit., 'a branch' ענף.
(19) Sc. joints; so Rashi and Maim. According to Nimukke Joseph the reference is to the number of windings in each joint.
(20) v. Hag. 12b. For the connection between the heavens and the zizith v. infra 43b.
(21) The white thread is deemed to be of a higher degree of sanctity since it is mentioned first in the text. The middle joint is wound round with the blue thread.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 39b

which were entirely wound around;[1] whereupon Rab remarked, A fine garment, but the fringes are not fine; but Rabbah b. Bar Hana said, A fine garment and fine fringes. Wherein do they differ? — Rabbah b. Bar Hana maintains, since Holy Writ says 'twisted cords'[2] and also 'thread',[3] [the fringe] may be either [entirely] a twisted cord or [entirely] in loose threads. Rab, however, maintains that there must always be loose threads; but the expression 'twisted cords' is required only for the determination of the number of threads; for the expression 'twisted cord' would imply two threads,[4] but 'twisted cords'[5] implies four; one must therefore twist them into a cord, but from the middle they must hang down in separate threads.[6]

Samuel said in the name of Levi, [White] woollen threads[7] fulfil[8] [the precept of fringes] in a linen garment. The question was raised: Would [white] linen threads[7] fulfil [the precept of fringes] in a woollen garment? Do we hold that only [white] woollen threads fulfil [the precept] in a linen garment, for since blue [woollen threads] fulfil [the precept in any garment][9] white [woollen threads] also fulfil the precept, but [white] linen threads cannot fulfil the precept in a woollen garment; or, we can argue, since it is written, Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together. Thou shalt make thee twisted cords,[10] accordingly it matters not whether woollen threads are put in a linen garment or linen threads in a woollen garment?[11] — Come and hear. Rehabah said in the name of Rab Judah, Woollen threads fulfil the precept in a linen garment and linen threads in a woollen garment; [blue] woollen threads together with [white] linen threads fulfil the precept in any garment, even [in a garment] of silk.

This differs from R. Nahman's view, for R. Nahman said, Silk garments are exempt from zizith. Raba raised the following objection against R. Nahman: It was taught: Garments of silk or of raw silk or of floss-silk must be provided with zizith![12] — That is merely a Rabbinic enactment. But then consider the next clause [of that Baraitha]: Woollen threads and linen threads fulfil the precept in every case.[13] Now if you say that it is so[14] by the law of the Torah then that is why diverse kinds are permitted for them; but if you say that it[14] is merely a Rabbinic enactment, how can it be that diverse kinds are permitted for them? — Render, either woollen threads or linen threads.[15] And that is indeed the more reasonable view to take, for it reads in the final clause [of that Baraitha]: These[16] fulfil the precept in a garment of the same material but not in a garment of a different material. Now if you say that it is merely a Rabbinic enactment, then that is why these fulfil the precept in a garment of the same material; but if you say that it is so by the law of the Torah, surely [according to the Torah] only wool and linen can discharge the obligation![17] — This is not a conclusive argument, for the text may be explained in accordance with Raba's argument. For Raba pointed out a contradiction: It is written, The corner,[18] [which implies that the fringes are to be of] the same kind [of material] as that of the corner, but it is also written, Wool and linen.[19] How are the texts to be reconciled? Wool and linen fulfil [the precept of zizith] both in garments of their own kind [of material] as well as in garments of a different kind, whereas other kinds of threads[20] fulfil the precept only in a garment of their own kind [of material], but not in a garment of a different kind [of material].

R. Nahman,[21] however, agrees with the view of the Tanna of the school of R. Ishmael. For a Tanna of the school of R. Ishmael taught: Since in the Torah the word ‘garments’ is used without being specified,[22] but in one particular case[23] Holy Writ specified ‘wool and linen’, the inference is that all garments are understood as being of wool or of linen.

Abaye said, This teaching of a Tanna of the school of R. Ishmael differs from that of another Tanna of the same school. For a Tanna of the school of R. Ishmael taught: By garment[23] I understand only a garment of [sheep's] wool; whence can I include garments of camel hair, of hare's hair, of goat's hair, or of raw silk or floss-silk or fine silk? Scripture therefore says, Or a garment.[24]

---

(1) The entire fringe had been covered with windings of thread so that no part hung loose as the locks of hair. I.e., it was all גדיל and no ענף.

(2) Deut. XXII, 22. Heb. גדילים.

(3) Num. XV, 38. Heb. פתיל.

(4) For a twisted cord cannot be made of less than two threads.

(5) In the plural.

(6) Or: ‘that which is used for winding shall be of it’, i.e., the thread that is wound around the others is included in the number of threads.

(7) Together with the blue woollen threads.

(8) Lit., ‘discharge’. Sc. the garment of its obligation.

(9) For in every garment of whatever material blue threads must be inserted, and these blue threads,תכלת, must be of wool.

(10) Deut. XXII, 11, 12.

(11) The precept is always fulfilled thereby.

(12) Shab. 20b.

(13) Meaning apparently that if the blue threads are of wool and the white threads of linen they together fulfil the obligation of zizith in any silk garment.

(14) That silk garments must be provided with zizith.

(15) But the two kinds together would not be permitted to be used as fringes in a silk garment.

(16) Sc., threads of silk.

(17) For only wool and linen are mentioned in connection with the zizith; cf. Deut. XXII, 11, 12.

(18) Num. XV, 38.
(19) Cf. Deut. XXII, 11, 12, which shows that the fringes must be either of wool or of linen, whatever the material of the garment is.
(20) E.g., silk.
(21) Who maintains that silk garments require fringes only by Rabbinic ordinance, for according to the law of the Torah only garments of wool and of linen are subject to zizith.
(22) Cf. Num. XV, 38: That they make them fringes in the corners of their garments; or with reference to uncleanness by creeping things, Lev. XI, 32.
(23) With reference to plagues in garments, Lev. XIII, 47, 48.
(24) Ibid. 47: Whether it be a woolen garment or a linen garment; the conjunction 'or' includes other garments too as being subject to the law of plagues.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 40a

Our Rabbis taught: A linen garment is, according to Beth Shammai, exempt from zizith;[1] but Beth Hillel declare it liable.[2] The halachah is in accordance with Beth Hillel. R. Eliezer son of R. Zadok said, Is it not a fact that any one in Jerusalem who attaches blue threads [to his linen garment] causes amazement?[3] Rabbi said, If that is so, why did they forbid it?[4] Because people are not versed in the law.[5]

Raba son of R. Hanan said to Raba, Then let ten people insert it and let them go about in the market place and so the law will be made known to all![6] People will wonder at it all the more.[7] Then let it be announced at the public lecture! — It is to be feared that people will use imitation blue.[8] But it is no worse than if it were white![9] — Since one could use threads of the same material [as the garment], it is not [allowed to do otherwise];[10] this being in accordance with Resh Lakish's view, for Resh Lakish said, Wherever you find a positive precept and a negative precept [in opposition], if you can possibly observe both,[11] well and good, otherwise let the positive precept come and override the negative one. But it can be examined,[12] can it not? — Rather we apprehend that it may have been used for testing.[13] But it can be announced on public notices,[14] can it not? — And are we to rely upon public notices?[15] Whereupon Raba said, If

---

(1) It is even forbidden to wear a linen garment that is provided with fringes on account of the prohibition of diverse kinds, linen and wool, which prohibition is not waived even for the performance of the law of zizith.
(2) For the prohibition of diverse kinds is waived by the precept of zizith, this being inferred by reason of the juxtaposition of the two texts; cf. Deut. XXII, 11 and 12.
(3) But it is not forbidden, thus contrary to Beth Shammai's view. Aliter: it causes amazement by reason of the flagrant transgression of the law, thus R. Eliezer b. R. Zadok is in conflict with Beth Hillel.
(4) Since it is not forbidden in law, why did Beth Shammai impose the restriction? Aliter: since Beth Hillel's view was accepted as the law, why should it create amazement in Jerusalem?
(5) And if it were permitted to wear diverse kinds in pursuance of the precept of zizith people might forget about the precept and would wear diverse kinds in all circumstances.
(6) That the prohibition of diverse kinds is waived only in pursuance of the precept of zizith.
(7) That pious men should be wearing garments of diverse kinds, wool and linen.
(8) קלא אילן, a vegetable blue dye, probably indigo, being an imitation of the genuine blue תכלת which is obtained from the blood of a mollusc. Now the prohibition of diverse kinds is waived only when woollen threads dyed with genuine blue are used, but not when they are dyed with imitation blue.
(9) The threads dyed with this imitation blue should be regarded as though not dyed at all, and it has been established that in the absence of blue threads ordinary white woollen threads may be used in their stead.
(10) Since genuine blue is unobtainable and in its place white threads are used, it is proper to use those threads which are of the same material as the garment, thus avoiding any clashing between precepts and obviating the one overriding the other; so that only white threads of linen may be used as fringes in a linen garment.
(11) By carrying out the positive precept without at the same time transgressing the prohibition, as here by attaching

white threads of linen as fringes in a linen garment.
(12) Every blue thread can be subjected to a test so as to ascertain whether the blue dye is genuine or imitation; v. infra 42b. According to another interpretation given in Rashi, the purchaser of the blue thread can inspect the dye in the pan of the dyer in order to ascertain whether the dye is genuine or not.
(13) This thread of blue may be the testing thread, i.e., the thread that was dipped into the pan of dye in order to ascertain whether the dye had reached its proper strength and consistency, and it may not be inserted in a garment, for it is essential that the dyeing of the thread be prepared specifically for the purpose of zizith and not for testing purposes. According to the second interpretation (v. prec. n.): the inspection is of no avail, for the dyer may have drawn off a small quantity so as to test its colour and then have poured it back into the pan, which action renders the entire contents of the pan invalid for the zizith.
(14) Notifying all dyers that the testing thread may not be used in a garment. And according to the second interpretation: notifying all dyers that the quantity taken for the test may not be poured back into the pan.
(15) Some people may ignore these notices, either through inadvertence or deliberately.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 40b

in respect of leaven on the Passover Festival or in respect of the Day of Atonement which involve the penalty of kareth we rely upon public notices,[1] how much more so may we rely upon them here where only the transgression of a positive precept can be involved![2] — Rather, said Raba, I suggested the following explanation[3] and in the West it was similarly[4] reported in the name of R. 'Zera: The apprehension is that the linen garment may have been torn within three fingerbreadths' distance [from the hem] and it had been sewn together [with linen threads, and the threads were left hanging for the fringe],[5] and the Torah has said, 'Thou shalt make[6] and not use what is ready made'.[7] R. Zera [it was reported,] removed [the fringes from] his linen garment.[8] Rab Zera said, It is also to be feared that one will use it as a night wrap.[9]

Raba also said, I stated the following and in the West it was similarly reported in the name of R. Zera: If the garment is made of cloth and the corners thereof of leather, it is subject to zizith; If the garment is made of leather[10] and the corners thereof of cloth, it is exempt. What is the reason? Because we consider the main part of the garment. R. Ahai, however, always decided according to the material of the corner.[11]

Raba said in the name of R. Sehora who said it in the name of R. Huna, If a man inserted fringes in the corners of a three-cornered garment and then added a fourth corner [and inserted a fringe therein], it is invalid, because of the rule 'Thou shalt make, and not use what is ready made'.[12] An objection was raised: The pious men of old used to insert the zizith[13] as soon as three fingerbreadths of the garment had been woven![14] — Render: they used to insert the fringes as soon as the last three fingerbreadths had been reached.

Do we then always apply the rule 'Thou shalt make, and not use what is ready made'? Surely R. Zera has said that if a man inserted fringes in a garment that was already provided with fringes,[15] it is valid![16] — Raba replied, Since one thereby transgresses the law of Thou shalt not add thereto,[17] the act done is not considered at all. R. Papa demurred: How do you know that this man's intention was to add [to the other fringes]? Perhaps it was to cancel the others, so that there was no transgression of 'Thou shalt not add thereto'; accordingly the act done is considered an act.[18]

R. Zera said in the name of R. Mattena who said it in the name of Samuel, [A garment that is provided with] fringes does not come within the prohibition of diverse kinds,[19] and [it is the same] even though the garment was exempt from zizith. What is meant by 'a garment exempt from zizith'? Does it mean a garment smaller than the prescribed measure? But it has been taught: A garment with which a child can cover his head and most of his body,

(1) The decisions of the Sanhedrin concerning intercalation of the year whereby the year is deemed to be a leap year and thus postponing the Passover Festival for a month, or intercalation of the month whereby another day is added to the month and thus postponing the Day of Atonement (or any Festival that comes in the subsequent month) by one day, were announced to the public by means of notices and letters.
(2) For the use of the test thread (or the thread dyed from the quantity taken for testing) is but an infringement of a positive precept, for Holy Writ declares, That they make them fringes (Num. XV, 38), that is to say, the threads must be prepared specifically for the zizith.
(3) Why it is forbidden to insert the blue woollen threads in a linen garment.
(4) Lit., 'in agreement with me'.
(5) So that when the garment is repaired it is already provided with part of the fringe, which is invalid for the precept.
(6) Deut. XXII, 12.
(7) Accordingly when threads of wool are added to the fringe the prohibition of diverse kinds applies and it is not waived by the precept since the precept is not properly performed.
(8) For the same reason as explained above by Raba.
(9) Which is exempt from zizith. And whenever the garment is used not in pursuance of the performance of the precept (e.g., if worn by night) one transgresses the prohibition of diverse kinds.
(10) And a leather garment is exempt from zizith.
(11) And the rule is just the reverse of that stated by Raba.
(12) A three-cornered garment is exempt from zizith, accordingly when the first three fringes were inserted there was no obligation for fringes, and when the obligation falls due, i.e. when the fourth corner is added, the fringes are found to be already made.
(13) Lit., 'the blue' (threads).
(14) As soon as a strip three fingers wide (the minimum size of a garment) had been woven they used to insert two fringes, one at each corner, and the other two fringes they inserted when the cloth was finished. Now it is clear that the obligation of fringes falls due only when the weaving is finished, nevertheless, it is taught here, that the first two fringes are deemed valid and are not regarded as ready made.
(15) A second fringe was inserted at each corner close to the existing fringe, and when all eight fringes were attached, the first set of four fringes were cut away.
(16) I.e., the second set of fringes satisfy the law, although when these fringes were inserted there was no obligation for them, since the first set of fringes had not yet been removed.
(17) Deut. XIII, 1. At the time when each fringe of the second set is inserted there is a transgression of this precept, so that the fringe so made is null and void, and therefore only when the first set is removed does the second set of fringes come into existence, Where, however, the fringes were inserted in a three-cornered garment, this act, not being an infringement of the law, is an act of consequence, and when a fourth corner is added and a fringe attached thereto, the first three fringes are disqualified as being ready made.
(18) Nevertheless R. Zera rules that the second set of fringes is valid even though it was ready made; thus in conflict with the principle laid down.
(19) And it may be worn by a person that is not subject to the law of zizith, e.g. a woman (R. Tam).

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 41a

and in which a grown-up person would walk out for a moment, is subject to zizith; but if a child cannot cover with it his head and most of his body, even though a grown-up person might walk out in it for a moment, it is exempt. And so it is, too, in regard to diverse kinds. Now we pondered over this: What does the ruling 'And so it is, too, in regard to diverse kinds' signify? Can it mean: And so it is, too, in regard to the applicability of the prohibition of diverse kinds?[1] Surely we have learnt:[2] Diverse kinds may not be worn even for a moment! R. Nahman b. Isaac, however, explained, It means, And so it is, too, in regard to the insertion of fringes in a linen garment![3] — We must say that 'a garment exempt from fringes' means, a garment already provided with fringes in which one inserted [another set of fringes].[4] But has not R. Zera taught this once?[5] — One was stated as an inference from the other.[6]

Our Rabbis taught: A garment that was folded over is subject to zizith, but R. Simeon declares it to be exempt.[7] They are agreed, however, that if it was folded over and sewn down, it is subject to the law. Is not this obvious? — It is necessary to be stated where it was only fastened down with pins.[8]

Rabbah son of R. Huna once visited the house of Raba b. R. Nahman and saw that the latter was wearing a garment that was folded over, the fringes being inserted in the folded corners. It happened to become unfolded and the fringes were found to be above[9] [in the middle of the garment], whereupon Rabbah said to him, 'Surely this is not the corner prescribed by the All-Merciful in the Torah!' He at once cast off this garment and put on another. Thereupon Rabbah said to him, 'Do you think that [the law of zizith] is an obligation incumbent upon the person? It is an obligation attaching to the garment;[10] go, therefore, and insert the fringes in it [in the proper manner]'.

Shall we say that the following supports his view?[11] [For it was taught]: The pious men of old used to insert the fringes as soon as three fingerbreadths of the garment had been woven?[12] — It is different with those pious men for they imposed upon themselves additional obligations.

His view[13] is at variance with the angel's view. For an angel once found R. Kattina wearing a linen wrap,[14] and he exclaimed, 'Kattina, Kattina, a wrap in summer and a cloak[15] in winter, and what is to happen to the law of zizith?' 'And do you punish', asked R. Kattina, 'a person [who omits to perform] a positive precept?' 'In a time of wrath', replied the angel, 'we do'. Now if you hold that the law of zizith is an obligation incumbent upon the person then that is why one would incur guilt for not wearing a garment with fringes; but if you hold that it is an obligation attaching to the garment, then why [is any guilt incurred] seeing that these garments are exempt? What then do you hold? That it is an obligation incumbent upon the person? I grant you that the All — Merciful would punish one who wears [without fringes] a garment that is subject to fringes, but would the All-Merciful punish one who wears [without fringes] a garment that is not subject to it? — This is what [the angel] implied, 'You find every excuse to free yourself from the law of zizith'.

R. Tobi b. Kisna said in the name of Samuel, The garments put away in a chest are subject to zizith.[16] Samuel, however, admits that where an old man made it for his shroud[17] it is exempt, for the Divine Law says, Wherewith thou coverest thyself,[18] and this is not intended for an ordinary covering. Nevertheless, when the time comes for its use we should insert fringes in it, on account of the injunction, Whoso mocketh the poor[19] blasphemeth his Maker.[20]

Rehabah said in the name of Rab Judah, If a garment was torn more than three [fingerbreadths' distance from the corner], it may be sewn up, but if [torn] within three [fingerbreadths' distance from the corner], it may not be sewn up.[21] It has been taught [in a Baraitha] to the same effect, viz., If a garment was torn more than three [fingerbreadths' distance from the corner], it may be sewn up, but if [torn] within three [fingerbreadths' distance from the corner], R. Meir says, It may not be sewn up; but the Sages say, It may be sewn up. And they are agreed that one may not fetch a piece of cloth, even a cubit square, which has fringes to it from another garment and tack it on to this garment.[22] And they are also agreed that the fringes may be taken out of another garment and put into this garment,

---

(1) Namely, that a garment which is too small to cover a child but which might be worn by a grown-up person temporarily is not prohibited, although consisting of diverse kinds, wool and linen.

(2) Kil. IX, 2.

(3) And it is forbidden to insert the fringes in a linen garment that is too small to cover the head and the greater part of the body of a child. It is thus evident that a garment smaller than the prescribed measure, even though provided with fringes, comes within the prohibition of diverse kinds.

(4) The second set of fringes, although unnecessary, does not bring the garment within the prohibition.

(5) Supra 40b. Since each set is regarded as being in pursuance of the precept, it follows that the prohibition of diverse kinds does not apply.
(6) R. Zera stated one ruling only, namely the previous one, and this ruling here was inferred from it (Rashi). According to Tosaf. and Sh. Mek. it is just the reverse, i.e., the previous ruling was inferred from this one.
(7) For the garment might later become unfolded and spread out and the fringes will then be found to be in the middle of the garment, and not in the corner as required by law.
(8) In this case all agree that it is subject to zizith, since the pins fasten the parts firmly together, and there is little likelihood of the garment becoming unfolded.
(9) Lit., 'at his head'.
(10) And every garment of four corners in one's possession must be provided with fringes, and it is not sufficient that the garment one is wearing is provided with fringes.
(11) Of Rabbah b. R. Huna, that the zizith is an obligation attaching to the garment.
(12) Clearly because the obligation rests upon the garment as soon as it is made, for if it were a personal obligation the duty to insert fringes would arise only when the garment was about to be worn.
(13) V. p. 246, n. 8.
(14) Which was without fringes, since it was mainly used as a night wrap.
(15) A garment with rounded corners and so not subject to the law of zizith.
(16) For the obligation rests upon the garments, and as they are intended to be worn, they must be provided with fringes.
(17) Lit., 'for his honour'.
(18) Deut. XXII, 12:
(19) There is none so poor as the dead. So that no indignity be shown to the dead the fringes are inserted in the shroud. V. Ber. 18a, and Tosaf. Nid. 61b s.v. אבל.
(20) Prov. XVII, 5.
(21) According to Rashi and R. Gershom the garment had as yet no fringes to it. Now if a piece had torn away within three fingerbreadths' distance from the corner (the area within which it is proper to insert the fringes, v. infra), it may not be sewn together, for after the sewing a thread may be left hanging and, together with other threads, will be used for the fringe. But such a fringe is invalid since one of the threads was ready made and not inserted for the purpose of the fringe. According to R. Amram, Halakoth Gedoloth, and Nimmuke Joseph this garment had fringes to it but one corner with the fringe had torn off; now if the piece torn off was more than three fingerbreadths' distance on each side from the corner, i.e., the piece was three fingerbreadths square or more, it is still a garment and the fringe retains its character as a fringe, so that it may be sewn to the rest of the garment and the fringes are valid: If, however, the piece was less than three fingerbreadths square, it is no more a garment and the fringe is no more a fringe, consequently it may not be sewn to the rest of the garment so as to serve as a fringe, since the fringe had already lost its character as such.
(22) For the fringe would be ready made, and so invalid.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 41b

provided they are not cut.[1] You may well infer from this, may you not, that one may detach the fringes from one garment [for insertion] into another garment?[2] — Perhaps [it is permitted] only when the first garment was worn out.[3]

Our Rabbis taught: In a garment that is entirely blue [threads of] any colour fulfil [the precept of zizith], except imitation blue.[4] An objection was raised: Only threads of the same colour as the garment fulfil the precept; but in a garment that is entirely blue one should insert blue threads and threads of some other colour, except threads of imitation blue;[5] if, however, these were inserted, it is, nevertheless, valid![6] — R. Nahman b. Isaac said, This is no difficulty, for in the one case the garment had fringes, each consisting of four threads, and in the other it had fringes each consisting of eight threads.[7] You may well infer from this, may you not, that one may detach the fringes from one garment [for insertion] into another garment?[8] — Perhaps it had been done [in contravention of the law].[9]

It was stated: Rab said, One may not detach [the fringes] from one garment [and insert them] into

another; but Samuel said, One may do so. Rab said, One may not kindle one light[10] from another light; but Samuel said, One may do so. Rab said, The halachah is not in accordance with R. Simeon's view concerning the dragging [of an object on the Sabbath]; but Samuel said, It is. Abaye said, In every case my Master [Rabbah] followed Rab's ruling, save in the above three cases in which he followed Samuel's ruling, namely, that one may detach the fringes from one garment [and insert them] into another, that one may kindle one light from another light, and that the halachah is in accordance with R. Simeon's view concerning the dragging [of an object on the Sabbath], for it was taught: R. Simeon says, A man may drag a bed, a chair or a bench on the Sabbath, provided he has no intention of making a groove.[11]

Rab Judah used to send [his garment with the fringes] to the fuller.[12] R. Hanina used to roll up the fringes into a ball.[13] Rabina used to sew them up.

Our Rabbis taught: How many threads must one insert? Beth Shammai say, Four;[14] but Beth Hillel say. Three. And how far must they hang down?[15] Beth Shammai say, Four [fingerbreadths]; but Beth Hillel say, Three. And as for the three [fingerbreadths] stated by Beth Hillel each must measure one fourth part of the handbreadth of an ordinary person. R. Papa said, The handbreadth of the Torah is equal to four times the width of the thumb, or six times the width of the little finger, or five times the width of the middle finger.[16]

R. Huna said, Four [threads] must be [inserted in the garment] within [the distance of] four [fingerbreadths from the corner], and they must hang down for four [fingerbreadths]. Rab Judah said, Three [threads] must be inserted within three [fingerbreadths from the corner], and they must hang down for three [fingerbreadths]. R. Papa said, The law is: Four [threads] must be inserted within three [fingerbreadths from the corner], and they must hang down for four [fingerbreadths].

Do we then hold that the fringes have a prescribed length, but I can point out a contradiction. It was taught: Zizith:[17] the word zizith means nothing else than something which hangs over; moreover zizith signifies any length whatsoever. And [this was established] long ago when the elders of Beth Shammai and of Beth Hillel went up into the upper chamber of Johanan b. Bathyra and decided that there was no prescribed length for the zizith; and so, too, that there was no prescribed length for the lulab.[18] Now this means, does it not, that there is no prescribed length at all for it? — No,

---

(1) I.e., each thread is whole and intact (Rashi). This is too obvious, and Tosaf and Nimmuke Joseph are at a loss to suggest a satisfactory explanation.

(2) But it is a subject of dispute between Rab and Samuel, infra.

(3) But it is forbidden to remove the fringes from a garment that is in good condition in order to insert them into another garment, for this would be a disparagement of the precept.

(4) For the fringe must consist of two colours, threads of real blue and threads of another colour (usually white). Hence it is not permitted to have a fringe of real blue and imitation blue since they are both the one colour.

(5) V. p. 248, n. 6.

(6) Thus in conflict with the Baraitha which absolutely excludes imitation blue.

(7) The second Baraitha deals with the case where there were four threads already inserted in the garment, two of real blue and two of some other colour, and it was desired to insert four more threads of imitation blue. Now this is not permitted in the first instance (though if one did so it is valid), for this garment might be sold and the buyer, believing that all the blue threads are genuine, might remove two of the imitation blue threads and insert them into another garment, relying upon them as genuine blue threads, thus involving the transgression of the law of diverse kinds. (Second interpretation of Rashi.)

(8) Since the apprehension is that the imitation blue threads will be removed from this garment and put into another (v. prec. note), it is obvious that it is permitted to do so.

(9) Although it is not permitted to remove the fringes from one garment for insertion into another, the apprehension is that one might do so and in the circumstances of this case there might arise therefrom the transgression of a grave law.

(10) On the Feast of Hanukkah when lights are kindled for eight days.
(11) Although when dragging a heavy object over soft earth it is inevitable that a groove be made, which act is forbidden on the Sabbath, R. Simeon permits it as long as there was no intention of making the groove. V. Shab. 22a.
(12) And he had no fears lest the fuller damage the real blue threads and replace them with imitation blue threads.
(13) To protect them during washing.
(14) One must insert four threads in the hole at each corner of the garment and double them over in the middle, so that eight threads hang down.
(15) After making the necessary windings and knots in the form of a chain, the threads are left to hang loose; and it is established that the loose threads, called the פתיל or ענף, must be twice as long as the chain-like portion, called the גדיל. The dispute between Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel is, according to Rashi, in respect of the length of the פתיל, and according to R. Tam, in respect of the length of the גדיל.
(16) In MS.M.: 'five times and one third the (width of the middle) finger'; so too' R. Gershom, and Sh. Mek.
(17) Num. XV, 38.
(18) The palm-branch, לולב used on the Feast of Tabernacles. V. Lev. XXIII, 40.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 42a

there is no prescribed maximum length but there is a prescribed minimum length.[1] For if you will not say so, the ruling 'And so, too, that there was no prescribed length for the lulab' would also have to mean that there is no prescribed length at all for it, but we have learnt: A lulab which is three handbreadths in length, long enough to shake, is valid?[2] We must therefore say that it means, there is no prescribed maximum length for it but there is a prescribed minimum length; so here too, [with regard to the zizith] it means, there is no prescribed maximum length for it but there is a prescribed minimum length.

Our Rabbis taught: zizith: the word zizith means nothing else than something which hangs loose, for so it says, And took me by a lock [zizith] of mine head.[3] Abaye said, One must keep [the threads] separate, like the forelock of the gentiles.[4]

Our Rabbis taught If one attached the fringes to the tip [of the corner] or to the selvedge [of the garment],[5] it is valid; R. Eliezer b. Jacob declares it invalid in both cases. Whose view is adopted in the following statement of R. Giddal in the name of Rab: The fringes must hang over the corner,[6] for it is written, Upon the corners of their garments?[7] It is the view of R. Eliezer b. Jacob.

R. Jacob said in the name of R. Johanan, It[8] must be removed from the corner the distance of the first joint of the thumb. Now both R. Papa's teaching[9] and this teaching of R. Jacob are necessary. For from R. Papa's teaching I only know that it must be within three fingerbreadths' distance from the corner and not farther away than that, but the nearer it is [to the corner] the better; therefore R. Jacob's teaching was necessary. And from R. Jacob's teaching I only know that it must be away from the corner the distance of the first joint of the thumb and not nearer than that, but the farther away it is [from the corner] the better; therefore [both teachings] are necessary.

Rabina and R. Sama were once sitting before R. Ashi when R. Sama noticed that the [edges around the hole in the] corner of Rabina's garment had frayed and [the fringe] was now less than the distance of the first joint of the thumb away [from the corner], and he said to him, 'Does not my Master accept R. Jacob's teaching?' He replied, 'That rule was intended to apply only at the time when it was first made'. [R. Sama] became embarrassed, whereupon R. Ashi said to him, 'Do not be upset, for one of them[10] is equal to two of us'.

R. Aha b. Jacob used to take four threads, double them over, insert them through the garment, and then make them into a loop;[11] he was of the opinion that there must be eight threads in the [hole of the] garment, the same number as the threads which hang loose.[12] R. Jeremiah of Difti used to insert

eight threads, which [when hanging down] made sixteen loose threads, but he did not make them into a loop. Mar the son of Rabina used to do it as we do now.[13]

R. Nahman once found R. Adda b. Ahabah inserting the threads [in a garment] and reciting the blessing '[Blessed art thou . . . and hast commanded us] to make the zizith', whereupon he said, 'What is this zizi that I hear?[14] Thus said Rab: When making the zizith no blessing is to be pronounced'.

After the death of R. Huna, R. Hisda came in [as head of the School] and pointed out the following contradictory teachings of Rab. Did Rab really say that when making the zizith no blessing was to be pronounced? Surely Rab Judah has stated in the name of Rab, Whence do we know that the zizith made by a gentile are invalid? Because it is said, Speak unto the children of Israel and bid them that they make them fringes;[15] the children of Israel shall make [the fringes], but not gentiles! But where is the contradiction here? — R. Joseph said, R. Hisda is of the opinion that a precept which may be performed by a gentile does not require a blessing when performed by an Israelite,[16] but a precept which may not be performed by a gentile requires a blessing when performed by an Israelite.[17]

Is this a general principle? But take the case of circumcision. This is permitted to be performed by a gentile, for it has been taught: In a town where there is no Israelite physician but there is a Cuthean[18] physician as well as a gentile one, circumcision should be performed by the gentile but not by the Cuthean. This is the opinion of R. Meir. But R. Judah said, It should be performed by the Cuthean but not by the gentile.[19] And yet when performed by an Israelite a blessing must be pronounced, for a Master has said,[20] He that performs the circumcision must say, 'Blessed . . . who hast sanctified us by thy commandments, and hast given us command concerning the circumcision!' — This question [by R. Hisda] concerns Rab, does it not? Surely Rab declares it[21] invalid! For it has been stated:[22] Whence do we know that circumcision performed by a gentile is invalid? Daru b. Papa said in the name of Rab, From the verse, And as for thee, thou shalt keep my covenant.[23] R. Johanan said, From the words, Must needs be circumcised,[24] that is, he who is circumcised shall circumcise.

The law concerning the sukkah[25] adds support [to R. Hisda's principle] while that concerning the tefillin refutes it. Thus, the sukkah is valid when made by a gentile, for it has been taught: A booth of gentiles, women, cattle, or Cutheans, or any manner of booth, is valid [as a sukkah], provided it was roofed according to law.[26] And when made by an Israelite no blessing is necessary, for it has been taught: When a man makes a sukkah for himself he must say, 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast kept us in life, and hast preserved us, and enabled us to reach this season'; and when he enters to sit in it he must say, 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us by thy commandments, and hast commanded us to dwell in the sukkah'. But one never says, [Blessed . . . and hast commanded us] to make the sukkah. On the other hand, the law of tefillin is a refutation; for the tefillin are invalid when made by a gentile, for R. Hinena the son of Raba

---

(1) The fringes may be as long as desired, but they must hang down for at least the length of four fingerbreadths.

(2) But if it is less than three handbreadths in length it is not valid; so that there is a prescribed minimum length for it. V. Suk. 29b.

(3) Ez. VIII, 3. Heb. בציצת.

(4) The forelock after being bound together was left to hang loose in separate strands of hair. So, too, with the fringes, after the necessary windings the threads must hang loose in separate strands.

(5) The closely woven binding at the edge of the garment so as to prevent ravelling.

(6) I.e., the fringes must be some distance away from the corner so that the threads hang over and strike the corner; and it is invalid if the fringes were attached to the actual corner, thus in agreement with R. Eliezer b. Jacob.

(7) Num. XV, 38.

(8) I.e., the hole in the garment through which the fringes are thread.
(9) Supra 41b, that the fringes must be inserted within three fingerbreadths' distance from the corner.
(10) Sc. scholars from Palestine, of whom Rabina was one.
(11) Having doubled over the threads he used to insert the looped end through the hole in the garment an inch or so and then pass the ends of the threads through this loop and pull tight, and in this manner the threads hung from the garment.
(12) So MS.M. and early editions, reading דבעינן for גדיל גדילים דליהוי. According to cur. text: the same as the number of threads that hang loose suggested by the terms 'twisted cord' and 'twisted cords' (v. supra p. 239).
(13) I.e., insert four threads so that there are eight threads hanging loose.
(14) Mockingly mispronouncing the word.
(15) Num. XV, 38.
(16) For the usual formula 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who hast sanctified us by thy commandments and hast commanded us . . .' does not apply since the commandment may be also performed by a gentile.
(17) And since gentiles may not make the fringes it follows that when an Israelite makes them a blessing must be pronounced; thus contradicting the former statement of Rab.
(18) The Cutheans, often called Samaritans, were one of the peoples settled in Samaria by the Assyrian king after the exile of the ten tribes. They adopted certain Jewish practices, particularly those based upon the written word of the Torah; cf. 2 Kings XVII, 2ff. Later, however, they were found to be worshipping a dove on Mount Gerizim; v. Hul. 6a.
(19) V. A.Z. 26b.
(20) Shab. 137b.
(21) Sc. circumcision by a gentile.
(22) A.Z. 27a.
(23) Gen. XVII, 9. Only one like Abraham, i.e., circumcised, may perform the circumcision.
(24) Ibid. 13. Heb. המול ימול can by a slight alteration of the vowels be rendered המול, 'he who is circumcised may circumcise', thus excluding gentiles.
(25) Heb. סכה, the booth set up at the Feast of Tabernacles in fulfilment of Lev. XXIII, 42.
(26) Suk. 8b.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 42b

of Pashrunia taught: A scroll of the Law, tefillin and mezuzoth written by a min,[1] a Cuthean, a gentile, a slave, a woman, a minor, or an apostate Jew,[2] are invalid, since it says, And thou shalt bind them . . . and thou shalt write them,[3] which indicates that those who 'bind' may 'write', but those who do not 'bind' may not 'write'. And yet when made by an Israelite no blessing is pronounced; for R. Hiyya the son of R. Huna sent the following decision in the name of R. Johanan: Over the hand-tefillah one must say, 'Blessed . . . who hast sanctified us by thy commandments and hast commanded us to put on the tefillin'. Over the head-tefillah one must say, 'Blessed . . . who hast sanctified us by thy commandments and hast given us command concerning the precept of the tefillin'. But one never says, '[Blessed . . . and hast commanded us] to make the tefillin!' — Indeed this is the true principle: Wherever a precept is completed by a single act,[4] e.g., circumcision, although it may be performed by a gentile, when an Israelite performs it he must pronounce a blessing; and wherever a precept is not completed by a single act, e.g., the tefillin,[5] although it may be made by a gentile, when an Israelite makes it he does not pronounce a blessing. And as regards the zizith they differ[6] in this: One holds that [the law of zizith] is an obligation resting upon the garment,[7] whilst the other holds that it is an obligation incumbent upon the person.[8]

R. Mordecai said to R. Ashi, You have had it reported so;[9] but we had it reported thus: Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, Whence do we know that the zizith made by a gentile is valid? Because it is said, Speak unto the children of Israel and bid them that they make them fringes;[10] others may make [the fringes] for them.

Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, If a man made [the zizith] from the fringes[11] of the cloth, or

from sewing threads,[12] or from tufts[11] of the cloth, they are invalid;[13] but if he made them from a ball of thread they are valid.[14] When I repeated this before Samuel he said that even if he made them from a ball of thread they are invalid, because it is necessary that the weaving of the thread be done for this purpose. This, however, is a matter of dispute between Tannaim, for it has been taught:[15] If a man overlaid [the tefillin] with gold or covered them with the skin of an unclean animal, they are invalid;[16] if with the skin of a clean animal, they are valid, even though he did not prepare it for this specific purpose. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, Even if he covered them with the skin of a clean animal they are invalid, unless it had been prepared for this specific purpose.[17]

Abaye enquired of R. Samuel b. Rab Judah, How do you dye the blue thread? He replied, We take the blood of hillazon[18] together with other ingredients and put them all in a pot and boil them together. Then we take out a little in an egg-shell and test it on a piece of wool; and we throw away what remains in the egg-shell and burn the wool. One can infer three things from this: [i] that the dye used for testing is unfit;[19] [ii] that the dyeing must be for the specific purpose [of the precept]; and [iii] that the dye used for testing renders the rest unfit.[20] Are not the rules that the test quantity is itself unfit and that the dyeing must be for the specific purpose [of the precept] identical in meaning? — R. Ashi answered, One states the reason for the other, as much as to say: Why is the test quantity itself unfit? Because the dyeing must be for the specific purpose [of the precept]. This, however, is a matter of dispute between Tannaim, for it has been taught: The test quantity is itself unfit, for it says, All of blue.[21] So R. Hanina b. Gamaliel. But R. Johanan b. Dahabai says, Even the second dyeing[22] is valid, for it says, And scarlet.[23]

Our Rabbis taught: There is no manner of testing the blue thread;[24] it should therefore be bought only from an expert.[25] The tefillin can be tested,[26] nevertheless they should only be bought from an expert.[27] Scrolls of the Law and mezuzoth can be tested, and may be bought from anyone.[28]

Is there then no manner of testing the blue thread? But R. Isaac the son of R. Judah used to test it (mnemonic sign: with Ge Shem)[29] thus: He used to mix together liquid alum, juice of fenugreek, and urine

---

(1) Heb. מין, a sectarian, or heretic. Idolatrous priests, whether Jews or gentiles (Rashi); v. Glos.

(2) Heb. מומר, 'a changed (Israelite)'; a Jew who neglects the practices without discarding the beliefs of Judaism.

(3) Deut. VI, 8, 9.

(4) Lit., 'comes to an end by the doing thereof'.

(5) For the performance of the precept of tefillin is not completed by the making but by the wearing of them.

(6) R. Nahman and R. Hisda as to whether one must pronounce a blessing when making the fringes.

(7) This is R. Hisda's view, and therefore as soon as the fringes are inserted in the garment that is the completion of the precept, so that it is necessary to make a blessing at the time.

(8) R. Nahman holds that the precept is performed only when the garment is worn, and therefore no blessing is pronounced when inserting the fringes.

(9) That fringes made by a gentile are invalid.

(10) Num. XV, 38. 'They' is taken impersonally, not necessarily the children of Israel.

(11) The fringes or tufts of the woven cloth were twisted into zizith, but were not attached to the cloth for this purpose.

(12) That were used in the sewing of the garment and the ends of which were left hanging from the garment.

(13) Since they were not attached to the garment as zizith.

(14) Even though the thread was not woven specifically for zizith.

(15) Git. 45b; Sanh. 48b.

(16) Cf. Shab. 108a: That the law of the Lord may be in thy mouth (Ex. XIII, 9), the tefillin should be made from that which is permissible for food.

(17) Similarly the first Tanna and Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel would differ as to the necessity for weaving the threads specifically for the purpose of zizith.

(18) Heb. חלזון, a species of mollusc. V. Lewysohn, Zoologie des Talmuds, 280-285.

(19) For dyeing, and the wool dipped in it must be burnt, since it was not dyed for the purpose of the zizith.
(20) If it is poured back into the vessel with the dye.
(21) Ex. XXVIII, 31. The dyeing of the blue thread for the zizith should be the first use of the dye, i.e. nothing should have been dyed with this dye previously. Hence the quantity of dye used in testing is not valid for the zizith.
(22) I.e., even though something else has already been dyed with this dye.
(23) Lev. XIV, 4. Heb. שני תולעת is interpreted as שני תולעת 'the second use of the scarlet dye'. And so it is too with the blue dye.
(24) To ascertain whether it has been dyed with genuine or imitation blue.
(25) One who knows that vegetable blue or any other imitation blue is unfit for the purpose.
(26) To ascertain whether they have been made according to prescribed law and whether the Scriptural portions therein have been correctly written.
(27) One who knows that it is essential to prepare the leather specifically for the tefillin.
(28) Since it is not necessary that the parchment upon which they are written be prepared specially for the purpose.
(29) גשם being the initial letters of the ingredients used in the mixture for testing: ג for גילא (alum), ש for אתלילבש (fenugreek) and מ for מי רגלים (urine).

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 43a

of a forty-day old child,[1] and soak [the blue thread] in it overnight until the morning; if the colour faded it is invalid,[2] but if not, it is valid. Moreover, R. Adda stated the following test before Raba in the name of R. 'Avira: One should take a piece of hard leavened dough of barley meal and bake it with [the blue thread] inside; if the colour improved[3] it is valid, but if it deteriorated it is invalid; and in order to remember this, think of the phrase 'a false change, a true change!'[4] — The statement 'There is no manner of testing the blue thread' refers to the test quantity.[5]

Mar of Moshke once obtained in the time of R. Ahai some blue thread; on testing it by the test submitted by R. Isaac the son of R. Judah its colour faded, but on testing it by R. Adda's test its colour improved. He was about to declare it invalid when R. Ahai said to him, This is neither genuine blue nor imitation blue! We must therefore say that one test[6] supplements the other thus: if the test of R. Isaac the son of R. Judah had been applied and the colour had not faded it is certainly valid, but if its colour had faded we should then test it by R. Adda's test by [baking it in] a hard piece of leavened dough; if its colour improved it is valid, but if it deteriorated it is invalid. A message was sent from there [Palestine] saying, The tests supplement each other.

R. Mani was most particular when buying [the blue thread]. in accordance with the restrictions of the above Baraitha;[7] whereupon a certain old man said to him, Those who long preceded you acted so, and they were successful in their business.

Our Rabbis taught: If a man bought a garment furnished with zizith from an Israelite in the market, the presumption is [that it is valid];[8] if he bought it from a gentile, who was a merchant, it is valid,[9] but if he was a private individual it is invalid.[10] And [this is so] not withstanding that they said, A man may not sell a garment furnished with zizith to a gentile unless he removed the zizith.[11] What is the reason for this? — Here it was explained, on account of a harlot.[12] Rab Judah said, It is to be feared that [an Israelite] might join him on the road and he might kill him.[13]

Rab Judah attached fringes to the aprons of [the women of] his household;[14] moreover, he used to say every morning the blessing ['. . . and hast commanded us] to enwrap ourselves with the fringes'. But since he attached [the fringes to the womens' garments], obviously he is of the opinion that it is a precept not dependent on a fixed time;[15] why then did he say the blessing every morning?[16] — He follows Rabbi's view; for it was taught: Whenever a man puts on the tefillin he should make a blessing over them, says Rabbi. But if so, at any time [of the day whenever he puts on the garment he should say the blessing]? — Rab Judah was a most decorous person and would not take off his

cloak the whole day long. Then why [did he say the blessing] in the morning?[17] — That was when he changed from night clothes into day clothes.

Our Rabbis taught: All must observe the law of zizith, priests, Levites, and Israelites, proselytes, women and slaves. R. Simeon declares women exempt, since it is a positive precept dependent on a fixed time,[18] and women are exempt from all positive precepts that are dependent on a fixed time.

The Master said, 'All must observe the law of zizith, priests, Levites, and Israelites'. Is not this obvious? For if priests and Levites and Israelites were exempt, then who would observe it? — It was stated particularly on account of priests. For I might have argued, since it is written, Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together, and [it is followed by,] Thou shalt make thee twisted cords,[19] . that only those who are forbidden to wear mingled stuff must observe the law of zizith, and as priests are permitted to wear mingled stuff[20] they need not observe [the law of zizith]; we are therefore taught [that they, too, are bound], for although while performing the service [in the Temple] they may wear [mingled stuff] they certainly may not wear it when not performing the service.

R. Simeon declares women exempt'. What is R. Simeon's reason? — It was taught: That ye may look upon it:[21] this excludes a night garment. You say it excludes a night garment, but perhaps it is not so, but it excludes rather a blind man's garment? The verse, when it says, Wherewith thou coverest thyself,[22] clearly includes a blind man's garment; how then must I explain the verse, That ye may look upon it? As excluding a night garment. And why do you choose to include a blind man's garment and to exclude a night garment?[23] include a blind man's garment since it is looked upon by others, whilst I exclude a night garment since it cannot be looked upon by others. And the Rabbis,

---

(1) Or 'that had been kept for forty days'.

(2) For it is not genuine blue.

(3) Lit., 'changed for the better'.

(4) Where the change was for the worse, i.e., the colour deteriorated, it is spurious and is invalid; but where the change was for the better it is genuine and is valid.

(5) I.e., there is no manner of testing the blue thread so as to ascertain whether it was dyed in the vessel with the dye or in the quantity taken out as a test.

(6) Lit., 'the teachings' referring to the teachings of R. Isaac and R. Adda.

(7) That it should be bought only from an expert who knows the law.

(8) I.e., the blue thread in the zizith is deemed to be genuine.

(9) For the merchant would not risk his reputation as an honest dealer by passing off the imitation blue for the genuine.

(10) For the gentile may have dyed the thread himself, in which case it obviously could not have been dyed for the purpose of the precept.

(11) Nevertheless if one bought it from a gentile merchant it is valid, for it is almost certain that a Jew sold it to him.

(12) A gentile harlot, receiving this garment with the fringes from a gentile as hire, might spread an evil report against a Jew, producing the garment in support of her words.

(13) A Jewish wayfarer would unhesitatingly join the gentile on the way, believing him to be a Jew since he is wearing a garment with fringes, and would have no suspicion against him so as to guard himself against attack.

(14) For he held that women are also bound to wear zizith.

(15) For women must observe only those positive precepts that do not depend upon the time of the year or of the day for their performance; therefore by imposing the precept of zizith upon women Rab Judah obviously holds that night as well as day is the proper time for the fringes.

(16) Surely the blessing should be said only once, and that when the garment is put on for the first time.

(17) Which presumably means at dawn; he should, however, have recited the blessing even earlier than dawn, as soon as he rose.

(18) For the night is not the proper time for zizith.

(19) Deut. XXII, 11, 12.

(20) For the girdle which was part of the Priests' robes consisted of wool and linen.

(21) Num. XV, 39.

(22) Deut. XXII, 12.

(23) The verse surely is not required to include a blind man's garment; since they declare that a night garment is subject to zizith — for according to them the precept is not limited to time, a fortiori a blind man's garment is subject to zizith.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 43b

for what purpose do they use the expression 'Wherewith thou coverest thyself'? — They require it for the following Baraitha that was taught: Upon the four corners of thy covering;[1] four, but not three.[2] You say, 'four but not three', but perhaps it is not so, but rather 'four but not five'? The verse, when it says, 'Wherewith thou coverest thyself', clearly includes a five-cornered garment; how then must I explain the verse, 'Upon the four corners'? Four, but not three. And why do you choose to include a five-cornered garment and to exclude a three-cornered one? I include a five-cornered garment since five contains four, whilst I exclude a three-cornered garment since three does not contain four. And whence does R. Simeon know this? — He derives it from the word 'wherewith'.[3] And the Rabbis? — The word 'wherewith' [they say] does not convey any teaching.

And for what purpose do the Rabbis use the expression 'That ye may look upon it'? — They require it for the following teaching: ' That ye may look upon it, and remember', that is, look upon this precept and remember another precept that is dependent upon it, namely, the reading of the Shema'. As we have learnt: From what time in the morning may the Shema' be read? From the time that one can distinguish between blue and white.[4] Another [Baraitha] taught: 'That ye may look upon it, and remember', that is, look upon this precept, and remember another precept that is next to it, namely, 'the law concerning mingled stuffs, for it is written, Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together'. Thou shalt make thee twisted cords.[5] And another [Baraitha] taught: That ye may look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord: as soon as a person is bound to observe this precept[6] he must observe all the precepts. This is in accordance with R. Simeon's view that [the zizith] is a precept dependent on time.[7] And another [Baraitha] taught: 'That ye may look upon it and remember all the commandments of the Lord': this precept is equal to all the precepts together.[8] And another [Baraitha] taught: 'That ye may look upon it and remember . . . and do them': looking [upon it] leads to remembering [the commandments], and remembering leads to doing them. R. Simeon b. Yohai says, Whosoever is scrupulous in the observance of this precept is worthy to receive the Divine presence, for it is written here, 'That ye may look upon it', and there it is written, Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and Him shalt thou serve.[9]

Our Rabbis taught: Beloved are Israel, for the Holy One, blessed be He, surrounded them with precepts: tefillin on their heads, tefillin on their arms, zizith on their garments, and mezuzoth on their door-posts; concerning these David said, Seven times a day do I praise Thee, because of Thy righteous ordinances.[10] And as David entered the bath and saw himself standing naked, he exclaimed, 'Woe is me that I stand naked without any precepts about me!' But when he reminded himself of the circumcision in his flesh his mind was set at ease. And when he came out he sang a hymn of praise concerning it, as it is written, For the Leader; [with stringmusic;] on the Eighth. A Psalm of David;[11] that is, concerning circumcision which was given eighth.[12]

R. Eliezer b. Jacob said, Whosoever has the tefillin on his head, the tefillin on his arm, the zizith on his garment, and the mezuzah on his doorpost, is in absolute security against sinning, for it is written, And a threefold cord is not quickly broken;[13] and it is also written, The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them.[14]

It was taught: R. Meir used to say, Why is blue specified from all the other colours [for this precept]? Because blue resembles the colour of the sea, and the sea resembles the colour of the sky,

and the sky resembles the colour of [a sapphire, and a sapphire resembles the colour of][15] the Throne of Glory, as it is said, And there was under his feet as it were a paved work of sapphire stone,[16] and it is also written, The likeness of a throne as the appearance of a sapphire stone.[17]

It was taught: R. Meir used to say, Greater is the punishment for the [non-observance of the] white threads than for the [non-observance of the] blue threads [of the fringes].[18] This is to be illustrated by a parable. A king of flesh and blood gave orders to two servants; to one he said, 'Bring me a seal of clay', but to the other he said, 'Bring me a seal of gold'; and they both failed in their duty and did not bring them. Now who is deserving of the greater punishment? Surely it is the one to whom the king said, 'Bring me a seal of clay', and who did not do so.

It was taught: R. Meir used to say, A man is bound to say one hundred blessings daily, as it is written, And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee?[19] On Sabbaths and on Festivals[20] R. Hiyya the son of R. Awia endeavoured to make up this number by the use of spices and delicacies.[21]

It was taught: R. Judah[22] used to say, A man is bound to say the following three blessings daily: '[Blessed art thou . . .] who hast not made me a heathen',[23] '. . . . who hast not made me a woman'; and ' . . . who hast not made me a brutish man'. R. Aha b. Jacob once overhead his son saying '[Blessed art thou . . .] who hast not made me a brutish man', whereupon he said to him, 'And this too!'[24] Said the other, 'Then what blessing should I say instead?' [He replied,] . . . who hast not made me a slave'. And is not that the same as a woman?[25] — A slave

---

(1) Deut. XXII, 12.

(2) I.e., a three-cornered garment is not subject to zizith.

(3) This word, being superfluous, includes a five-cornered garment within the law.

(4) As soon as one can distinguish the various threads of the zizith one may recite the Shema'; v. Ber. 9b. Thus one precept is made dependent upon the other. For the Shema' v. Authorized P.B. p. 40.

(5) Deut. XXII, 11, 12.

(6) I.e., at the age of thirteen years and one day; in other words: whosoever is bound to keep the law of zizith must keep all the precepts of the Torah. Aliter: As soon as one is bound to observe this precept, i.e., at daybreak, one must observe all the other precepts of the day.

(7) And consequently women are exempt. According to the Rabbis, however, this principle does not hold good, for women, although bound to observe the law of zizith, are exempt from many laws.

(8) The numerical value of the letters of the word **ציצית** (90+10+90+10+400) is 600, which together with the eight threads and five knots of each fringe makes 613, which equals the number of precepts in the Torah.

(9) Deut. VI, 13. The word **אתו** 'him' or 'it' is common to both verses, and as in the latter verse it refers to the Lord, so too in the former; thus the observance of 'it' makes one worthy of looking upon 'Him'.

(10) Psalms CXIX, 164. The reference is to these seven precepts: the four fringes, the two tefillin, and the mezuzah.

(11) Psalms VI,1.

(12) I.e., to be observed on the eighth day. Or, which was given as the eighth commandment in the Torah specifically to Israel, for the first seven commandments were given to the sons of Noah. V. Maharsha.

(13) Eccl. IV, 12. The reference is to the three precepts enumerated.

(14) Psalms XXXIV, 8.

(15) Supplied from Sh. Mek.

(16) Ex. XXIV, 10.

(17) Ezek. I, 26. And as God sits upon His Throne of Glory He is immediately reminded of the blue thread of the zizith worn by the Israelites, and bestows upon them blessings. Moreover, it is a mark of honour for Israel to wear upon their garments a thread which bears the colour of the Throne of Glory.

(18) For the white threads are easily obtainable, whereas the blue threads are not only difficult to obtain but very expensive.

(19) Deut. X, 12, The word **מה** 'what' is interpreted as though it were **מאה** 'a hundred'. But see Tosaf. s.v. **שואל**.

(20) When in place of the usual prayer of eighteen benedictions there is a prayer of seven benedictions.
(21) For the enjoyment of which it is necessary to make a blessing.
(22) So in many MSS., in Hal. Ged. and Alfasi, and in the parallel passages in Jer. Ber. IX, 1, and Tosef. Ber. VII. Cur. edd. 'R. Meir'.
(23) So MS.M., Alfasi and Asheri, and so too in Tosef. Ber. l.c. Cur. edd. '. . . who hast made me an Israelite'.
(24) This blessing savours somewhat of conceit. Aliter: there is no reason to make this blessing since a brutish man is also bound by all the precepts.
(25) For with regard to the performance of precepts a woman and a slave are on the same footing; cf. Hag. 4a.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 44a

is more contemptible.[1]

Our Rabbis taught: The hillazon resembles the sea in its colour,[2] and in shape it resembles a fish; it appears[3] once in seventy years, and with its blood one dyes the blue thread; and therefore it is so expensive.

It was taught: R. Nathan said, There is not a single precept in the Torah, even the lightest, whose reward is not enjoyed in this world; and as to its reward in the future world I know not how great it is. Go and learn this from the precept of zizith. Once a man, who was very scrupulous about the precept of zizith, heard of a certain harlot in one of the towns by the sea who accepted four hundred gold [denars] for her hire. He sent her four hundred gold [denars] and appointed a day with her. When the day arrived he came and waited at her door, and her maid came and told her, 'That man who sent you four hundred gold [denars] is here and waiting at the door'; to which she replied 'Let him come in'. When he came in she prepared for him seven beds, six of silver and one of gold; and between one bed and the other there were steps of silver, but the last were of gold. She then went up to the top bed and lay down upon it naked. He too went up after her in his desire to sit naked with her, when all of a sudden the four fringes [of his garment] struck him across the face; whereupon he slipped off and sat upon the ground. She also slipped off and sat upon the ground and said, 'By the Roman Capitol,[4] I will not leave you alone until you tell me what blemish you saw in me. 'By the Temple',[5] he replied, 'never have I seen a woman as beautiful as you are; but there is one precept which the Lord our God has commanded us, it is called zizith, and with regard to it the expression 'I am the Lord your God' is twice written,[6] signifying, I am He who will exact punishment in the future, and I am He who will give reward in the future. Now [the zizith] appeared to me as four witnesses [testifying against me]'. She said, 'I will not leave you until you tell me your name, the name of your town, the name of your teacher, the name of your school in which you study the Torah'. He wrote all this down and handed it to her. Thereupon she arose and divided her estate into three parts; one third for the government,[7] one third to be distributed among the poor, and one third she took with her in her hand; the bed clothes, however, she retained. She then came to the Beth Hamidrash of R. Hiyya, and said to him, 'Master, give instructions about me that they make me a proselyte'. 'My daughter', he replied; 'perhaps you have set your eyes on one of the disciples?' She thereupon took out the script and handed it to him. 'Go', said he 'and enjoy your acquisition'. Those very bed-clothes which she had spread for him for an illicit purpose she now spread out for him lawfully. This is the reward [of the precept] in this world; and as for its reward in the future world I know not how great it is. Rab Judah said, A borrowed garment is exempt from zizith for the first thirty days, thereafter it is subject to it. So, too, it was taught in a Baraitha: He who stays at an inn in the Land of Israel or who rents a house outside the Land [of Israel] is, for the first thirty days, exempt from mezuzah, thereafter he is subject to it. But he who rents a house within the Land of Israel is bound to affix a mezuzah forthwith, in order to maintain the settlement in the Land of Israel.[8]

THE [ABSENCE OF THE] HAND-TEFILLAH DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE

HEAD-TEFILLAH. R. Hisda said, This was taught only when he has [both],[9] but if he has not [both, the absence of one will certainly] invalidate the other. They asked him, 'Do you still say this?' 'No', he replied; 'for can it be said that one who has not the wherewithal to perform two precepts should not even perform one?' What was his opinion before? — It was only a precaution lest he become negligent [in the precept].[10]

R. Shesheth said, Whosoever does not put on the tefillin transgresses eight precepts;[11] and whosoever has not zizith attached to his garment transgresses five precepts;[12] and every priest who does not go up to the platform[13] transgresses three precepts;[14] and whosoever has not a mezuzah on his door transgresses two precepts, namely, And thou shalt write them,[15] And thou shalt write them.[16]

Resh Lakish said, He who puts on the tefillin will live long, for it is written,

---

(1) Or, 'nevertheless go on (including the blessing concerning the slave)', so as to make up the three blessings.

(2) Or 'its essence', i.e. its blood. V. Lewysohn, op. cit. p. 282.

(3) Lit., 'comes up', i.e., from the sea; so Rashi in San. 91a and Meg. 6a.

(4) A form of oath. According to Rashi: By the head of Rome (referring to the Emperor).

(5) Lit., 'the service' (of the Temple).

(6) Num. XV, 41. The expression is repeated in this verse.

(7) So that they should not hinder her in her purpose of being converted to Judaism.

(8) The rule that the tenant must fix the mezuzah will deter him from leaving the premises since he would not be permitted to remove it on leaving; v. B.M. 102a. Furthermore, even if he were to leave the premises the house would soon be let again because of the advantage of its having mezuzoth affixed.

(9) I.e., he possesses both tefillin; in that case the wearing of one is not dependent upon the other.

(10) And he will acquire only one tefillah since the use of one is itself a precept.

(11) For in each of the four Scriptural texts of the tefillin there is a twofold injunction, namely, to place the tefillin upon the hand and upon the head; hence the non-observance of this law involves the transgression of these eight commands. V. Rashi.

(12) The four precepts stated in Num. XV, 38 and 39, and the fifth in Deut. XXII, 12.

(13) To pronounce the priestly benediction.

(14) Cf. Num. VI, 23: On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel; ye shall say to them, which contains two precepts, and the third in v. 27: So shall they put My name upon the children of Israel.

(15) Deut. VI, 9.

(16) Ibid. XI, 20.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 44b

The Lord upon them, they shall live, and altogether therein is the life of my spirit; wherefore recover Thou me, and make me to live.[1]

MISHNAH. THE [ABSENCE OF THE] FINE FLOUR AND THE OIL DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE WINE,[2] NEITHER DOES THE [ABSENCE OF THE] WINE INVALIDATE THEM. THE [OMISSION OF ONE OF THE] SPRINKLINGS [OF THE BLOOD] ON THE OUTER ALTAR DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE REST.[3]

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: It is written, And their meal-offering and their drink-offerings,[4] that is, you must first offer the meal-offering and then the drink-offering.[5] Rabbi says, It is written, A sacrifice and drink-offerings,[6] that is, you must first offer the sacrifice and then the drink-offering.[7] But [against] Rabbi [it will be asked]: Is it not written, 'And their meal-offering and their drink-offerings'? — That verse he requires for the teaching that their meal-offering and their drink-offerings may be offered at night and that their meal-offering and their drink-offerings may be

offered even on the following day.[8] And [against] the Rabbis [it will be asked]: Is it not written, 'A sacrifice and drink-offerings'? — That verse they require for Ze'iri's teaching; for Ze'iri said, The drink-offerings become hallowed only by the slaughtering of the animal-offering.[9] And does not Rabbi also require that verse for Ze'iri's teaching? And do not the Rabbis also require the other verse for the teaching that their meal-offering and their drink-offerings may be offered at night and that their meal-offering and their drink-offerings may be offered even on the following day?[10] — In truth this is the reason for the Rabbis' view; it is written, A burnt-offering and a meal-offering.[11] And [against] Rabbi [then it will be asked]: Is it not written, A burnt-offering and a meal-offering? — Rather [this is the true position]: When the drink-offerings accompany the sacrifice all are agreed that the meal-offering is offered first and it is followed by the drink-offering, for it is written, 'A burnt-offering and a meal-offering'. They only differ where they are offered as an offering by themselves; the Rabbis are of the opinion that just as when they accompany the sacrifice the meal-offering is offered first and then the drink-offering, so it is, too, when they are offered by themselves, namely, the meal-offering is offered first and then the drink-offering. Rabbi, however, distinguishes thus: only there [where they accompany the sacrifice does the meal-offering precede the drink-offering] for since the offering began with what is eaten[12] one should continue with what is eaten;[13] but where they are offered as an offering by themselves the drink-offering takes the first place, since the Psalm is sung [by the Levites] over it.[14]

THE [OMISSION OF ONE OF THE] SPRINKLINGS [OF THE BLOOD] ON THE OUTER ALTAR DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE REST. Our Rabbis taught: Whence do we know that any offering whose blood must be sprinkled on the outer altar effects atonement even if it is sprinkled with but one act of sprinkling? From the verse, And the blood of thy sacrifices shall be poured out against the altar of the Lord thy God.[15]

MISHNAH. THE [ABSENCE OF EITHER THE] BULLOCKS OR THE RAMS OR THE LAMBS DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE OTHERS.[16] R. SIMEON SAID, IF THEY HAD [MEANS ENOUGH FOR THE] MANY BULLOCKS BUT HAD NOT [MEANS ENOUGH FOR] THE DRINK-OFFERINGS, THEY SHOULD BRING ONE BULLOCK AND ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS AND SHOULD NOT OFFER THEM ALL WITHOUT DRINK-OFFERINGS.

GEMARA. Which bullocks and lambs are meant? Will you say those of the Feast [of Tabernacles]?[17] But there is written of them, After the ordinance,[18] After the ordinance![18] — We must therefore say that those of the New Moon and of Pentecost are meant, which are ordained in the Book of Numbers.[19]

---

(1) Isa. XXXVIII, 16. The opening of this verse is interpreted in reference to the tefillin thus: They that hear upon them the name of the Lord (i.e. that wear the tefillin) shall live.

(2) The reference is to the drink-offerings which accompanied most important animal sacrifices; v. Num. XV, 4ff. The absence of one component part does not prevent the offering of the other.

(3) I.e., the omission of one sprinkling does not render the ceremony invalid, since the sacrifice is valid if the blood was sprinkled with but one act of sprinkling. V. Zeb. 36b.

(4) Ibid. XXIX, 18.

(5) In this passage 'drink-offering' (in the sing.) refers only to the wine libation.

(6) Lev. XXIII, 37.

(7) Which is to be followed by the meal-offering.

(8) Provided they were not hallowed in a vessel of ministry on the previous day. Cf. Tem. 14a.

(9) But before the slaughtering of the animal the drink-offerings designated for this sacrifice may be used for another.

(10) Since both the verses cited are required for the special teachings, neither can draw any inference therefrom as to the priority of the meal-offering over the drink-offering, or vice versa.

(11) Lev. XXIII, 37. Hence the meal-offering follows immediately after the animal-offering.

(12) Sc. solid food; i.e., the flesh of the sacrifice which is burnt upon the altar.
(13) Sc. the meal-offering. which is also solid food consumed by the altar.
(14) V. ‘Ar. 11a.
(15) Deut. XII, 27. The expression ‘poured out’ suggests one act of sprinkling.
(16) Each may be offered by itself in the absence of the others.
(17) On each day of this Festival bullocks and lambs were offered; v. Num. XXIX, 12ff.
(18) Ibid. 18 and 33. These terms imply precision and the indispensability of every item prescribed.
(19) The reference is to the Musaf or additional offerings of the New Moon and of Pentecost, consisting in each case of two bullocks, one ram and seven lambs; cf. ibid. XXVIII, 11 and 27.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 45a

And which rams are meant? Will you say those of the above occasions?[1] But only one ram is spoken of there![2] Or will you say those of Pentecost which are ordained in the Book of Leviticus?[3] But the expression ‘shall be’ is used with regard to them![4] — In truth those of Pentecost which are ordained in the Book of Leviticus are meant, and [the Mishnah] teaches that neither the [absence of the] rams which are ordained in Leviticus will invalidate the ram ordained in Numbers nor will [the absence of] the ram ordained in Numbers invalidate the rams ordained in Leviticus. Then [the position is this, is it not], that in regard to the bullocks even [though they are ordained in one passage the absence of] one does not invalidate the other;[5] whereas in regard to the rams the absence of what is ordained in one passage does not invalidate what is ordained in another passage, but of what is ordained in one passage the absence of one invalidates the other?[6] — The Tanna dealt with different conditions in each case.[7]

And in the day of the new moon it shall be a young bullock without blemish; and six lambs and a ram; they shall be without blemish.[8] Why does the text say, ‘A bullock’? It is because in the Torah it says, [Two] bullocks;[9] but whence do I know that if two are not to be found one must be brought? The text therefore says, ‘A bullock’. Again why does the text say. ‘Six lambs’? It is because in the Torah it says. Seven lambs;[9] but whence do I know that if seven are not to be found six must be brought? The text therefore says, Six lambs. And whence do I know that if six are not to be found five are to be brought, and if not five four, and if not four three, and if not three two, or even one? The text therefore says. And lambs according as his means suffice.[10] But since this is so,[11] why does the text say, ‘six lambs’? To indicate that we must make every effort to obtain as many as possible. And whence do I know that [the absence of] one invalidates the others?[12] Because the text says. They shall be.[13]

Thus saith the Lord God, In the first month, in the first day of the month thou shalt take a young bullock without blemish, and thou shalt offer it as a sin-offering in the sanctuary.[14] A sin-offering’? But surely it is a burnt-offering?[15] — R. Johanan said, This passage will be interpreted by Elijah in the future.[16] R. Ashi said, [It refers to] the special consecration-offering [to be] offered in the time of Ezra[17] just as it was offered in the time of Moses.[18] There has also been taught [a Baraitha] to the same effect: R. Judah says, This passage will be interpreted by Elijah in the future. But R. Jose said to him, [It refers to] the consecration-offering [to be] offered in the time of Ezra just as it was offered in the time of Moses. He replied, May your mind be at ease for you have set mine at ease.

The priests shall not eat of anything that dieth of itself [nebelah], or is torn [trefah], whether it be fowl or beast.[19] Is it only the priests that may not eat such but the Israelites may?[20] — R. Johanan said, This passage will be interpreted by Elijah in the future. Rabina said, It was necessary [to repeat this prohibition] for the priests, for I might have thought that since they are permitted [to eat] a bird-offering of which the head had been nipped off at the neck,[21] they are also permitted to eat nebelah and trefah; we are therefore told [that it is not so].

And so thou shalt do on the seventh day of the month for every one that erreth, and for him that is simple; so shall ye make atonement for the house.[22] 'Seven',[23] says R. Johanan, refers to a sin committed by seven tribes, even though they do not constitute the majority of the community.[24] 'New [moon]', that is, they decided a new law saying, [e.g.,] that fat is permitted.[25] 'For every one that erreth and for him that is simple', this teaches that they[26] are liable[27] only if the ruling [of the Beth din was made] in ignorance and the transgression [of the community] was committed in error.[28]

Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, That man is to be remembered for good, and Hanina b. Hezekiah is his name; for were it not for him the Book of Ezekiel would have been suppressed, since its sayings contradicted the words of the Torah. What did he do? He took up with him three hundred barrels of oil[29] and remained there in the upper chamber until he had explained away everything.

R. SIMEON SAID, IF THEY HAD [MEANS ENOUGH FOR] THE MANY BULLOCKS etc. Our Rabbis taught: It is written, And he shall prepare a meal-offering, an ephah for the bullock, and an ephah for the ram, and for the lambs according as his means suffice, and a bin of oil to an ephah.[30] R. Simeon asked, Is the quantity [of flour for a meal-offering] the same for bullocks as for rams?[31] But it signifies that if they had [means enough for] the many bullocks but had not [means enough for] the drink-offerings, they should bring one bullock and its drink-offerings and should not offer them all without drink-offerings. And if they had [means enough for]

---

(1) As prescribed in the Book of Numbers; v. prec. note.

(2) Whereas our Mishnah speaks of rams in the plural.

(3) Which are offered with the two loaves; v. Lev. XXIII, 18: And ye shall offer with the bread seven lambs . . . and one young bullock and two rams; they shall be for a burnt-offering unto the Lord.

(4) V. prec. note. The expression 'shall be' invariably implies indispensability of every item and detail; thus conflicting with our Mishnah.

(5) And if one bullock was lost the other may nevertheless be offered.

(6) I.e., the two rams offered with the two loaves on Pentecost, ordained in Lev. XXIII, 18, are indispensable to each other, and one cannot be offered without the other.

(7) I.e., the position as described is quite correct, and the Tanna of our Mishnah was in no way concerned with the facts that the cases of the bullocks and of the rams were not on all fours.

(8) Ezek. XLVI, 6.

(9) Num. XXVIII, 11.

(10) Ezek. XLVI, 7.

(11) That less than the prescribed number of seven may be brought.

(12) I.e., if there were seven (or any lesser number of) lambs each one is indispensable and the absence of one of them would prevent the offering of the others. So Rashi; but v. Tosaf. s.v. ומנין, and Sh. Mek. n. 3.

(13) Ezek. XLVI, 6. This expression indicates indispensability

(14) Ezek. XLV, 18. The word וחטאת rendered in the versions 'and thou shalt purify' is understood as though it were read וחטאת 'and a sin-offering'.

(15) The special sacrifices of the New Moon were burnt-offerings, v. Num. XXVIII, 11.

(16) This means that it is beyond our power to reconcile this verse with the ordinance of the Torah and will be explained by Elijah the Prophet, the herald of the Messianic era, who is to make the truth known.

(17) V. Sh. Mek. n. 4.

(18) For on the eighth day of the consecration of the Sanctuary in the time of Moses, which coincided with the New Moon of Nisan, sin-offerings, and not the usual burnt-offerings, were brought. The prophet Ezekiel foretells a similar consecration of the Temple on the New Moon in the future, when in place of the usual burnt-offerings sin-offerings will be offered.

(19) Ezek. XLIV, 31.

(20) Surely not; for nebelah and trefah are expressly forbidden in the Torah to all Israelites, v. Deut. XIV, 21, and Ex. XXII, 30.

(21) Bird-offerings were not slaughtered in the usual manner but their heads were nipped off at the neck, v. Lev. I, 15.

After the application of the blood as prescribed, the priests were allowed to eat the flesh of the bird, although for profane purposes such nipping would render the bird nebelah.

(22) Ezek. XLV, 20.

(23) The expression בשבעה בחדש, 'on the seventh day of the month' is interpreted separately, שבעה meaning seven, and חדש the new moon.

(24) The reference is to the special sin-offering of a bullock brought on behalf of the community when the whole community or the greater part thereof or even the majority of the tribes had committed a sin by acting upon the erroneous ruling of the Beth din; v. Lev. IV, 13.

(25) Whereas the fat is forbidden by the Torah on penalty of kareth; v. Lev. VII, 25.

(26) Sc. the community.

(27) To bring the special sin-offering of a bullock.

(28) I.e., the people acted in accordance with the new ruling of the Beth din and actually ate forbidden fat.

(29) To serve him for lighting.

(30) Ezek. XLVI, 7.

(31) Of course not, for the quantity of flour for the meal-offering which accompanied the offering of a bullock was three tenths of an ephah whereas that which accompanied a ram was two tenths. V. Num. XV, 6, 9.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 45b

the many rams but had not [means enough for] the meal-offerings,[1] they should bring one ram and its meal-offering and should not offer them all without meal-offerings.

MISHNAH. THE [ABSENCE OF THE] BULLOCK,[2] OR THE RAMS, OR THE LAMBS OR THE HE-GOAT DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE BREAD-OFFERING,[3] NEITHER DOES THE [ABSENCE OF THE] BREAD-OFFERING INVALIDATE THEM. THE [ABSENCE OF THE] BREAD-OFFERING INVALIDATES THE LAMBS,[4] BUT THE [ABSENCE OF THE] LAMBS DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE BREAD-OFFERING. SO R. AKIBA. R. SIMEON B. NANOS SAID, IT IS NOT SO, BUT RATHER THE [ABSENCE OF THE] LAMBS INVALIDATES THE BREAD-OFFERING, WHILST THE [ABSENCE OF THE] BREAD-OFFERING DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE LAMBS; FOR SO WE FIND IT WAS THE CASE THAT WHEN THE ISRAELITES WERE IN THE WILDERNESS FOR FORTY YEARS THEY OFFERED THE LAMBS WITHOUT THE BREAD-OFFERING;[5] THEREFORE NOW TOO THEY MAY OFFER THE LAMBS WITHOUT THE BREAD-OFFERING. R. SIMEON SAID, THE HALACHAH IS ACCORDING TO THE WORDS OF BEN NANOS BUT THE REASON IS NOT AS HE STATED IT; FOR EVERY OFFERING STATED IN THE BOOK OF NUMBERS WAS OFFERED IN THE WILDERNESS, BUT NOT EVERY OFFERING STATED IN THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS WAS OFFERED IN THE WILDERNESS; HOWEVER, WHEN THEY CAME INTO THE LAND OF ISRAEL THEY OFFERED BOTH KINDS. WHY THEN DO I SAY THAT THE LAMBS MAY BE OFFERED WITHOUT THE BREAD-OFFERING? BECAUSE THE LAMBS RENDER THEMSELVES PERMISSIBLE.[6] AND [WHY DO I SAY THAT] THE BREAD-OFFERING MAY NOT BE OFFERED WITHOUT THE LAMBS? BECAUSE THERE IS NOTHING THAT RENDERS IT PERMISSIBLE.[7]

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: And ye shall present with the bread,[8] that is, as an obligation with the bread-offering;[9] seven lambs without blemish,[10] that is, even though there is no bread-offering. Then why does the verse say, 'With the bread'? To teach that there was no obligation to bring the lambs before there was the obligation to bring the bread-offering.[11] This is the view of R. Tarfon.[12] You might think that the lambs stated here[13] are the identical ones which are stated in the Book of Numbers;[14] but you must say that this is not the case, for when you come to the bullocks and the rams it is evident that they are not the identical ones;[15] but these[16] are brought on their own account, whilst those[17] are brought on account of the bread-offering.[18] It will thus be seen that those offerings stated in the Book of Numbers were offered in the wilderness but those stated in the Book of

Leviticus were not offered in the wilderness. Perhaps the bullocks and the rams [of the two Books] are not the identical ones, but the lambs are the identical ones?[19] — Since those [the former] are certainly different ones,[20] these [the latter] too are not the identical ones. And why must one say that the bullocks and the rams are different ones? perhaps the Divine Law meant to say, If it is so desired one bullock and two rams are to be offered or, if preferred, two bullocks and one ram? — Since the order is different[21] they must be other sacrifices.

THE [ABSENCE OF THE] BREAD-OFFERING INVALIDATES THE LAMBS. What is the reason for R. Akiba's view? — He infers the expression 'they shall be' [yiheyu][22] from the other expression 'they shall be' [tiheyenah]:[23] as in the latter case it refers to the bread-offering, so in the former it refers to the bread-offering. Ben Nanos, however, infers the expression 'they shall be' [yiheyu][22] from the other expression 'they shall be' [yiheyu]:[24] as in the latter case it refers to the lambs, so in the former it refers to the lambs. And why does not Ben Nanos infer [yiheyu] from tiheyenah, [and say:] as in the latter case it refers to the bread-offering so in the former it refers to the bread-offering? — One may infer yiheyu from yiheyu[25] but one may not infer yiheyu from tiheyenah. But what does this [variation] matter? Was it not taught in the school of R. Ishmael that in the verses, And the priest shall come again,[26] and And the priest shall come in,[27] 'coming again' and 'coming in' have the same import [for purposes of inference]? — That is permissible only where there is no identical expression [on which to base the inference], but where an identical expression exists, the inference must be drawn from the identical expression. And why does not R. Akiba infer yiheyu from yiheyu? — One should infer that [offering] which provides a gift to the priest from that which provides a gift to the priest.[28] but the others[29] are burnt-offerings. Alternatively I can say that they differ on the interpretation of this very verse: They shall be holy to the Lord for the priest.[30] R. Akiba maintains, What is it that is entirely for the priest? I should say, It is the Bread-offering. And Ben Nanos, [what does he say]? Does the verse say, 'They shall be holy to the priest'? It says, 'They shall be holy to the Lord for the priest'. What is it that is partly to the Lord and partly for the priest? I should say, It is the lambs. And R. Akiba [what does he say to this]? — Does the verse say, 'They shall be holy to the Lord and for the priest'? It says, 'To the Lord for the priest'. It is as stated by R. Huna, for R. Huna said, God[31] acquired it and granted it to the priest.

R. Johanan said, All agree

---

(1) Lit., 'their ephahs'.

(2) The animals here enumerated are the special offerings prescribed for Pentecost, cf. Lev. XXIII, 17-19; the bullock, the two rams and the seven lambs for burnt-offerings, and the he-goat for a sin-offering.

(3) I.e., the two loaves; cf. ibid. 17.

(4) Sc. the two lambs for peace-offerings; ibid. 19.

(5) For only flour from the Land of Israel was to be used for the Bread-offering and the 'Omer-offering; v. infra 83b.

(6) The sprinkling of the blood of the lambs renders the sacrificial portions permissible for sacrifice and the rest of the flesh permissible to be eaten; thus the validity of the lambs is in no wise dependent on the bread-offering.

(7) For it is the slaughtering of the lambs that renders the bread-offering permissible to be eaten, so that in the absence of the lambs there is naught to render the bread-offering permissible.

(8) Lev. XXIII, 18.

(9) And one may not be offered without the other.

(10) Ibid.

(11) And this obligation only commenced when they entered the Land of Israel.

(12) In cur. edd. are added the words: 'R. Akiba says'. They are not found in the parallel passage in the Sifra and in all extant MSS., and are struck out by Sh. Mek. V. Glosses of Strashun a.l.

(13) In Lev. ibid. where the verse reads: And ye shall present seven lambs . . . and one young bullock and two rams.

(14) Num. XXVIII, 27: Two young bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs.

(15) Since the number of each kind is different in each passage.

(16) Those animals stated in Numbers are offered as additional sacrifices and are not related to the bread-offering.

(17) Mentioned in Leviticus.
(18) And since the bread-offering was not offered in the wilderness the sacrifices stated in connection with it were similarly not offered in the wilderness.
(19) Since the number of lambs is seven in each passage.
(20) For the number of animals of each kind is different in the two texts.
(21) Cf. the verses of Lev. and Num. supra p. 274, nn. 8 and 9. The fact that in Lev. the seven lambs are stated in the verse before the bullock and the rams and in Num. after them signifies that they are not the identical ones.
(22) Lev. XXIII, 20: And the priest shall wave them with the bread of the firstfruits for a wave-offering before the Lord, with the two lambs; they shall be holy to the Lord for the priest. Now the expression 'they shall be' יהיו implies that the offering cannot be dispensed with, but the doubt is as to which offering is meant, whether the bread-offering or the two lambs.
(23) Ibid. 17: סלת תהיינה, they shall be of fine flour; this clearly refers to the bread-offering.
(24) Ibid. 18: יהיו. This expression clearly refers to the seven lambs and the other burnt-offerings.
(25) Being identical expressions.
(26) Ibid. XIV, 39 and 44. The reference is to the treatment of a leprous spot in the walls of a house.
(27) v. p. 275, n. 8.
(28) The two lambs for the peace-offerings provided a gift to the priest, for after the burning of the sacrificial portions the flesh was eaten by the priests, and so, too, did the two loaves, for they were entirely eaten by the priests.
(29) Sc. the seven lambs etc.
(30) Lev. XXIII, 20.
(31) Lit., 'the Name'.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 46a

that if they were attached to each other the [absence of] one invalidates the other.[1] And what creates this attachment? — It is the slaughtering.[2]

'Ulla reported that in the West [Palestine] the following question was raised: Does the waving[3] create any attachment or not? — But surely this can be solved from the foregoing statement of R. Johanan, for since R. Johanan said that the slaughtering creates the attachment, it follows that the waving does not! — That very statement of R. Johanan gave rise to doubts, viz., Was R. Johanan certain that the slaughtering creates an attachment and that the waving does not, or was he certain only about the slaughtering, but about the waving he was in doubt? — This remains undecided.

R. Judah b. Hanina said to R. Huna the son of R. Joshua, Behold, the verse, 'They shall be holy to the Lord for the priest', is written after the rite of waving, nevertheless Ben Nanos and R. Akiba differ![4] — But according to your view, too, [this same argument can be put forward, for is the verse written] only after the rite of waving and not after the slaughtering?[5] You have therefore no alternative but to say that [the rule contained in this verse][6] applies to the early stage of the offering,[7] and that the verse, 'They shall be holy to the Lord for the priest', is to be understood in the sense that later on they will be for the priest; then one can say the same here, too,[8] that only later on they will be for the priest.

And does the slaughtering create any attachment? But the following contradicts it, for it was taught: If a cake[9] broke[10] before [the thank-offering] had been slaughtered, he[11] should bring another cake and then the offering may be slaughtered. If the cake broke after [the thank-offering] had been slaughtered, the blood should be sprinkled[12] and the flesh may be eaten, but he has not fulfilled his vow; moreover the bread is invalid.[13] If the blood had already been sprinkled [and then the cake broke], he must give as the priestly offering[14] a whole cake in place of the broken one. If a cake had been taken outside[15] before [the thank-offering] had been slaughtered, it should be brought in again and then the offering may be slaughtered. If the cake had been taken outside after [the thank-offering] had been slaughtered, the blood should be sprinkled and the flesh may be eaten, but

he has not thereby fulfilled his vow; moreover the bread is invalid. If the blood had already been sprinkled [and then the cake had been taken outside], he must give as the priestly offering a cake which had remained inside in place of that which had been taken outside.[16] If a cake had become unclean before [the thank-offering] had been slaughtered, he should bring another cake and then the offering may be slaughtered. If the cake had become unclean after [the thank-offering] had been slaughtered, the blood should be sprinkled and the flesh may be eaten, and he has also fulfilled his vow,[17] for the [High Priest's] plate renders acceptable the offering which became unclean; but the bread is invalid. If the blood had already been sprinkled [and then the cake became unclean], he must give as the priestly offering a clean cake in place of that which had become unclean. Now if one were to hold that the slaughtering creates an attachment [between the animal offering and the cakes], then surely when this attachment has already been created by the slaughtering and thereafter the cakes become invalid, the thankoffering should also be invalid,[18] should it not? — The thank-offering is a special case, for Holy Writ refers to it as a peace-offering,[19] and as peace-offerings are offered without any bread-offering so the thank-offering too may be offered without the bread-offering.

R. Jeremiah said, If you were to say that the waving creates an attachment, then it is clear that if the bread-offering was lost[20]

---

(1) I.e., if the two loaves and the two lambs were together in the Sanctuary intended and ready for the Festival-offering, that fact attached them to each other; and therefore if one kind, either the loaves or the lambs, was lost, the remaining kind may not be offered, but must be taken away to be burnt.

(2) I.e., if the loaves were in the Sanctuary at the time of the slaughtering of the lambs they at once become attached to each other, and one may not be offered without the other.

(3) Which is prior to the slaughtering, for the two lambs were waved before the Lord whilst still living together with the two loaves, v. Lev. XXIII, 20.

(4) As to whether it is the lambs that may be offered in the absence of the loaves or vice versa, but one may certainly be offered without the other; it is evident, therefore, that the waving stated at the beginning of the verse in question creates no attachment whatsoever between the lambs and the loaves.

(5) This verse clearly relates to the time after the slaughtering, for only then can they be considered for the priest, and yet they differ as to which is indispensable; hence the argument could be adduced to prove that even the slaughtering does not create any attachment.

(6) Sc. that one may be offered without the other.

(7) Before the slaughtering.

(8) Viz., that the rule that one may be offered without the other relates only to the early stage of the offering, namely, before the waving, for the waving, it may be said, creates an attachment.

(9) For the four kinds of bread which accompanied the thank-offering v. Lev. VII, 22,23.

(10) The disqualifying effect of a broken loaf is derived according to Rashi from the Shewbread (v. Rashi).

(11) The offerer of the thank-offering.

(12) As an ordinary peace-offering and not as a thank-offering.

(13) I.e., none of the cakes may be eaten. V. Rashi.

(14) The priestly share of the bread-offering was one out of every ten cakes; moreover what he received had to be whole and not broken; v. infra 77b.

(15) Outside the walls of Jerusalem.

(16) When giving the tenth part to the priest the broken cake or what was taken outside or what was unclean must be included in the total, although these particular cakes may not be given to the priest.

(17) According to MS.M.: 'He has not fulfilled his vow', and omitting 'for the plate . . . unclean'; so also in Tosef. Men. VIII. This text is preferred by Tosaf. s.v. משׁשׁחטה, and by Sh. Mek.

(18) And the blood should not be permitted to be sprinkled even as a peace-offering.

(19) Cf. Lev. VII, 15.

(20) After the waving.

the lambs must be destroyed, and if the lambs were lost the bread must be destroyed. But if you were to say that the waving does not create an attachment, then in the case where the bread-offering and the lambs had been brought [into the Sanctuary] and after they had been waved together the bread was lost and other bread was brought in its place, the question would arise, must the second bread be waved or not? Of course, if it was the lambs that were lost [and other lambs were brought in their place], there is no question at all that [the second pair of lambs] must be waved.[1] The question can only arise when it was the bread that was lost. And again, according to Ben Nanos, who said that the lambs constitute the main part of the offering, this question cannot arise;[2] but it can only arise according to R. Akiba, who maintains that the bread constitutes the main part of the offering. And the question is, Shall we say that since the bread constitutes the main part of the offering, it[3] requires to be waved; or perhaps, since it is the lambs which render the bread permissible it does not require to be waved? — This must remain undecided.

Abaye said to Raba, Why is it that the two lambs[4] hallow the bread and [their absence] renders [the bread] invalid, whereas the seven lambs and the bullock and the rams[4] do not hallow the bread and [their absence] does not render [the bread] invalid? — He replied, It is because they have become attached to each other by the waving.[5] But take the case of the thank-offering, where [the animal-offering and the bread] are not attached to each other by any waving, and yet the one hallows the other and the [absence of] one invalidates the other! — Let us indeed compare it with the thank-offering, as the thank-offering is a peace-offering [and that alone hallows the bread] so here too it is the peace-offering [alone which hallows the bread].[6] But can we make this comparison? In that case[7] there are no other offerings with it, but here,[8] since there is another kind of offering that goes with it, both kinds should hallow [the bread]? — We should, however, compare this case with the ram of the Nazirite; as with the ram of the Nazirite, although there are other offerings that go with it,[9] it is the peace-offering only and nothing else that hallows the bread, so it is in this case too. And whence do we know this there? — Because it is written,[10] And he shall offer the ram for a sacrifice of peace-offerings unto the Lord, with the basket of unleavened bread,[11] which teaches us that the basket [of bread] comes as an obligation for the ram, and the slaughtering of the ram hallows it. Therefore, if it was slaughtered under the name of any other offering, the bread is not hallowed thereby.

Our Rabbis taught: If the Two Loaves were brought alone,[12] they must [none the less] be waved, and then their appearance must be spoilt,[13] and they must be taken away to the place of burning. But say what you will, if they[14] are brought to be eaten then let them be eaten, and if they are brought to be burnt then let them be burnt immediately! Wherefore is it necessary that their appearance be spoilt? — Rabbah answered, Actually they are brought to be eaten but [they are forbidden to be eaten] as a precautionary measure lest in the following year, when they have the lambs, they[15] might say, 'Last year did we not eat the loaves without offering the lambs? We can do the same this year', and they will not appreciate the fact that last year the loaves rendered themselves permissible because there were no lambs, but now that there are lambs it is the lambs that render them permissible.[16]

Rabbah said, Whence do I arrive at this view?[17] Because we have learnt:[18] R. Judah said, Ben Bokri testified at Jabneh that a priest who paid the shekel has committed no sin. Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai said to him, Not so, but rather a priest who did not pay the shekel has committed a sin. The priests, however, used to expound the following verse to their advantage, And every meal-offering of the priest shall be wholly burnt, it shall not be eaten.[19] Since the 'Omer-offering and the Two Loaves and the Shewbread are ours, how can they be eaten?[20] Now what are the circumstances with regard to the Two Loaves referred to? If they are offered with the sacrifice then [the question will at once be asked], Do not the priests make a freewill-offering of a thank-offering and its loaves and also eat

them?[21] It must be that they are offered by themselves, yet it says above, 'How can they be eaten?' We thus see that [when brought alone] they are brought to be eaten. But Abaye said to him, I maintain that it is a case when they are offered with the sacrifice, and as to your difficulty raised from the thank-offering and its loaves, [it is no difficulty at all], for the loaves of the thank-offering are nowhere referred to as a meal-offering, whereas the Two Loaves are referred to as a meal-offering,[22] for it is written, When you bring a new meal-offering unto the Lord.[23]

R. Joseph said, In fact they are brought to be burnt, but the reason why we do not burn them [immediately] is that we must not burn holy things on a Festival. But Abaye said to him, Where is the comparison? There[24] the precept is not to do so,[25] but here since it is the precept to do so they should be burnt [on the Festival], as is the case with the bullock and the he-goat offered on the Day of Atonement! — Rather, said R. Joseph, it is to be feared that later on [during the day] they might obtain lambs.[26] Said Abaye to him, This is very well [to delay the burning] as long as the time for the offering thereof continues,[27] but after that time they should be burnt, should they not? — The expression 'their appearance must be spoilt' indeed means that they must be kept as long as the time for the offering thereof continues.

Raba said, I maintain that they are brought to be eaten, [yet they are not eaten] because of the precautionary measure stated by Rabbah,[28] but [the law][29] is not derived from the passage adduced by him, but from a Scriptural verse. For I derive it, said Raba, from the following verse: Ye shall bring out of your dwellings two wave-loaves . . . for firstfruits unto the Lord.[30] As firstfruits are offered by themselves so the Two Loaves may also be offered by themselves; and it follows also, as the firstfruits are offered to be eaten so the Two Loaves also are offered to be eaten.

---

(1) Together with the two loaves, for in the first place, it is the lambs which render the two loaves permissible to be eaten, and secondly, the rite of waving is stated primarily of the lambs; cf. Lev. XXIII, 20.

(2) For since the lambs are still here and have once been waved nothing further is required.

(3) Sc. the second bread, brought as a substitute for the first which was lost.

(4) Offered on the Feast of Weeks.

(5) The two lambs must be waved before the Lord together with the two loaves.

(6) Whereas the seven lambs, the bullock, and the rams are burnt-offerings.

(7) Sc. the thank-offering.

(8) With regard to the offerings of the Feast of Weeks.

(9) The Nazirite at the fulfilment of his period of consecration must bring a ram for a peace-offering as well as a male lamb for a burnt-offering and an ewe lamb for sin-offering, v. Num. VI, 14.

(10) So MS.M. and Sh. Mek. In cur. edd. 'For it was taught'.

(11) Ibid. 17.

(12) Where the two lambs were not available the loaves, according to R. Akiba, may be offered by themselves, since they constitute the main part of the Festival-offering.

(13) I.e., they must be kept overnight whereby they become invalid and then are burnt, for it is forbidden to destroy an offering that is still valid.

(14) Sc. the Two Loaves when brought without the lambs.

(15) Sc. the priests.

(16) But since the Two Loaves are in fact a valid offering they must not be destroyed unless they were first made invalid.

(17) That the Two Loaves even when brought by themselves without the lambs, are offered to be eaten.

(18) Shek. I, 4. V. supra p. 139 and the notes thereon.

(19) Lev. VI, 16.

(20) They argued that if they were to contribute the shekel for the public-offerings they would then have a share in the public-offerings, and as the priest's meal-offering must be burnt then it would follow that every meal-offering, e.g. the Shewbread, would be forbidden to be eaten, and this would be contrary to Scripture.

(21) And therefore the priests' argument 'How can they be eaten?' cannot apply to this case.

(22) And the meal-offering of priests must be wholly burnt, hence their argument from the Two Loaves.

(23) Num. XXVIII, 26.
(24) In the rule stated that holy things may not be burnt on a Festival. Cf. Shab. 23b.
(25) The holy thing was originally not intended for burning but for eating, but as it became invalid it was condemned to be burnt; that burning may not be carried out on the Festival.
(26) So that it is possible that later during the day the ceremony might be carried out in the manner ordained; it is therefore proper to delay the burning of the loaves as long as possible.
(27) I.e., so long as the evening daily sacrifice has not been offered (Rashi). After this, even if lambs were obtained they would not be offered.
(28) V. supra p. 281.
(29) That the Two Loaves are brought to be eaten even when offered by themselves.
(30) Lev. XXIII, 17.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 47a

Our Rabbis taught: The lambs of Pentecost hallow the bread only by their slaughtering. Thus, if they were slaughtered under their own name and their blood was sprinkled under their own name, the bread is hallowed thereby;[1] if they were slaughtered under another name and their blood was sprinkled under another name, the bread is not hallowed; if they were slaughtered under their own name but their blood was sprinkled under another name, the bread is hallowed and not hallowed. So Rabbi. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon says, [The bread] always remains unhallowed unless [the lambs] were slaughtered under their own name and their blood was sprinkled under their own name.

What is the reason for Rabbi's view? — Because it is written, And the ram he shall offer by slaughtering it as a peace-offering unto the Lord, with the basket of unleavened bread,[2] that is to say, the slaughtering hallows [the bread]. And R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon? — The expression 'he shall offer' implies that he must perform all the rites of the offering.[3] And Rabbi? Is not the expression 'he shall offer' used? — Had the term 'slaughtering' been followed by 'he shall offer' I agree that the meaning would be as you say;[4] but now that it is written 'he shall offer' and then 'slaughtering', it clearly means, he shall offer it by the act of slaughtering. And R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon? Is not the expression 'slaughtering' used? — That is necessary for R. Johanan's teaching, for R. Johanan said, All[5] agree that the bread must be there at the time of the slaughtering.

What is meant by 'hallowed and not hallowed'? — Abaye said, It is hallowed but not completely so. Raba said, It is hallowed but not permitted [to be eaten]. What is the practical difference between them?[6] — There is a difference between them as to whether redemption is effective; according to Abaye the redemption is effective, according to Raba it is not.[7] Now according to Raba there is clearly a difference of opinion between Rabbi and R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon;[8] but according to Abaye what difference is there between Rabbi and R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon?[9] — There is a difference between them as to whether it would become invalid if taken out [of the Sanctuary].[10]

R. Samuel b. R. Isaac enquired of R. Hiyya b. Abba: If the lambs of Pentecost were slaughtered under their own name but their blood was sprinkled under another name, may the bread be eaten or not? According to whose view does this question arise? If [you say] according to R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon, [then there is no question at all for] he holds that it is the sprinkling that hallows the bread.[11] And if [you say] according to Rabbi, [then there is also no question about it for] whether one accepts the interpretation of Abaye or of Raba [the bread] is hallowed but not permitted [to be eaten].[12] The question can arise only according to the view of the following Tanna. For the father of R. Jeremiah b. Abba taught: If the Two Loaves were taken out [of the Sanctuary] between the slaughtering [of the two lambs] and the sprinkling of their blood, and subsequently [the priest] sprinkled the blood of the lambs [and expressed at the time the intention of eating the flesh] outside the prescribed time, R. Eliezer says, The bread is not subject to the law of piggul[13] but R. Akiba says, The bread is subject to the law of piggul. And R. Shesheth said, Both these Tannaim agree with Rabbi that the slaughtering hallows the bread,[14] but R. Eliezer maintains his view that the sprinkling has no effect upon what was taken out,[15] and R. Akiba his that the sprinkling has an effect upon what was taken out.[16]

---

(1) The bread, i.e., the Two Loaves, may now be eaten, and if taken out of the Sanctuary would become invalid.

(2) Num. VI, 17, literally translated. The reference is to the sacrifice brought by the Nazirite, but the law is the same for the lambs of Pentecost.

(3) Including the sprinkling of the blood.

(4) I.e., that in addition to the slaughtering there is also another essential act of offering, namely the sprinkling.

(5) Even R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon who maintains that the sprinkling is the principal service.

(6) For according to Abaye too, since it is not completely hallowed it certainly may not be eaten.

(7) The underlying principle is that whatever is consecrated only for its value (קדושת דמים) can be redeemed and

its sanctity is thereby transferred to the money set aside for the purpose, whilst the thing itself becomes profane; but whatever is hallowed bodily (קדושת הגוף) cannot be redeemed. Now, dealing with Rabbi's view, according to Abaye since the bread is not completely hallowed it may be redeemed; according to Raba, however, it is hallowed entirely, and therefore the redemption is of no effect. The text adopted is that which is preferred by Rashi. In cur. edd. the opinions are reversed, thus according to Abaye the redemption is ineffective etc.

(8) For according to R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon the redemption is effective and according to Rabbi it is not.

(9) For both are of the opinion that the redemption is effective.

(10) According to Rabbi it would thereby become invalid but not so according to R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon.

(11) Consequently the bread has not been hallowed at all; obviously then it may not be eaten.

(12) V. supra n. 1.

(13) V. Glos.

(14) R. Akiba and R. Eliezer therefore both agree that the bread becomes invalid by being taken out.

(15) Consequently the bread remains invalid but is not affected by the piggul intention expressed during the sprinkling.

(16) For in as much as the invalidity of the bread is due to an external cause (it having been taken out of the Sanctuary) and not to any defect inherent in it, the sprinkling can affect it, and as the wrongful intention expressed during the sprinkling renders the offering piggul, it also renders the bread piggul.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 47b

For we have learnt:[1] If the sacrificial portions of the Less Holy offerings were taken out [of the Sanctuary] before the sprinkling of the blood of the offering, R. Eliezer says, They are not subject to the law of sacrilege,[2] and one is not liable on account of them for any transgression of the laws of piggul, nothar,[3] and uncleanness.[4] R. Akiba says, They are subject to the law of sacrilege, and one is also liable on account of them for any transgression of the laws of piggul, nothar, and uncleanness.[5] Now what is the position [in the aforementioned case[6] according to R. Akiba]? Shall we say that as the sprinkling performed with a piggul — intention renders the bread[7] piggul like the flesh of the offering,[8] so too, the sprinkling performed under another name will render the bread permissible;[9] or do we say so only where the result tends to stringency[10] but not where it tends to leniency?[11] R. Papa, however, demurred[12] saying, Why do you assume that they differ in the case where [the loaves] were still outside [the Sanctuary]? Perhaps in the case where they were still outside all agree that the sprinkling can have no effect upon what is outside;[13] but they differ only in the case where they were brought in again, R. Eliezer adopting Rabbi's view that the slaughtering hallows them, consequently they have become invalid by their having been taken outside, whereas R. Akiba adopts the view of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon that the slaughtering does not hallow them, consequently they have not become invalid by their having been taken outside! — How can this be? It is well if you say that R. Akiba adopts Rabbi's view that the slaughtering hallows [the loaves], for then the slaughtering hallows them, and having been hallowed by the slaughtering they are rendered piggul by the sprinkling. But if you say that he adopts the view of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon that the slaughtering does not hallow them, then [it will be asked,] Can the sprinkling performed with a piggul-intention hallow them?[14] Has not R. Giddal said in the name of Rab, A sprinkling performed with a piggul-intention does not bring within the law of Sacrilege nor does it take out of the law of Sacrilege; it does not bring within the law of Sacrilege-that refers to the sacrificial parts of Less Holy offerings;[15] nor does it take out of the law of Sacrilege — that refers to the flesh of Most Holy offerings?[16] — Was not R. Giddal's statement refuted?[17]

R. Jeremiah enquired of R. Zera: If the lambs of Pentecost were slaughtered under their own name and then the [Two] Loaves were lost, may the blood be sprinkled now under another name[18] so that the flesh be permitted to be eaten?[19] — He replied, Do you know of any offering which if offered under its own name is invalid but under another name is valid? But is there not? What of a Passover-offering offered before midday, which if offered under its own name is invalid[20] but under another name[18] is valid? — [He replied,] This is what I mean: Do you know of any offering which was at one time fit to be offered under its own name but was rejected[21] from being offered under its

own name, and now if offered under its own name it is invalid but under another name it is valid? But what of the Passover-offering after midday?[22] — This is what I mean: Do you know of any offering which at one time was fit to be offered under its own name, and indeed was slaughtered under its own name, but was rejected from being offered under its own name, and now if offered under its own name it is invalid but under another name it is valid? But what of the thank-offering?[23] — It is different with the thank-offering for the Divine Law referred to it as a peace-offering.[24]

Our Rabbis taught: If the two lambs were slaughtered [accompanied] by four loaves,[25] two of them should be selected and waved[26]

---

(1) Me'il. 6b, Zeb. 89b.

(2) Cf. Lev. V, 15. For the sprinkling, he maintains, has had no effect upon those portions that were taken out, so that they were not consecrated for the altar; consequently no guilt-offering is incurred by the one who derives enjoyment or use therefrom.

(3) V. Glos.

(4) Piggul does not apply to these sacrificial portions since they are already invalid, so that if a man were to eat of them he would not be liable to the penalty of kareth. So, too, if he were to eat of them whilst he was in an unclean state, or after they had been left over beyond the time prescribed for eating, he would not be liable.

(5) For the sprinkling has had an effect upon the sacrificial portions that were taken out of the Sanctuary.

(6) The case put by R. Samuel b. Isaac to R. Hiyya supra, as to the permissibility of the bread where the blood of the lambs was sprinkled under another name.

(7) According to R. Akiba, not withstanding that the bread is already invalid by having been taken out.

(8) Hence the bread is deemed to be affected in the same way as the flesh of the offering. The text adopted is that of many MSS. and Tosaf., reading בפיגול כבשר, and omitting the word ביוצא.

(9) Since the flesh of the offering is permissible in such circumstances, for all offerings even though slaughtered under another name are permitted to be eaten; v. Zeb. 2a.

(10) As in the case of piggul.

(11) Whereby the bread is rendered permitted.

(12) To the assumption that both R. Akiba and R. Eliezer accept Rabbi's view.

(13) Even R. Akiba would agree that the sprinkling can have no effect upon the bread that is still outside, for the bread cannot be regarded in the same category as the sacrificial portions of the offering, since these are part of the offering whereas the bread is something distinct and apart from it.

(14) And at the same time render them piggul! This surely cannot be.

(15) These normally are subject to the law of Sacrilege only after the sprinkling of the blood, but where the sprinkling was not validly performed these sacrificial portions are never subject to the law of Sacrilege.

(16) This is subject to the law of Sacrilege only until the sprinkling of the blood, for after the sprinkling the flesh is permitted to be eaten by the priests, and the principle is well established that whatsoever is permissible to the priests is not subject to the law of Sacrilege (cf. Me'il. 2a). Where, however, the sprinkling was not validly performed the flesh, not being permissible to the priests, remains for all time subject to the law of Sacrilege.

(17) His statement was indeed refuted, v. Me'il. 3b. The position is now that R. Papa's objection stands good, and so it is not known for certain according to whose view did R. Samuel b. Isaac raise his question.

(18) I.e., as an ordinary peace-offering. To sprinkle the blood under their own name as lambs of Pentecost would not render their flesh permitted for the two loaves are absolutely indispensable to the validity of the offering.

(19) For in the absence of the loaves the lambs can be regarded as peace-offerings.

(20) For the proper time to offer the Passover lamb is after midday on the fourteenth of the month of Nisan; cf. Ex. XII, 6.

(21) By reason of the loss of the loaves.

(22) Which was available at the proper time and yet if held over till after the festival and offered under its own name as a Passover-offering is invalid, but if offered as a peace-offering is valid. The text adopted here is that of MS.M., which agrees with that in Rashi and in Sh. Mek.

(23) If one of the cakes of the thank-offering was broken after the slaughtering of the animal, the blood is sprinkled as though it were a peace-offering, and not a thank-offering, and the flesh may be eaten; v. supra p. 278. Here then the

thank-offering was slaughtered under its own name, was rejected from being offered under its own name, and yet is valid if offered under another name; contra R. Zera.

(24) Cf. Lev. VII, 15. And as the peace-offering is offered without the accompaniment of loaves, the thank-offering also may be offered under its own name even without the loaves. In other words the offering of the thank-offering as a peace-offering is not regarded as offering it under another name.

(25) Instead of the prescribed two loaves.

(26) It is an essential rite to wave the loaves with the lambs both before and after the slaughtering of the lambs; v. infra 61a.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 48a

and the other [two] may be eaten after redemption. The Rabbis who recited this in the presence of R. Hisda said, This surely does not agree with Rabbi's view,[1] for according to Rabbi who holds that the slaughtering hallows [the loaves], where can they be redeemed?[2] If they are [all taken] outside [the Sanctuary], and redeemed there, they[3] become at once invalid for having been taken out, for it is written, Before the Lord;[4] and if inside,[5] one is thus bringing unconsecrated food into the Sanctuary! Thereupon R. Hisda said to them, It is indeed in agreement with Rabbi's view and [the loaves] are actually redeemed inside [the Sanctuary], for they became unconsecrated of themselves.[6]

Rabina said to R. Ashi, But it has been taught that when they are redeemed they must be redeemed outside [the Sanctuary] only! — He replied, That [Baraitha] is clearly in agreement with the view of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon,[7] for according to Rabbi they would at once become invalid on being taken out.

R. Aha the son of Raba said to R. Ashi, Shall we say that [in this Baraitha] we have a refutation of R. Johanan's view? For it was stated: If the thank-offering was slaughtered [accompanied] by eighty cakes,[8] Hezekiah said, Forty out of the eighty are hallowed; but R. Johanan said, Not even forty out of the eighty are hallowed![9] — Was it not also reported thereon that R. Zera said, All agree that where [the slaughterer] declared, ‘Let forty out of the eighty be hallowed’, they are hallowed? Then here, too, we will say that he declared, ‘Let two out of the four be hallowed’.

R. Hanina of Tirta[10] recited before R. Johanan: If four lambs were slaughtered [on the Pentecost accompanied] by two loaves, two of the lambs should [first] be drawn to one side and their blood sprinkled under another name,[11] for if you do not decide to act in this way[12] you forfeit the last [pair of lambs].[13] Thereupon R. Johanan said to him, Should we bid a man, ‘Arise and sin, so that you may thereby obtain a benefit’?[14] Surely we have learnt:[15] If the limbs of a sin-offering[16] were mixed with the limbs of a burnt-offering,[17] R. Eliezer says, Let them all be put above [upon the altar], for I regard the flesh of the sin-offering that is above as wood. But the Sages say, Their appearance must first be spoilt[18] and they must all be taken away to the place of burning. But why?[19] Should we not say, ‘Arise and sin, so that you may thereby obtain a benefit’?[20] — We would say, ‘Arise and sin with the sin-offering so that you may thereby obtain some benefit in regard to the sin-offering itself’,[21] but we would not say, ‘Arise and sin with the sin-offering so that you may thereby obtain a benefit in regard to the burnt-offering’.

And do we say it of one subject?[22] But it was taught:[23] If the lambs of Pentecost were slaughtered under another name, or if they were slaughtered either before or after the proper time,[24] the blood is to be sprinkled[25] and the flesh may be eaten. If [the Festival] was on the Sabbath, the blood must not be sprinkled;[26] if, however,

is valid and may be eaten’, v. Zeb.[13] a; and the second pair of lambs will Serve for the Pentecost-offering together with the two loaves. it was sprinkled, the sacrifice is acceptable, but the sacrificial portions must be burnt after dark. But why? Should we not say, ‘Arise and sin, so that you

may gain an advantage'?[27] — We would say, 'Arise and sin on the Sabbath so that you may gain an advantage on the Sabbath',[28] but we would not say, 'Arise and sin on the Sabbath so that you may gain an advantage on a weekday'.

And do we not say it of two subjects?[29] But we have learnt:[30] If a barrel [of wine of terumah] was broken in the upper part of the winepress and in the lower part there was unclean [ordinary wine], R. Eliezer and R. Joshua agree that if a man can save a quarter [log] of it in cleanness he must save it;[31] but if not, R. Eliezer says,

---

(1) But it agrees with the view of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon who holds that it is the sprinkling that hallows the loaves, accordingly none of the loaves have as yet been hallowed, and therefore any two may be taken for the offering and the other two redeemed like all holy things consecrated for their value only.

(2) Two of these loaves have already been hallowed by the slaughtering of the lambs and two have not, and the latter are therefore to be redeemed. The difficulty, however, is as to the place of the redemption, since the hallowed loaves are not distinguished and separated from the others.

(3) The hallowed loaves.

(4) Lev. XXIII, 20.

(5) I.e., the redemption is to take place inside the Sanctuary and all four loaves are to be eaten inside, since it is not known which are the hallowed and which the redeemed loaves.

(6) There is no transgression committed here, for the loaves only become unconsecrated when already in the Sanctuary.

(7) Who maintains that the slaughtering of the lambs does not hallow the loaves, consequently, at any time before the sprinkling of the blood, two loaves can be selected to be hallowed for the offering, and the remaining two must be redeemed outside the Sanctuary.

(8) Instead of the prescribed forty.

(9) The foregoing Baraitha which states that two out of the four loaves are hallowed thus conflicts with R. Johanan's view.

(10) Obermeyer, Die Landschaft Babylonian, p. 185, identifies it with Tirastan in the region of Mahuza.

(11) These lambs may be eaten in accordance with the principle, 'Every offering offered under another name

(12) But sprinkle the blood of the first pair of lambs for the Pentecost-offering.

(13) The second pair of lambs would now be invalid and would be forbidden to be eaten, for since they were at one time fit to be offered under their own name, and indeed were slaughtered as such, but are now rejected, they cannot be valid if offered under another name. V. supra p. 288.

(14) I.e., in order to save two lambs, that they may be eaten, a sin is deliberately committed by offering a sacrifice under some other name.

(15) Zeb. 77a.

(16) That are consumed by the priests.

(17) That are burnt upon the altar.

(18) I.e., all the limbs must be kept overnight.

(19) Why should everything be burnt?

(20) One should commit the sin of burning the limbs of a sin-offering upon the altar for the sake of the limbs of the burnt-offering, so that the latter be rendered acceptable.

(21) And likewise with the lambs of Pentecost: a sin is committed by sprinkling the blood of the lambs under another name and the advantage is thereby gained that these lambs may be eaten.

(22) I.e., where both the sin committed and advantage gained relate to the same thing.

(23) Bez 20b; Naz. 28b.

(24) Sc. the Festival.

(25) Under another name.

(26) For since the offering is no longer on behalf of the community the services in connection therewith do not supersede the Sabbath laws.

(27) Let the sin of sprinkling the blood on the Sabbath be committed so as to gain the advantage of burning the sacrificial portions upon the altar after the Sabbath and then the flesh would be permitted to be eaten.

(28) I.e., the advantage gained must be enjoyed on the same day as the commission of the sin, as is the case with the

lambs of Pentecost, v. supra, p. 290, n. 10.

(29) I.e., to sin in one thing so as to gain an advantage in another.

(30) Ter. VIII, 9; Pes. 15a.

(31) He must endeavour to obtain clean vessels so long as he can save a quarter log of the terumah wine, although in the meantime the terumah wine is flowing down and mixing with the unclean non-terumah wine, thereby rendering the entire mixture absolutely unfit.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 48b

Let it run down and become unclean, but he must not render it unclean with his own hands;[1] and R. Joshua says, He may even render it unclean with his own hands![2] — In that case it is different, since in any event it will become unclean.[3]

When R. Isaac came [from Palestine] he recited: If the lambs of Pentecost were slaughtered not according to the prescribed rite,[4] they are invalid; their appearance must be spoilt[5] and they must be taken away to the place of burning. R. Nahman said to him, You, Master, who compare [the lambs of Pentecost] with the sin-offering[6] recite that they are invalid, but a Tanna of the School of Levi who infers obligatory peace-offerings from freewill peace-offerings[7] recites that they are valid. For Levi taught:[8] And so with the peace-offerings of a Nazirite, if they were slaughtered not according to the prescribed rite, they are valid but they do not count in fulfilment of their owner's obligation; they may be eaten the same day and evening [until midnight], and they do not require any cakes nor the offering of the shoulder [to the priest].[9]

An objection was raised: If for the guilt-offering that requires a lamb of the first year[10] a sheep of the second year was offered, or for that which requires a sheep of the second year[11] a lamb of the first year was offered,it is invalid; its appearance must be spoilt and it must be taken away to the place of burning. But if the burnt-offering of the Nazirite, or of a woman after childbirth, or of a leper, was a sheep of the second year and it was slaughtered, it is valid.[12] This is the general principle: Whatsoever is valid for a freewill burnt-offering is also valid for an obligatory burnt-offering, and whatsoever is invalid for a sin-offering is also invalid for a guilt-offering except [when the offering was slaughtered] under another name![13] — The author of this Baraitha is the Tanna of the School of Levi.

Come and hear from the following which Levi taught: If the guilt-offering of the Nazirite[14] and the guilt-offering of the leper were slaughtered under another name, they are valid, but they do not count in fulfilment of the owner's obligation. If they were slaughtered before the time had arrived for the owner to offer them,[15] or if they were of the second year, they are invalid. Now if this were so,[16] he should then draw an inference from the peace-offering![17] — He infers peace-offering from peace-offering but he does not infer guilt-offering from peace-offering. But then if he infers peace-offering from peace-offering he should also infer guilt-offering from guilt-offering, viz., the guilt-offering of the Nazirite and of the leper from the guilt-offering for robbery and for sacrilege, and then the guilt-offering for robbery and for sacrilege from the guilt-offering of the Nazirite and of the leper![18] — R. Shimi b. Ashi answered, We infer what is offered not according to the prescribed rite from what is similarly offered not according to the prescribed rite,[19] but we do not infer what is offered not according to the prescribed rite from what is offered according to the prescribed rite.[20] Do we not? Surely it has been taught: Whence do we know that if what had been taken out [of its proper place] was later brought up upon the altar it must not come down again? From the fact that with regard to the high places what was taken out was still valid to be offered![21] —

---

(1) By collecting the whole of the terumah wine in an unclean vessel; he must not deliberately render it unclean, in order to save the unclean non-terumah wine.

(2) Hence, according to R. Joshua, we bid a man to sin in respect of the terumah wine in order to benefit from the

non-terumah wine.
(3) Lit., 'it goes to uncleanness'. It is therefore not regarded as a sin to render unclean this terumah.
(4) I.e., under another name, as some other sacrifice. Aliter: instead of lambs of the first year those of the second year were offered.
(5) They should be allowed to remain overnight whereby they become invalid and then burnt, for it is not proper to destroy any sacrificial portions that are still valid.
(6) V. Lev. XXIII, 19; as the sin-offering is invalid if offered under another name (or, if the animal offered was over a year old), so it is with these lambs.
(7) As ordinary peace-offerings are valid even though offered under another name (or, if the animal offered was over the prescribed age), so it is with these obligatory peace-offerings of Pentecost.
(8) Nazir 24b; Tosef. Nazir IV.
(9) As would be the case were the offering accepted in fulfilment of the Nazirite's obligation (cf. Num. VI, 19). Now, although the peace-offering of the Nazirite is mentioned alongside with his sin-offering in verse 14 ibid., and one could conclude therefrom that the former, if offered not according to its prescribed rite, is invalid, Levi prefers to draw the inference between the identical kinds of offerings, namely from the freewill peace-offering to the obligatory peace-offering. Accordingly any obligatory peace-offerings, e.g., the Nazirite's peace-offering or the lambs of Pentecost, are valid even though offered not according to the prescribed rite, as is the case with freewill peace-offerings.
(10) That is, the guilt-offering brought by a Nazirite when rendered unclean, or the guilt-offering of a leper at his purification, in connection with which Holy Writ uses the expression כבש 'a lamb', i.e., of the first year; v. Parah I, 3.
(11) That is, the guilt-offering for robbery, or the guilt-offering for sacrilege, in connection with which the term איל 'a ram' is used, i.e., a sheep of the second year; v. Parah ibid.
(12) These obligatory burnt-offerings, although prescribed to be lambs of the first year, are nevertheless valid, for in the case of a freewill burnt-offering, if an older animal was offered in place of a younger one, the offering is valid. V. infra 107b.
(13) In which case if the offering was a sin-offering it would be invalid, but if a guilt-offering it would be valid. It will thus be seen that obligatory burnt-offerings are placed on the same footing as freewill burnt-offerings and are not compared with sin-offerings (although these are mentioned in the same verse as the obligatory burnt-offerings, cf. Lev. XIV, 19; Num. VI, 14); likewise obligatory peace-offerings are to be compared with freewill peace-offerings but not with sin-offerings; contra R. Isaac.
(14) Brought by the Nazirite who had been rendered unclean unwittingly during the continuance of his Nazirite vow. Cf. Num. VI, 12.
(15) In the case of the leper, before the period of seven days had elapsed from the beginning of his cleansing rites v. Lev. XIV, 8; and in the case of the Nazirite, before he had rendered himself clean, v. Num. VI, 12.
(16) That the Tanna of the school of Levi draws an inference from the freewill-offering to the obligatory offering.
(17) Thus, as the freewill peace-offering is valid even though a sheep of the second year was offered in place of the lamb of the first year that was vowed, so it should be with the obligatory guilt-offering.
(18) With the result that all guilt-offerings are valid whether the lamb offered was of the first year or of the second year.
(19) Thus the lambs of pentecost, when offered not according to their prescribed rite but e.g., under another name, are valid by inference drawn from the case of freewill peace-offerings, which are valid even though not offered according to their prescribed rite.
(20) I.e., that the guilt-offering of the Nazirite or of the leper should be valid when offered not according to its prescribed rite (e.g., if a sheep of the second year was offered), by inference from the guilt-offering for robbery or for sacrilege which according to the prescribed law must be a sheep of the second year.
(21) For the law of hallowed things being taken out does not apply to the high places (i.e., private altars) as there were no restrictions of place in regard to the sacrifices offered at the high places. V. supra p. 34, nn. 3 and 4. Now here is an instance of an act though not in accordance with the prescribed rite (sc. the offering upon the altar of what was taken outside the Sanctuary) being regarded as valid by inference from the high places where such an act is permitted.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 49a

That Tanna in fact relies upon the verse, This is the law of the burnt-offering,[1] which includes [all things that were brought up].

Rabbah b. Bar Hanah recited before Rab: If the lambs of Pentecost were slaughtered as rams,[2] they are valid, but they do not count to the owners[3] in fulfilment of their obligation; whereupon Rab said to him, They certainly count as such. Said R. Hisda, Rab's view is reasonable in the case where [the slaughterer] believing them to be rams slaughtered them as lambs, for then lambs were in fact slaughtered as lambs; but not where he believed them to be rams and slaughtered them as rams, for even a mistaken variation[4] is considered a variation. Rabbah, however, says: A mistaken variation is no variation.[5] Rabbah[6] said, I raised an objection against my own statement from the following: Priests who rendered the flesh in the Sanctuary piggul, if they did so deliberately, are liable to pay compensation.[7] It follows that if they did so unwittingly they are exempt. And in connection therewith it was taught: What they rendered piggul [although unwittingly] is nevertheless piggul. Now what were the circumstances [where the priest acted unwittingly]? If the priest knew that [the offering] was a sin-offering and treated it as a peace-offering,[8] then surely he was not acting unwittingly but deliberately! We must say, therefore, that he believed that it[9] was a peace-offering and treated it as though it were a peace-offering; and yet it has been taught: 'What they rendered piggul [though unwittingly] is nevertheless piggul', thus proving that a mistaken variation is considered a variation! — Abaye answered, I can still say that the priest knew that it was a sin-offering and treated it as a peace-offering, [and yet he was acting unwittingly] for he believed that it was permitted [to change the character of the sacrifice].

R. Zera raised an objection from the following:[10] R. Simeon says, All meal-offerings from which the handful was taken under some other name are valid, and also discharge the owner's obligation, since meal-offerings are unlike animal-offerings; for when the priest takes the handful from a meal-offering prepared on a griddle and refers to it as one prepared in a pan, [his intention is of no consequence], for the preparation thereof clearly indicates that it is a meal-offering prepared on a griddle. Or if he is dealing with a dry[11] meal-offering and refers to it as one mixed with oil, [his intention is of no consequence], for the preparation thereof clearly indicates that it is a dry meal-offering. But it is not so with animal-offerings: the same slaughtering is for all offerings, the same manner of receiving the blood for all, and the same manner of sprinkling for all. Now what are the circumstances? If the priest knows that it is in fact a meal-offering prepared on a griddle and yet when taking the handful refers to it as one prepared in a pan, then what does it matter that the preparation thereof clearly indicates the true nature of the offering? He has deliberately varied the offering, has he not? We must say, therefore, that he believes it[12] to be a meal-offering prepared in a pan and when taking the handful refers to it as such, but he is mistaken; now in this case only [is his intention of no consequence], since the preparation thereof clearly indicates the true nature of the offering, but in all other cases we say that a mistaken variation is considered a variation? — Abaye answered him, I can still say that the priest knows that it is in fact a meal-offering prepared on a griddle yet when taking the handful refers to it as one prepared in a pan, and as for the question, 'What does it matter that the preparation thereof clearly indicates the true nature of the offering?' [I answer that] Rabbah is consistent with his view, for Rabbah has said, only a wrongful intention which is not manifestly [absurd] does the Divine Law declare capable of rendering an offering invalid, but a wrongful intention which is manifestly [absurd] the Divine Law declares incapable of rendering invalid.[13]

MISHNAH. THE [ABSENCE OF THE] DAILY OFFERINGS DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS,[14] NEITHER DOES [THE ABSENCE OF] THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS INVALIDATE THE DAILY OFFERINGS; MOREOVER OF THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS THE [ABSENCE OF] ONE DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE OTHER. EVEN THOUGH THEY[15] DID NOT OFFER THE LAMB[16] IN THE MORNING THEY MUST OFFER [THE LAMB] TOWARDS EVENING.[17] R. SIMEON SAID, WHEN IS THIS? ONLY WHEN THEY HAD ACTED UNDER CONSTRAINT OR IN ERROR, BUT IF THEY ACTED DELIBERATELY AND DID NOT OFFER THE LAMB IN THE MORNING THEY MAY NOT

OFFER [THE LAMB] TOWARDS EVENING. IF THEY DID NOT BURN THE INCENSE IN THE MORNING[18] THEY BURN IT TOWARDS EVENING. R. SIMEON SAID, THE WHOLE OF IT WAS BURNT TOWARDS EVENING,[19] FOR THE GOLDEN ALTAR WAS DEDICATED ONLY BY THE INCENSE OF SPICES,[20] THE ALTAR FOR THE BURNT-OFFERING ONLY BY THE DAILY OFFERING OF THE MORNING, THE TABLE ONLY BY THE SHEWBREAD ON THE SABBATH, AND THE CANDLESTICK ONLY BY [THE KINDLING OF] SEVEN LAMPS TOWARDS EVENING.

GEMARA. R. Hiyya b. Abin enquired of R. Hisda, If the community had not [means enough] for the Daily Offerings as well as for the Additional Offerings, which take precedence? But what are the circumstances? If you say that the reference is to the Daily Offerings required for to-day and the Additional Offerings also for to-day, then surely it is obvious that the Daily Offerings take precedence, for they are more frequent[21] and holy![22] We must therefore say, the reference is to the Daily Offerings required for the morrow and the Additional Offerings for to-day. Shall we say that the Daily Offerings take precedence for they are more frequent, or the Additional Offerings, since they are holy?[23] — He replied, But you have learnt it: THE [ABSENCE OF THE] DAILY OFFERINGS DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS NEITHER DOES [THE ABSENCE OF] THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS INVALIDATE THE DAILY OFFERINGS; MOREOVER OF THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS THE[ABSENCE OF] ONE DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE OTHER. Now what are the circumstances? if you say that [both kinds of offerings] are available and it is only a question of precedence,[24] surely it has been taught: Whence do we know that no offering should be sacrificed prior to the Daily Offering of the morning? Because it is written, And he shall lay the burnt-offering in order upon it,[25] and Raba stated, 'The burnt-offering' implies the first burnt-offering.[26]

---

(1) Lev. VI, 2. By interpreting עולה (rendered 'burnt-offering') as whatsoever is brought up' from עלה 'to go up', the rule is established that whatsoever is brought upon the altar, although unfit, must not come down again. Accordingly the rule is not derived by inference from the case of the high places.

(2) The slaughterer believed and expressly declared that he was slaughtering rams (i.e., sheep of the second year).

(3) Sc. the community

(4) For the slaughterer did not know that they were in fact lambs of the first year.

(5) And the owners' obligation is 'thereby fulfilled.

(6) So MS.M. and also B.H. In cur. edd. 'Raba'.

(7) To the owners who, owing to the priests' wrongful intention, must now provide a fresh sacrifice. V. Git. 54b.

(8) By expressly declaring his intention of eating of the flesh of the offering for the next two days, which intention in a sin-offering renders piggul, for a sin-offering may be eaten the same day and night but no more.

(9) Sc. the sin-offering.

(10) V. supra 2b.

(11) I.e., one that is not mixed with oil, e.g., a sinner's meal-offering; cf. Lev. V, 11.

(12) Sc. the meal-offering prepared on a griddle.

(13) Where the priest's actions belie his expressed intention, obviously his words cannot be taken seriously, and they therefore cannot render the offering invalid.

(14) Offered on Sabbaths and on Festivals; cf. Num. XXVIII.

(15) Sc. the priests.

(16) Of the Daily Offering.

(17) I.e., the lamb for the evening Daily Offering is nevertheless to be offered.

(18) Cf. Ex. XXX, 7, 8; one half-maneh of incense was offered every morning and the other half-maneh every evening.

(19) I.e., the whole maneh.

(20) Consisting of one whole maneh offered towards evening; v. Gemara infra.

(21) For the one was offered daily whereas the other only on Sabbaths and Festivals.

(22) I.e., more holy. For on Sabbaths and Festivals the Daily Offering is offered prior to the Additional Offering. Aliter: 'holy' in that they are offered on a holy day.

(23) For these are to be offered on a holy day whereas the Daily Offerings are for the morrow, a weekday. Or, according to the first interpretation given on p. 297, n. 8: the Additional Offerings in this case are sacrificed prior to the Daily Offerings, since the former are offered to-day and the latter on the morrow.

(24) And by stating that one does not invalidate the other the Mishnah teaches us that any one may be offered first.

(25) Lev. VI, 5.

(26) The definite article, העולה emphasizes the importance of this burnt-offering.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 49b

Obviously then there are not sufficient means [for the two kinds of offerings]; now if both are required for to-day how [can it be said that either the one or the other may be offered]? Surely what is more frequent and holy takes precedence![1] We must say, therefore, [that one is required] for the morrow, and yet it states, that [the absence of] one does invalidate the other, thus proving that they are on a par. Thereupon Abaye said to him, I can still say that [both kinds of offerings] are available and it is only a question of precedence and as for your objection that nothing should be offered prior to [the Daily Offering, I say that] that is only a recommendation.[2]

Come and hear: We have learnt:[3] There must never be less than six inspected[4] lambs in the chamber of lambs, sufficient for a Sabbath and the two Festival days of the New Year.[5] Now what are the circumstances? Shall I say that [lambs] are available, then surely many more are required for the Daily Offerings and the Additional Offerings![6] Obviously there are not sufficient lambs; we thus see that the Daily Offerings take precedence![7] — This is not so, for actually lambs are available [for all the offerings], but this is what [that Mishnah] says: There must never be less than six lambs, inspected four days before the slaughtering,[8] in the chamber of lambs. And the author [of that Mishnah] is Ben Bag Bag. For Ben Bag Bag says, Whence do we know that the lamb for the Daily Offering must be inspected four days before the slaughtering? Because it is written here, Ye shall observe to offer unto Me in its due season[9] , and there it is written, And ye shall keep it until the fourteenth day of the same month;[10] as in the latter case the lamb was inspected four days before the slaughtering,[11] so in the former case the lamb must be inspected four days before the slaughtering.

Rabina said to R. Ashi, Why six? Surely seven are necessary, for one must reckon also the lamb for the morning [Daily Offering] on Tuesday![12] And according to your argument, [retorted the other], are not eight necessary? For one must also reckon the lamb for the evening Daily Offering on Friday![13] — This is no difficulty, for [the Tanna] assumed that [the Friday evening Daily Offering] had been offered.

---

(1) And that is the Daily Offering.

(2) But in fact offerings may be sacrificed before the morning Daily Offering.

(3) ‘Ar. 13a.

(4) I.e., examined and found free from all physical blemishes.

(5) When the three fall on consecutive days six lambs would be required for the Daily Offerings; v. ‘Ar. 13a.

(6) Actually twenty two lambs would be required for these three days, six for the Daily Offerings and sixteen for the Additional Offerings.

(7) Since all the six lambs are reserved for the Daily Offerings in preference to the Additional Offerings.

(8) This requirement was essential for the Daily Offerings only.

(9) Num. XXVIII, 2.

(10) Ex. XII, 6. In both these verses a form of the root שמר ‘to keep’ ‘observe’ is used.

(11) For the lamb was taken on the tenth of the month of Nisan and slaughtered on the fourteenth of the same month. Cf. ibid. 3,6.

(12) When the New Year falls on Sunday and Monday, the six inspected lambs would, it is true, serve for the Daily Offerings of the three days, namely the Sabbath, Sunday and Monday, but surely another lamb must be had in readiness for the morning Daily Offering on Tuesday, since there is no opportunity to obtain one during the preceding three days.

There is another reading: 'for the morning Daily Offering on Sunday'. The interpretation is similar but the assumption is that the New Year preceded the Sabbath and fell on Thursday and Friday.

(13) It being assumed that the evening offering on Friday had not yet been offered, consequently the number of lambs stated by the Tanna would have to include this lamb too.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 50a

At all events seven are necessary! — We must say that the Tanna [of that Mishnah] speaks in general,[1] and the expression 'sufficient for a Sabbath and the two Festival days of the New Year' serves merely as a mnemonic. This can indeed be proved [from the wording]; for it reads, 'Sufficient for a Sabbath', and not 'For the Sabbath and the two Festival days of the New Year'. This is conclusive.

EVEN THOUGH THEY DID NOT OFFER THE LAMB IN THE MORNING . . . R. SIMEON SAID THE WHOLE OF IT WAS BURNT TOWARDS EVENING, FOR THE GOLDEN ALTAR WAS DEDICATED ONLY BY THE INCENSE OF SPICES. Who speaks of dedication here? — A clause has been omitted and it really should read as follows: EVEN THOUGH THEY DID NOT OFFER THE LAMB IN THE MORNING, they must not offer the lamb towards evening. This is the rule only if the altar had not been dedicated,[2] but if the altar had once been dedicated, THEY MUST OFFER [THE LAMB] TOWARDS EVENING.[3] R. SIMEON SAID, WHEN IS THIS? ONLY WHEN THEY HAD ACTED UNDER CONSTRAINT OR IN ERROR, BUT IF THEY ACTED DELIBERATELY AND DID NOT OFFER THE LAMB IN THE MORNING THEY MAY NOT OFFER [THE LAMB] TOWARDS EVENING. IF THEY DID NOT BURN THE INCENSE IN THE MORNING THEY BURN IT TOWARDS EVENING. Whence is this derived? From the following which our Rabbis taught: It is written, And the second lamb thou shalt offer towards evening:[4] the second is to be offered towards evening but the first may not be offered towards evening. This is so only if the altar had not been dedicated, but if the altar had once been dedicated, even the first lamb may be offered towards evening. R. Simeon said, When is this? Only when they had acted under constraint or in error, but if they acted deliberately and did not offer the lamb in the morning they must not offer the lamb towards evening; if they did not burn the incense in the morning they burn it towards evening.

['If they did not offer the lamb in the morning, they must not offer the lamb towards evening'].[5] Is the altar to be idle because the priests have been remiss? — Raba explained, It means, They[6] must not offer it, but other priests should offer it. 'If they did not burn the incense in the morning, they burn it towards evening'. For since it is not so frequent,[7] and moreover it enriches,[8] it is therefore most dear to them and they would not be remiss about it.[9]

R. SIMEON SAID, THE WHOLE OF IT WAS BURNT TOWARDS EVENING, FOR THE GOLDEN ALTAR WAS DEDICATED ONLY BY THE INCENSE OF SPICES OFFERED TOWARDS EVENING etc. But it has been taught: Only by the incense of spices offered in the morning! — Tannaim differ on this point. Abaye said, It is more logical to accept the view of him who says, 'Only by the incense of spices offered towards evening', for it is written, Every morning when he dresseth the lamps he shall burn it,[10] and how can he dress [the lamps] in the morning If they were not kindled the previous evening?[11] But he who says, 'Only by the incense of spices offered in the morning', infers it from the altar for burnt-offering: as that was dedicated by the morning Daily Offering so the golden altar was dedicated by the incense of spices offered in the morning.

THE TABLE ONLY BY THE SHEWBREAD ON THE SABBATH. Does this mean to say that [the table] was not dedicated thereby,[12] but that it nevertheless hallowed it?[13] — It really teaches us that the dedication of the table and the hallowing [of the bread] was only on the Sabbath, as it reads

in the last clause: AND THE CANDLESTICK ONLY BY [THE KINDLING OF] ITS SEVEN LAMPS TOWARDS EVENING.[14]

Our Rabbis taught: That was [the only case of] an offering of incense which was offered by an individual upon the outer altar, and it was a special ruling.[15] To what [does it refer]? — R. Papa said, [To incense-offering] by the princes [of the tribes].[16] Does this mean then that an individual may not offer [incense] upon the outer altar but he may upon the inner altar? And furthermore, that an individual may not offer incense upon the outer altar but the community may? Behold it was taught: One might think that an individual may make a freewill-offering [of incense] in the same manner[17] and offer it, for I would apply the verse, That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt observe and do,[18] Holy Writ therefore says, Ye shall not offer strange incense thereon.[19] One might further think that an individual may not offer it since he does not offer the like as an obligation,

---

(1) I.e., at all times of the year there must be six lambs in readiness, each inspected four days previously, so that whatever the circumstances there would always be sufficient lambs to last for three days. The expression used by the Tanna 'sufficient for a Sabbath and the two Festival days of the New Year' is merely a mnemonic suggesting the number six. To ensure that every day there would be at least six lambs inspected four days previously it was necessary at the dedication of the Temple, when sacrifices commenced, to have twelve lambs each inspected free from blemish four days previously. On the following day two lambs were taken from the twelve for the Daily Offering and two other lambs, inspected on this day, were added; and so regularly on subsequent days. After four days the lambs added on the first day belonged to the category of lambs inspected four days previously, and on the fifth day two more were added to this class and so on. So Rashi; but v. com. of R. Gershom and also Rashi's interpretation in 'Ar. 13a and b.

(2) The altar had only recently been erected and sacrifices had not yet been offered thereon.

(3) Even though the morning offering had been omitted.

(4) Ex. XXIX, 39.

(5) V. Glosses of Bah, n. 1.

(6) Sc. those priests who had been negligent and had omitted to offer the morning offering.

(7) Incense was offered only twice daily whereas burnt-offerings were frequent all the day.

(8) Sc. the priest that offered the incense; v. Yoma 26a.

(9) And therefore even though it did happen that the priest had omitted to offer the morning incense, he may nevertheless offer the incense in the evening.

(10) Ibid. XXX, 7.

(11) Obviously then the candlestick was dedicated and inaugurated for use in the evening, and so it was too with the inauguration of the incense offering, for it is written (ibid. 8): And when Aaron lighteth the lamps towards evening he shall burn it.

(12) If the Shewbread was placed on the table on a weekday.

(13) But this is not correct for we have learnt (infra 100a) that the placing of the Shewbread on the table on a weekday does in no wise hallow the bread.

(14) And as the entire service of the Candlestick, i.e., the kindling of its lamps, was to be at its dedication in the evening, so the entire service in connection with the table, i.e., the hallowing of the bread, must be at its dedication on the Sabbath.

(15) Lit., 'a decision for the hour'.

(16) Cf. Num. VII, 12ff.

(17) As the princes of the tribes did at the dedication of the altar.

(18) Deut. XXIII, 24.

(19) Ex. XXX, 9.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 50b

but the community may offer [incense as a freewill-offering] since it offers the like as an obligation,[1] Holy Writ therefore says, Ye shall not offer.[2] One might further think that [the community] may not offer it upon the inner altar but it may [offer it] upon the outer altar, Holy Writ therefore states, And

the anointing oil and the incense of sweet spices for the holy place; according to all that I have commanded thee shall they do;[3] thus there is only offered that which is stated in the context! — R. Papa said, It is a case of 'it goes without saying'; thus, it goes without saying that a community may not offer [incense] upon the outer altar, for we find no such case; similarly that an individual may not offer [incense] upon the inner altar, for we find no such case. But even an individual may not offer [incense] upon the outer altar, although we find that this was the case with the princes, for that was a special ruling.

MISHNAH. THE HIGH PRIEST'S GRIDDLE-CAKES[4] MUST NOT BE BROUGHT IN [TWO SEPARATE] HALVES, BUT HE MUST BRING A WHOLE TENTH AND THEN DIVIDE IT, OFFERING A HALF IN THE MORNING AND A HALF TOWARDS EVENING. IF THE [HIGH] PRIEST THAT OFFERED THE HALF IN THE MORNING DIED AND THEY APPOINTED ANOTHER PRIEST IN HIS STEAD, [THE SUCCESSOR] MAY NOT BRING A HALF-TENTH FROM HIS HOUSE, NEITHER [MAY HE USE] THE REMAINING HALF-TENTH OF THE FIRST [HIGH PRIEST], BUT HE MUST BRING A WHOLE TENTH AND DIVIDE IT, OFFERING ONE HALF AND LEAVING THE OTHER HALF TO PERISH. THUS THE RESULT IS THAT TWO HALVES ARE OFFERED AND TWO HALVES ARE LEFT TO PERISH. GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: Had Scripture stated, 'For a meal-offering a half', I should then have thought that he must bring a half-tenth from his house in the morning and offer it and a half-tenth from his house in the evening and offer it; but Scripture states, Half of it in the morning,[5] that is, he must offer a half of the whole [tenth]. Thus he must bring a whole tenth and divide it, offering a half in the morning and a half towards evening. Where the half that was to be offered towards evening became unclean or was lost, I might say that he should bring a half-tenth from his house and offer it, Scriptures therefore states, And half thereof in the evening,[6] that is, he must offer a half of a whole [tenth]. Thus he must bring [another] whole tenth and divide it, offering one half and leaving the other half to perish; and so the result is that two halves are offered and two halves are left to perish. Where the High Priest that offered the half in the morning died and they appointed another High Priest in his place, I might say that he may bring a half-tenth from his house or that he may use the remaining half-tenth of the first [High Priest]. Scripture therefore states, 'And half thereof in the evening'; he must offer a half of a whole [tenth]. Thus he must bring [another] whole tenth and divide it, offering one half and leaving the other half to perish; and so the result is that two halves are offered and two halves are left to perish.

A Tanna[7] recited before R. Nahman: As for the half left by the first [High Priest] and the half left by the second, their appearance must first be spoiled[8] and they are then taken away to the place of burning. Whereupon R. Nahman said to him, I grant you that the first[9] should be treated so, since it was once valid for offering;[10] but as for the second, why must its appearance first be spoiled? From the very outset it was intended for destruction, was it not?[11] He who told you this rule must be a Tanna of the School of Rabbah b. Abbuha who has said that even piggul[12] must have its appearance spoiled [before it is destroyed]. R. Ashi said, This rule may be even in accordance with the view of the Rabbis, for each half was valid for offering inasmuch as at the time when it was divided either the one half or the other half could have been offered.

It was stated: How did they prepare the High Priest's griddlecakes? — R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan, They were first to be baked [in an oven] and then fried;[13] R. Assi said in the name of R. Hanina, They were first to be fried and then baked. R. Hiyya b. Abba said, My view is more probable, for 'tufine'[14] signifies 'to be baked whilst still attractive'.[15] But R. Assi said, My view is more probable, for 'tufine' signifies 'to be baked when already half-done'.[16] Indeed Tannaim differ with regard to it, for it was taught: 'Tufine' signifies 'to be baked whilst still attractive'. Rabbi says, It signifies 'to be baked when already half-done'. R. Dosa[17] says, It signifies 'to be baked several times'.[18] He accepts the interpretation 'half-done' as well as the interpretation 'attractive'.

We learnt elsewhere:[19] The kneading, the shaping and the baking of the High Priest's griddle-cakes were performed within [the Temple Court],[20] and they overrode the Sabbath. Whence is this derived?[21] — R. Huna said, Since tufine signifies 'to be baked whilst still attractive', if they were baked on the day before [the Sabbath] they would lose their freshness. R. Joseph demurred, Surely they could be preserved in herbs![22] In the School of R. Ishmael it was taught: It shall be prepared,[23] even on the Sabbath; 'it shall be prepared', even in uncleanness. Abaye said, The verse says, Of fine flour for a meal-offering daily,[24]

---

(1) Sc. the daily incense-offering on behalf of the community.

(2) Ex. XXX, 9. The plural of the verb is used so as to refer to the whole community too.

(3) Ibid. XXXI, II.

(4) I.e., the מנחת חביתין or חביתי כהן גדול, a meal-offering prepared on a griddle offered by the High Priest daily, consisting of a tenth of an ephah of fine flour, half of which was offered in the morning and the other half in the evening. Cf. Lev. VI, 12ff.

(5) Lev. VI, 13. 'Of it' signifies that there is before us a whole tenth but that only a half of it is to be offered.

(6) Ibid. The inference is derived from the waw, 'and' at the beginning of this phrase, which is regarded as superfluous.

(7) V. Glos. (s. v. b).

(8) I.e., they should be kept overnight.

(9) I.e., the half left over by the first High Priest.

(10) It therefore may not be burnt until it becomes invalid by being left overnight when 'its appearance becomes spoiled'.

(11) It should accordingly be destroyed at once.

(12) Which is invalid by the law of the Torah. For piggul v. Glos.

(13) On a griddle after being smeared with oil.

(14) Lev. VI, 14. תפיני is explained as a composite word.

(15) תאפינה נאה they must look fine at the time of baking, hence they must not be fried first for then they would be blackened somewhat by reason of the open griddle and the oil, and would not be so attractive.

(16) תאפינה נא: they must be half-done, i.e., fried in a griddle, before being baked.

(17) So in all MSS. and in the parallel passages and in R. Gershom; in cur. edd. 'R. Jose'.

(18) תאפינה רבה. They must be baked once before the frying so that they should look attractive (נאה) at the time of baking, and also after the frying so that they should be half-done (נא) at the second baking. Var. lec. רכה. V. Rashi for other interpretations.

(19) Infra 96a.

(20) For the half-tenth measure, whereby the tenth of flour was divided, was anointed as a vessel of ministry, so that whatsoever was put into it was immediately hallowed and liable to be rendered invalid if taken out of the Temple Court.

(21) That the kneading etc. overrode the Sabbath.

(22) So as to retain their freshness.

(23) Lev. VI, 14.

(24) Ibid. 13.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 51a

they are thus like the meal-offering which accompanies the Daily Offering.[1] Raba said, The expression 'on a griddle' implies that they require the use of a vessel of ministry, and [that being so] if they were baked on the day before [the Sabbath] they would be invalid by being kept overnight.[2]

There has been taught a Baraitha which coincides with Raba's view. The expression 'on a griddle' implies that it[3] requires the use of a vessel of ministry. 'With oil' signifies that it must have much oil; yet I know not how much, argue therefore as follows: here it is written oil, and there in connection with the meal-offering accompanying the lambs[4] [of the Daily Offering] it is also written oil,[5] as there it has three logs [of oil] to the tenth so here it must have three logs to the tenth. Or perhaps I should argue thus: here it is written oil and there in connection with the freewill

meal-offering it is also written oil,[6] as there it has only one log so here it should have only one log! Let us then see to which [of the two] is this case most similar. We may infer a meal-offering which is characterized by T.B.Sh.T.[7] — it is offered daily, is an obligation, and overrides the Sabbath and uncleanness — from another meal- offering which is also characterized by T.B.Sh.T, but we may not infer a meal-offering which is T.B.Sh.T. from another which is not T.B.Sh.T. Or perhaps I should argue thus: we may infer a meal-offering which is characterized by Y.G.L.[8] — it is an individual offering, brought on its own account, and requires frankincense — from another which is also characterized by Y.G.L., but we may not infer a meal-offering which is Y.G.L. from another which is not Y.G.L.! R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka [therefore] said, It is written, Of fine flour for a meal-offering daily;[9] it is to be similar to the meal-offering which accompanies the Daily Offering; as that meal-offering has three logs of oil to the tenth, this too must have three logs to the tenth. R. Simeon says, Here much oil is required and there also in connection with the meal-offering accompanying the lambs [of the Daily Offering] much oil is required; as there it has three logs to the tenth so here too it must have three logs to the tenth. Or perhaps I should argue thus: here much oil is required, and there also in connection with the meal-offering accompanying the offering of bullocks and rams much oil is required,[10] as there it has two logs [of oil] to the tenth so here too it must have two logs to the tenth! Let us then see to which [of the two] is this case most similar. We may infer a meal-offering consisting of one tenth from another meal-offering also consisting of one tenth,[11] but we may not infer a meal-offering consisting of one tenth from a meal-offering consisting of two or three tenths.

Is not the above passage self-contradictory? It states at first, ‘"With oil" signifies that it must have much oil’, and then it states, ‘Here it is written, ‘"oil", and there in connection with the freewill meal-offering it is also written, "oil"’![12] — Abaye answered,[13] The Tanna of the clause, ‘"With oil" signifies that it must have much oil’, is R. Simeon, whilst he that argues otherwise by inference [from the freewill meal-offering] is R. Ishmael. R. Huna the son of R. Joshua said, The whole [of the anonymous part of the Baraitha] is by R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka, and he argues thus: ‘With oil’ signifies that it must have much oil, for to establish merely that it requires oil no verse would be necessary, since the expression ‘on a griddle’ indicates that it shall be like any meal-offering prepared on a griddle. But perhaps it is not so, but that [‘with oil’] signifies merely that it requires oil, for had not Holy Writ stated ‘with oil’ I might have said that it shall be like the sinner's meal-offering![14] And then he said, Be it even so, that it signifies merely that it requires oil, but surely it can be argued by an inference[15] [that three logs are required]. He then argued by the inference[15] but could not prove his case;[16] whereupon he had to resort to the verse, ‘Of fine flour for a meal-offering daily’, as is expressly stated by R. Ishmael in his concluding remarks. Rabbah said, The whole [of the anonymous part of the Baraitha] is by R. Simeon and he argues thus: ‘With oil’ signifies that it must have much oil, for to establish merely that it requires oil no verse would be necessary since the expression ‘on a griddle’ indicates that it shall be like any meal-offering prepared on a griddle. But even without the expression ‘with oil’ I can arrive at the same conclusion by means of an inference. He thereupon argued by the inference but could not prove his case, so that he had to resort to the expression ‘with oil’. He then said, Let it be similar to the meal-offering accompanying the offering of bullocks or of rams;[17] but he rebutted this by saying, We may infer

---

(1) Which certainly overrides the Sabbath.

(2) For whatsoever has been hallowed in a vessel of ministry becomes invalid if kept overnight.

(3) Sc. the High Priest's meal-offering.

(4) So MS.M. and Rashi; in cur. edd. ‘the drink-offering’, which was also part of the Daily Offering.

(5) Ex. XXIX, 40. The quantity of oil prescribed is a ‘fourth part of a hin’, i.e., three logs.

(6) Lev. II, 1. The quantity of oil is fixed at one log, v. infra 88a.

(7) תבשט. These are the initial letters of the features characterizing the High Priest's meal-offering, viz., תדיר-ת a regular daily offering’, באה חובה-ב ‘is obligatory’, שבת-ש and טומאה-ט ‘it overrides the Sabbath and the law of uncleanness’. The meal-offering accompanying the Daily Offering is also characterized in this manner; these

features, however, are absent from the freewill meal-offering.

(8) יגל. So according to Sh. Mek.; cur. edd. יגיל. The High Priest's meal-offering can be characterized by the following features: יחיד-י 'an individual offering', גלל עצמה-ג 'brought on its own account' i.e., not accompanying another offering, and לבונה-ל 'requires frankincense'. These features are present in the freewill meal-offering but are absent from the meal-offering which accompanies the Daily Offering.

(9) Lev. VI, 13.

(10) Cf. Num. XV, 4ff. The meal-offering which accompanied the offering of a ram consisted of two tenths of fine flour mingled with the third part of a hin (i.e., four logs) of oil, and that which accompanied the offering of a bullock of three tenths of flour mingled with half a hin (i.e., six logs) of oil.

(11) The meal-offering which accompanied the Daily Offering consisted of one tenth of fine flour which is not the case with the bullocks and rams; v. prec. n.

(12) The purpose of the inference, namely to establish that not more than the normal quantity of oil (i.e., a log) is required, is contradicted by the verse which indicates the requirement of much oil, i.e., more than the usual quantity.

(13) From here to the end of the passage until the next Mishnah the text is in a doubtful state and the MSS. vary considerably from the present text. V. Sh. Mek. where the text is extensively altered. The above translation is based entirely upon the text as in cur. edd. For the variants v. D.S. a.l.

(14) Which had no oil at all; cf. Lev. V, 11.

(15) From the meal-offering which accompanied the Daily Offering.

(16) By reason of the counter argument, namely, let the inference be drawn from the freewill meal-offering.

(17) I.e., granted that it must have more oil than the ordinary meal-offering, it might nevertheless be compared with the meal-offering which accompanied bullocks or rams where only two logs to the tenth are required.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 51b

a meal-offering consisting of one tenth etc.

MISHNAH. IF THEY DID NOT APPOINT ANOTHER PRIEST IN HIS STEAD, AT WHOSE EXPENSE WAS IT[1] OFFERED? R. SIMEON SAYS, AT THE EXPENSE OF THE COMMUNITY; BUT R. JUDAH SAYS, AT THE EXPENSE OF THE HEIRS; MOREOVER A WHOLE [TENTH] WAS OFFERED.[2]

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: If the High Priest died and they had not appointed another in his stead, whence do we know that his meal-offering must be offered at the expense of his heirs? Because it is written, And the anointed priest that shall be in his stead from among his sons shall offer it.[3] I might think that they offer it a half-[tenth] at a time,[4] Scripture therefore stated 'it', implying the whole [tenth] but not half of it. So R. Judah. R. Simeon says, It is a statute for ever,[3] this implies that it is offered at the expense of the community.[5] It shall be wholly burnt,[3] that is, the whole of it shall be burnt.[6]

Does then the verse, 'And the anointed priest etc.' serve the above purpose? Surely it is required for the teaching of the following Baraitha: It is written, This is the offering of Aaron and of his sons, which they shall offer unto the Lord in the day when he is anointed.[7] Now I might think that Aaron and his sons shall together offer one offering,[8] the text therefore states, 'Which they shall offer unto the Lord', Aaron shall offer his separately and his sons theirs separately.[9] [The expression] 'his sons' refers to the ordinary priests.[10] You say 'the ordinary priests': but perhaps it refers only to the High Priests?[11] When it says, 'And the anointed priest that shall be in his stead from among his sons', it has already spoken of the High Priest; how then must I interpret 'his sons'? It must refer to the ordinary priests! — If so,[12] the verse should read, 'And [if] the anointed priest [died], his sons in his stead shall offer'; why does the verse read 'from among his sons'? You may thus infer both teachings.[13]

For what purpose does R. Simeon utilize the expression 'it'?-He requires it for the following

teaching: If the High Priest died[14] and they appointed another in his stead, [the successor] may not bring a half-tenth from his house neither [may he use] the remaining half-tenth of the first [High Priest].[15] But was not this rule derived from the expression 'And half thereof'?[16] He bases no exposition upon the letter waw ['and'].

And for what purpose does R. Judah utilize the expression a statute for ever'? — It means, a statute binding for all time. And what is the purpose of the expression, 'It shall be wholly burnt'? — He requires it for the following which was taught: I only know that the former,[17] namely the High Priest's meal-offering, must be wholly burnt, and that the latter, namely the ordinary priest's meal-offering, must not be eaten; but whence do I know that what is said of the former applies also to the latter and what is said of the latter applies also to the former? The text therefore stated 'wholly' in each case for the purposes of analogy; thus, it is written here 'wholly' and it is written there 'wholly',[18] as the former must be wholly burnt so the latter must be wholly burnt, and as in the latter case there is a prohibition against eating it, so in the former case there is a prohibition against eating it.

Is then R. Simeon of the opinion that by the law of the Torah it[19] must be offered at the expense of the community? Surely we have learnt:[20] The Beth din ordained seven things and this was one of them.[21] [They also ordained that] if a gentile sent his burnt- offering from a land beyond the sea and also sent with it the drink-offerings,[22] they [the drink-offerings] are to be offered of his own means; but if he did not [send the drink-offerings], they are to be offered at the expense of the community. Similarly, if a proselyte died and left animal-offerings, if he also left the drink-offerings,[22] they are offered of his own means; but if he did not [send the drink-offerings], they are to be offered at the expense of the community.[23] It was also a condition laid down by the Beth din that if the High Priest died and they had not appointed another in his stead, his meal-offering shall be offered at the expense of the community![24] — R. Abbahu explained, There were two ordinances. By the law of the Torah it should be offered at the expense of the community; but when they[25] saw that the funds in the Chamber were being depleted[26] they ordained that it should be a charge upon the heirs. When they saw, however, that [the heirs] were neglectful about it, they reverted to the law of the Torah.

'And concerning the Red Cow [they ordained] that the law of sacrilege does not apply to its ashes'.[27] Is not this the law of the Torah? For it was taught: It is a sin-offering:[28] this teaches that it is subject to the law of sacrilege; and 'it' implies that only it [the cow] is subject to the law of sacrilege

---

(1) This daily meal-offering of the High Priest, during the interregnum.

(2) In the morning and also in the evening. This is the opinion of R. Simeon too, v. infra n. 7.

(3) Lev VI, 15.

(4) As their father the High Priest had done during his lifetime.

(5) The Heb. עולם 'for ever' is interpreted in the later Heb. sense of 'world', 'people', 'the whole community'.

(6) None of it shall be left over to be eaten. Or better: a whole tenth shall be offered both morning and evening, thus agreeing with R. Judah's view in the Mishnah, v. supra n. 3.

(7) Lev. VI, 13.

(8) At their ordination.

(9) The sons offer their meal-offering at their ordination only, this is known as מנחת חינוך 'the meal-offering of initiation'; whereas the High Priest must offer his daily, from the day that he is anointed and onwards.

(10) I.e., every priest at the commencement of his ministry must offer a meal-offering of initiation.

(11) I.e., the descendants of Aaron, those anointed High Priest.

(12) That the verse in question (And the anointed priest etc.) only serves to teach that the heirs of the High Priest must continue at their expense their father's daily meal-offering until the appointment of a successor.

(13) The rule given in the prec. note and also the rule that ordinary priests at their ordination shall offer a meal-offering.

(14) After he had offered the half-tenth for the morning meal-offering.

(15) But must bring a whole tenth from his house; this being derived from the term 'it'.
(16) V. supra p. 304, n. 2, where this rule is derived from the letter wow which stands at the head of the phrase ומחציתה בערב.
(17) Cf. Lev. VI, 15.
(18) Cf. ibid. 16. In this verse as also in the preceding verse the expression כליל 'wholly' is used.
(19) Sc. the meal-offering of the High Priest.
(20) Shek. VII, 6.
(21) The law stated in the earlier Mishnah Shek. VII, 5.
(22) I.e., the money for the drink-offerings.
(23) Since a proselyte has no heirs.
(24) Evidently it was only an ordinance of the Beth din and not the law of the Torah.
(25) The Beth din.
(26) By reason of the frequent changes in the office of the High Priest, v. Yoma 9a.
(27) This too is one of the seven things ordained by the Beth din. Shek. VII, 7. For the law of sacrilege. i.e., the unintentional appropriation of the property of the Sanctuary, v. Lev. V, 15.
(28) Num. XIX, 9.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 52a

but its ashes are not subject to the law of sacrilege! — Said R. Ashi: There were two ordinances. By the law of the Torah only it [the cow] is subject to the law of sacrilege but not its ashes; but when they saw that people treated [the ashes] lightly and applied them to wounds, they ordained they should be subject to the law of sacrilege. When they saw, however, that people in doubtful cases of uncleanness would avoid the sprinkling,[1] they reverted to the law of the Torah.

Our Rabbis taught: The [money for the] bullock offered when the whole community sinned in error or for the he-goats offered on account of the sin of idolatry must be collected for the purpose.[2] So R. Judah. R. Simeon says, It must be taken from the funds[3] of the [Shekel] Chamber. But the reverse has been taught![4] Which of these was taught last?[5] Now the scholars argued before R. Ashi: Surely the former version was taught last for we already know that R. Simeon is concerned about possible neglect.[6] Whereupon R. Ashi said to them, You may even say that the latter version was taught last, because R. Simeon is concerned about possible neglect only in that case where they themselves receive no atonement by it, but where they themselves receive atonement thereby R. Simeon is not apprehensive about neglect.[7]

What is the decision? — Rabbah the Younger said to R. Ashi, Come and hear [the following teaching]: The verse, My food which is presented unto Me for offerings made by fire, of a sweet savour unto Me, shall ye observe to offer unto Me in its due season,[8] includes the bullock offered when the whole community sinned in error and the he-goats offered on account of the sin of idolatry, that these too are offered from the funds of the [Shekel] Chamber;[9] so R. Simeon.[10]

MOREOVER A WHOLE [TENTH] WAS OFFERED. R. Hiyya b. Abba said that R. Johanan had raised the question: Does it mean a whole tenth in the morning and a whole tenth in the evening, or a whole tenth in the morning and in the evening it was dispensed with? — Come and hear, said Raba, for we have learnt: The eighth bore the [High Priest's] meal-offering.[11] Now if it were so, that it was dispensed with in the evening, then it would sometimes happen that the eighth did not bear the [High Priest's] meal-offering, for example, at the time when the High Priest died and they did not appoint another in his stead. When the scholars repeated this in the presence of R. Jeremiah he exclaimed, These foolish Babylonians! because they dwell in a dark country they must say dark sayings![12] That Mishnah also states: The seventh bore the fine flour;[13] the ninth bore the wine.[12] Now were these never omitted? Surely it has been taught: Their meal-offering and their drink-offerings,[14] even at night; their meal-offering and their drink-offerings,[14] even on the following day.[15] We must say that

the Tanna of that Mishnah is not concerned with the exception,[16] so here too he is not concerned with the exception.[17] When this was reported back again to Raba he remarked, They always report to them[18] any indiscreet saying of ours, our wise sayings they never report to them. Later Raba said, This too is one of our wise sayings, for the verse says, Of fine flour for a meal-offering daily,[19] it is like the meal-offering which accompanies the Daily Offering.[20]

What is the decision then?[21] R. Nahman b. Isaac said, Come and hear; for it was taught: A whole tenth was offered in the morning and a whole tenth in the evening.

R. Johanan said, There is a difference of opinion between Abba Jose b. Dosethai and the Rabbis. Abba Jose b. Dosethai says, He[22] must set aside for [his meal-offering] two handfuls of frankincense, one handful to be offered in the morning and the other in the evening. But the Rabbis say, He must set aside for it one handful, half to be offered in the morning and the other half in the evening. On what principle do they differ? — Abba Jose b. Dosethai maintains that we know of no case when half a handful was offered; but the Rabbis maintain that we know of no case when a tenth required two handfuls.[23]

R. Johanan raised the following question: If the High Priest died and they had not appointed another in his stead,

---

(1) For fear that they might be making unnecessary use of the ashes and would be liable to bring a guilt-offering for their sacrilege.

(2) Lit., 'in the beginning they collect them'. I.e., when the occasion arises it must be collected from the members of the community.

(3) I.e., from the funds of the community accumulated in the Temple treasury.

(4) In Hor. 3b, where R. Simeon's opinion here is ascribed to R. Judah, and vice versa.

(5) The later version of a statement is regarded as the more reliable since the author may have reconsidered and changed his view. Moreover it is necessary to arrive at the correct version in order to establish the halachah which would follow R. Judah's view.

(6) V. Mishnah supra where R. Simeon maintains that the High Priest's meal-offering is offered out of the funds of the community and not left to be offered by the heirs at their expense for fear of neglect. Accordingly here the more reliable view of R. Simeon would be that these offerings are also taken out of the funds of the community, which view agrees with the former version.

(7) The heirs of the High Priest in as much as they receive no atonement from the meal-offering might conceivably be neglectful about it, but there is no such fear of neglect by the members of the community where the offering is to effect atonement on their behalf.

(8) Num. XXVIII, 2.

(9) This is derived from the use of the plural 'for offerings' which includes other offerings to be offered like the Daily Offering from the funds of the Temple Treasury.

(10) This view of R. Simeon, derived from the verse, is undoubtedly the correct one and, as it corresponds with the former version, that version must have been taught last.

(11) Tamid 31b, where it is stated that thirteen priests were engaged in the sacrifice of the Daily Offering and all that accompanied it in the morning, and likewise in the evening.

(12) V. Pes., Sonc. ed., P 158, n. 1.

(13) The fine flour for the meal-offering and the wine for the drink-offering which accompanied the Daily Offering.

(14) Num. XXIX, 18.

(15) V. supra 44b. It can thus happen that the meal-offering and the drink-offerings were, for some reason, not offered during the day, in which case the seventh and ninth priest would not be required. And yet these are included in the list.

(16) Lit., 'if', i.e., with the exceptional case when part of the service was omitted. The Tanna merely states the number of priests engaged in the service and the function of each when in normal circumstances everything was in accordance with the manner prescribed.

(17) Although in fact the High Priest's meal-offering might very well be dispensed with in the evening in the

circumstances of our Mishnah.

(18) To the Palestinian Rabbis.

(19) Lev. VI, 13.

(20) Which under no circumstances may be dispensed with; so it is, too, with the High Priest's meal-offering.

(21) Whose opinion is to prevail? Raba's or R. Jeremiah's?

(22) The High Priest in bringing daily for his meal-offering a tenth of fine flour which he divided and offered half in the morning and half in the evening.

(23) With the one meal-offering, notwithstanding the handfuls are offered one at a time.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 52b

must the quantity of frankincense, according to the view of the Rabbis,[1] be doubled or not? Should we say that since the quantity of flour has been doubled[2] the quantity of frankincense must also be doubled, or perhaps this is so only where it has been expressly stated[3] and not where it has not been expressly stated? And this question is also to be asked with regard to the quantity of oil,[4] both according to the view of the Rabbis and of Abba Jose b. Dosethai.

Come and hear: for we have learnt: The handful is specified in five cases.[5] Now if that were so,[6] there would sometimes be seven![7] — The Tanna is not concerned with the exception.[8]

R. Papa was sitting and reciting the above when R. Joseph b. Shemaiah said to him, 'Is not the case of a man offering the handful outside the Sanctuary an exceptional case',[9] and yet he reckoned it?

What is the decision then? — R. Nahman b. Isaac said, Come and hear: For it has been taught: If the High Priest died and they did not appoint another in his stead a whole tenth must be offered in the morning and a whole tenth in the evening. Two handfuls [of frankincense] must be set aside, one to be offered in the morning and one in the evening; and three logs of oil must be set aside, one log and a half to be offered in the morning and one log and a half in the evening. Now who is the author of this Baraitha? If you say it is the Rabbis, then it will be asked, Why is it that the quantity of frankincense is doubled and the quantity of oil is not? It must therefore be Abba Jose b. Dosethai who maintains that at all times the High Priest's meal-offering requires two handfuls of frankincense, so that neither the quantity of frankincense nor the quantity of oil has been doubled. And since according to Abba Jose b. Dosethai the quantity of oil is not doubled,[10] likewise according to the Rabbis the quantities of frankincense and of oil are not doubled.[11]

R. Johanan said, The halachah follows Abba Jose b. Dosethai.[12] But could R. Johanan have said so? Did not R. Johanan say that the halachah always follows the anonymous opinion of a Mishnah, and we have learnt: 'The handful is specified in five cases'?[13] — Different Amoraim report R. Johanan's opinion differently.[14]

CHAPTER V

MISHNAH. ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS MUST BE OFFERED UNLEAVENED, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE LEAVENED CAKES OF THE THANK-OFFERING[15] AND THE TWO LOAVES [OF PENTECOST].[16] WHICH ARE OFFERED LEAVENED. R. MEIR SAYS, THE LEAVEN MUST BE TAKEN FROM [THE MEAL-OFFERINGS] THEMSELVES AND WITH THIS THEY ARE LEAVENED.[17] R. JUDAH SAYS, THAT IS NOT THE BEST WAY,[18] BUT [FIRST OF ALL] LEAVEN MUST BE BROUGHT AND PUT INTO THE MEASURING VESSEL AND THEN THE MEASURING VESSEL IS FILLED UP [WITH FLOUR]. BUT THEY SAID TO HIM, EVEN SO [IT IS NOT SATISFACTORY]; FOR IT WOULD BE SOMETIMES TOO LITTLE AND SOMETIMES TOO MUCH.[19]

GEMARA. R. Perida enquired of R. Ammi, Whence is it derived that all meal-offerings must be offered unleavened? — 'Whence?' you ask, [R. Ammi replied] but surely where this[20] is expressly stated[21] it is expressly stated, and where it is not expressly stated there is the general statement,

---

(1) According to Abba Jose there is no doubt at all, for one never offers two handfuls at one time with one meal-offering.
(2) For a whole tenth of fine flour must be brought both in the morning and in the evening. Likewise a whole handful of frankincense must be brought morning and evening.
(3) In connection with the flour, v. supra 51b.
(4) The High Priest used to bring from his own house daily a tenth of fine flour and three logs of oil, which he divided and offered, half (i.e., a half-tenth of flour and one log and a half of oil) in the morning and half in the evening. During an interregnum, however, since the quantity of flour is doubled it might well be that the oil must also be doubled.
(5) V. infra 106b. The handful of frankincense which accompanied the High Priest's meal-offering is not included in that list since it was offered a half-handful at a time.
(6) That even the Rabbis hold that during an interregnum a whole handful was to be offered morning as well as evening.
(7) For although the two handfuls belong to the one offering, they should nevertheless be reckoned as two in the list; cf. the two handfuls of frankincense offered with the Shewbread which are reckoned as two in the list.
(8) I.e., with the case when the High Priest died. The Tanna merely listed five normal cases that happen daily or regularly.
(9) Likewise he should reckon the handful of frankincense offered morning and evening during an interregnum.
(10) The reason being no doubt that only that is doubled which is expressly so indicated in the Torah.
(11) For the same reason as given by Abba Jose, v. prec. note; thus solving the problem raised by R. Johanan.
(12) That the High Priest must offer with his meal-offering one handful of frankincense in the morning and another in the evening.
(13) V. p. 315, n. 6. But according to Abba Jose the number should be seven so as to include the two handfuls of the High Priest's meal-offering.
(14) Obviously R. Johanan could not have made both statements; some scholars report that he made only the former statement, namely, that the halachah follows Abba Jose, others that he made only the latter statement, that the halachah follows the anonymous Mishnah.
(15) The thank-offering was accompanied by an offering of forty cakes, thirty being unleavened and ten leavened, cf. Lev. VII, 12,13.
(16) V. ibid. XXIII, 17.
(17) I.e. a little flour is taken from the meal-offering, is mixed with water and is allowed to stand for some time until it becomes leavened, and this serves as yeast for leavening the rest of the meal-offering.
(18) For the yeast is too fresh and not sufficiently potent to leaven well the rest of the meal-offering.
(19) For if the yeast used was hard and compressed and of small bulk, there would be more than the usual quantity of flour in this meal-offering, and if, on the other hand, the yeast was of a thin consistency, taking up much space in the vessel, there would be less than the usual quantity of flour, and in either case the meal-offering would be invalid.
(20) That the meal-offering shall be unleavened.
(21) Cf. ibid. II, 4 and 5.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 53a

And this is the law of the meal-offering: the sons of Aaron shall offer it before the Lord in front of the altar . . . And that which is left thereof shall Aaron and his sons eat; it shall be eaten as unleavened bread![1] — He [R. Perida] said to him, As to the proper performance of the precept I have no doubt at all, I ask only whether it is indispensable.[2] But, said the other, even with regard to the question of indispensability there is written, It shall not be baked leavened,[3] but only unleavened.[4]

R. Hisda demurred, perhaps it means, 'It shall not be baked leavened', but only si'ur![5] — What si'ur is meant? If as defined by R. Meir, it is absolutely unleavened according to R. Judah. If as defined by R. Judah, it is absolutely leavened according to R. Meir. If as defined by R. Meir and

following R. Meir's ruling. It is absolutely leavened, since one incurs stripes for [eating] it [on the Passover]! — What is meant is that [si'ur] as defined by R. Judah and following R. Judah's ruling.[6]

R. Nahman b. Isaac demurred, Perhaps it means, 'It shall not be baked leavened', but only halut![7] -What does halut mean? Soaked [in hot water]. But surely if [the meal-offering] must be offered soaked, it is expressly stated so,[8] and this[9] is not prescribed to be soaked! — Perhaps the meaning is: whatsoever is prescribed to be soaked must be offered soaked, but whatsoever is not prescribed to be soaked may be offered either soaked or unleavened!

Rabina demurred, Perhaps the verse, 'It shall not be baked leavened', merely imposes a prohibition upon the person, but [the meal-offering] does not become invalid thereby? Whence then is it derived?[10] — From the following teaching: One might think that 'unleavened'[11] was only a recommendation, Holy Writ therefore stated, It shall be;[11] the verse thus laid it down as an obligation.

R. Perida enquired of R. Ammi, Whence is it derived that all meal-offerings, seeing that they were kneaded in lukewarm water,[12] must be specially watched lest they become leavened?[13] Shall we infer it from the Passover concerning which it Is written, And ye shall watch the unleavened bread![14] — He replied. In that very passage[15] It is written, it shall be unleavened,[11] that is, keep it so.[16] But have you not utilized this verse to indicate indispensability? — If for that alone Scripture would have used the expression 'It is to be unleavened'; why 'It shall be'? You may thus infer two things.

The Rabbis said to R. Perida, 'R. Ezra, the grandson of R. Abtolos, who is the tenth generation from R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah, who is the tenth generation from Ezra, is standing at the door' — Said he to them, 'Why all this [pedigree]? If he is a learned man, it is well; if he is a learned man and also a scion of noble ancestors, it is all the better; but if he is a scion of noble ancestors and not a learned man may fire consume him'. They told him that he was a learned man, whereupon he said, 'Let him come in'. He at once saw that his [R. Ezra's] mind was troubled, so he began his discourse and said, I said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord; my gratefulness is not with thee.[17] The congregation of Israel said to the Holy One, blessed be He, 'Lord of the universe, Show Thy gratefulness unto me for making Thee known in the world'. He replied. 'My gratefulness is not with thee, but with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who first made Me known in the world, as it is said, With the holy that are in the earth; they are the mighty ones in whom is all my delight.'[18] As soon as he [R. Ezra] heard the expression mighty',[19] he began his discourse, saying, Let the Mighty One come and take vengeance for the sake of the mighty from the mighty by means of the mighty. 'Let the Mighty One come' — that is, the Holy One, blessed be He, as it is written, The Lord on high is mighty.[20] 'And take vengeance for the sake of the mighty' — that is, Israel, as it is written, They are the mighty ones in whom is all my delight. 'From the mighty' — that is, the Egyptians, as it is written, The mighty sank like lead in the waters.[21] 'By means of the mighty' — that is, the water, as it is written, Above the voices of many waters, mighty waters, breakers of the sea.[20] Let the beloved[22] the son of the beloved come and build the beloved for the Beloved in the portion of the beloved that the beloved may receive atonement therein. 'Let the beloved come' — that is King Solomon, as it is written, And He sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet, and he called his name Jedidiah [beloved of the Lord], for the Lord's sake.[23]

---

(1) Lev. VI, 7, 9.

(2) That the meal-offering must be unleavened, and otherwise it would be invalid.

(3) Ibid. 10.

(4) R. Perida's question is therefore superfluous.

(5) שיאור 'dough in the early stage of fermentation'. There is, however, a difference of opinion as to what stage is meant. According to R. Meir it is that stage when the surface of the dough has become pale; after that it is regarded as absolutely leavened. According to R. Judah it is the advanced stage when the surface of the dough has become wrinkled;

before that it is regarded as unleavened. V. Pes. 48b.
(6) According to R. Judah he who eats si'ur (as defined by him) is not liable to any punishment. Consequently it could be said that the meal-offering may be si'ur and not necessarily absolutely unleavened, hence R. Perida's question.
(7) חלוט 'soaked or saturated with hot water'. The suggestion is that the meal-offering may be leavened provided it is not baked but only scalded in water.
(8) As in the case of the High Priest's meal-offering which is expressly prescribed to be soaked; cf. ibid. 14.
(9) Sc. the ordinary meal-offering. The verse therefore can only imply that a meal-offering must be unleavened.
(10) That meal-offerings must be unleavened or else they are invalid.
(11) Lev. II, 5.
(12) Infra 55a.
(13) They must be continually kneaded till the time of baking (Rashi).
(14) Ex. XII, 17; so according to Rabbinic interpretation. E.VV.: And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread.
(15) In connection with the meal-offering itself.
(16) I.e., guard it against its becoming leavened; v. Pes. 48b.
(17) Ps., XVI, 2.
(18) Ps. XVI, 3.
(19) Heb. אדיר, which word is used in all the following verses quoted.
(20) Ibid. XCIII, 4.
(21) Ex. XV, 10.
(22) Heb. ידיד, which word is used in all the verses quoted.
(23) II Sam. XII, 25.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 53b

'The son of the beloved' — that is, the son of Abraham, as it is written, What hath My beloved to do in My house?[1] 'And build the beloved' — that is, the Temple, as it is written, How lovely are Thy tabernacles![2] 'For the Beloved' — that is, the Holy One, blessed be He, as it is written, Let me sing of my Beloved.[3] 'In the portion of the beloved' — that is, Benjamin, as it is said, Of Benjamin he said, The beloved of the Lord shall dwell in safety by Him.[4] 'That the beloved may receive atonement therein' — that is, Israel, as it is written, I have given the dearly beloved of My soul into the hand of her enemies.[5] Let the good come and receive the good from the Good for the good. 'Let the good come' — that is, Moses, as it is written, And she saw that he was good.[6] 'And receive the good' — that is, the Torah, as it is written, For I give you good doctrine.[7] 'From the Good' — that is, the Holy One, blessed be He, as it is written, The Lord is good to all.[8] 'For the good' — that is, Israel, as it is written, Do good, O Lord, unto the good.[9] Let this come and receive this from This for this people. 'Let this come' — that is, Moses, as it is written, For as for this Moses, the man.[10] 'And receive this' — that is, the Torah, as it is written, And this is the Torah which Moses set.[11] 'From This' — that is, the Holy One, blessed be He, as it is written, This is my God and I will glorify Him.[12] 'For this people' — that is, Israel, as it is written, This people that Thou hast gotten.[13]

R. Isaac said, At the time of the destruction of the Temple the Holy One, blessed be He, found Abraham standing in the Temple. Said He, 'What hath My beloved to do in My house?'[14] Abraham replied, 'I have come concerning the fate of my children' . . . Said He, 'Thy children sinned and have gone into exile'. 'Perhaps', said Abraham, 'they only sinned in error?' And He answered, 'She hath wrought lewdness'.[15] 'Perhaps only a few sinned?' 'With many',[15] came the reply. 'Still', he pleaded, 'Thou shouldst have remembered unto them the covenant of circumcision'. And He replied, 'The hallowed flesh is passed from thee.'[16] 'Perhaps hadst Thou waited for them they would have repented', he pleaded. And He replied, 'When thou doest evil, then thou rejoicest!'[14] Thereupon he put his hands on his head and wept bitterly, and cried, 'Perhaps, Heaven forfend, there is no hope for them'. Then came forth a Heavenly Voice and said, The Lord called thy name a leafy olive-tree, fair with goodly fruit:[17] as the olive-tree produces its best only at the very end,[18] so Israel will flourish at the end of time.

Because of the noise of the great tumult He hath kindled fire upon it, and its branches are broken.[17] Said R. Hinena b. Papa, Because of the noise of the words of the spies the branches[19] of Israel were broken; for R. Hinena b. Papa said, A grievous statement did the spies make at that moment when they said, For they ore stronger than we.[20] Read not 'than we', but 'than He';[21] as it were, even the Master of the House cannot remove His furniture from there.[22]

R. Hiyya b. Hinena demurred, Then why does the verse read 'Because of the noise of the great tumult'? It should read, 'Because of the noise of the great word'.[23] Rather [it must be interpreted thus]: The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Abraham, 'I heard thy voice and will have compassion upon them.[24] I had said that they shall be subjected to four successive Empires,[25] each to endure the length of time that the four Empires together [actually lasted], but now each shall endure only the time alotted to it'. Another version: 'I had said [that they shall be subjected to the four Empires] in succession, but now [they shall be subjected to the four] concurrently'.[26]

R. Joshua b. Levi said, Why is Israel likened to an olive-tree? To tell you that as the olive-tree loses not its leaves either in summer or in winter, so Israel shall never be lost either in this world or in the world to come. R. Johanan said, Why is Israel likened to an olive-tree? To tell you that just as the olive produces its oil only after pounding, so Israel returns to the right way only after suffering.

R. MEIR SAYS, THE LEAVEN MUST BE TAKEN FROM [THE MEAL-OFFERINGS] THEMSELVES AND WITH THIS THEY ARE LEAVENED etc. What is meant by SOMETIMES TOO LITTLE AND SOMETIMES TOO MUCH? — R. Hisda explained, If the yeast [used] was of a thick consistency, then there would be too much [flour in the meal-offering], and if it was thin, there would be too little.[27] But in any event only a tenth is measured![28] — Rabbah and R. Joseph both said that we must measure it according to its former state.[29] But one can surely take a little of the flour[30] and have it leavened outside, and then it can be brought back and kneaded with the rest [of the flour]! — It is to be feared that one might bring leaven from elsewhere.[31]

Our Rabbis taught: One may not leaven [the meal-offering][32]

---

(1) Jer. XI, 15. Beloved here refers to Abraham, v. infra.

(2) Ps. LXXXIV, 2.

(3) Isa. V, 1.

(4) Deut. XXXIII, 12. The Temple was built in the territory of Benjamin.

(5) Jer. XII, 7.

(6) Ex. II, 2.

(7) Prov. IV, 2.

(8) Ps. CXLV, 9.

(9) Ibid. CXXV, 4.

(10) Ex. XXXII, 1.

(11) Deut. IV, 44.

(12) Ex. XV, 2.

(13) Ibid. 16.

(14) Jer. XI, 15.

(15) Ibid. The word המזמתה implies premeditated wickedness; cf. Ps. CXXXIX, 20.

(16) Jer. ibid. They attempted to disguise their circumcision.

(17) Ibid. 16.

(18) It is only after many years that the olive-tree bears fruit.

(19) I.e., the strength and glory of Israel.

(20) Num. XIII, 31.

(21) ממנו 'than He' instead of ממנו 'than we', a difference of pronunciation in the Oriental or Babylonian Massorah

in order to distinguish between the third person masc. sing. and the first person plur.; v. Sot., Sonc. ed., p. 172, n. 1.
(22) Even God is powerless against them.
(23) I.e., מלה 'word' instead of המולה 'tumult'.
(24) Interpreting המולה as חמלה 'compassion'.
(25) The Babylonian, Persian, Grecian and Roman Empires.
(26) Some under one Empire and others under another.
(27) V. supra p. 317, n. 5.
(28) For when the measure is filled up with flour there is already yeast in the vessel; it is therefore immaterial how much is taken up by the yeast, so long as the measure is full.
(29) I.e., when it was flour. In measuring we must have regard to the amount of flour used in the yeast. From this standpoint there would be either too much or too little flour according to the consistency of the leaven.
(30) After a full tenth has been measured for the meal-offering.
(31) And not take it from the flour of the meal-offering, so that an onlooker might be led to believe that one may add to the meal-offering.
(32) I.e., the two loaves of Pentecost and the ten loaves of the Thank-offering, which must be leavened.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 54a

with apples. In the name of R. Hanina b. Gamaliel they said, One may do so. R. Kahana reports this in the name of R. Hanina b. Teradion. With whom will the following agree? For we have learnt:[1] If an apple [of terumah] was chopped up and put into dough so that it leavened it, the dough is forbidden.[2] Now with whom does this agree? Shall we say with R. Hanina b. Gamaliel and not with the Rabbis?[3] — You may even say that this agrees with the Rabbis too, for although it is not the finest leaven it is, however, an inferior leaven.[4]

R. Ela said, From no meal-offering is it more difficult to take out the handful than from the sinner's meal-offering.[5] R. Isaac b. Abdimi said, The sinner's meal-offering may be mixed with water[6] and it is valid. Shall we say that they differ in this: one[7] holds that we must measure [the handful] according to its present state,[8] and the other[9] holds that we must measure it according to its former state?[10] — No, both agree that we must measure it according to its present state, but they differ in this: one' holds that dry[11] means, dry without oil, and the other[9] holds that dry means, dry without any kind [of liquid].

We have learnt there:[12] Calf's flesh[13] that had swelled[14] and the flesh[15] of an old beast that had shrivelled,[16] must be measured[17] according to their present state. Rab, R. Hiyya and R. Johanan read: 'according to their present state'; whereas Samuel, R. Simeon b. Rabbi and Resh Lakish read: 'according to their former state'.

An objection was raised: If a piece of calf's flesh which was not of the prescribed size[15] swelled so that it is now of the prescribed size until now it has been clean but from now onwards it is unclean![18] — It is only so Rabbinically. If so, consider the next clause: And so it is, too, with regard to the flesh of an offering that was piggul or nothur.[19] Now if you hold that this rule[20] is Scriptural then it can well apply to piggul and to nothar; but if you hold that it is only Rabbinical, it will be asked: Is one liable [to kareth] for [eating] what is regarded as piggul or nothar Rabbinically?[21] — Render: And so it is, too, with regard to the uncleanness of what is piggul or nothar.[22] For I might have said that since the uncleanness attaching to what is piggul or nothar is only a Rabbinic ordinance, the Rabbis would certainly not apply this rule[23] to that which is only a Rabbinic ordinance; we are therefore taught [otherwise].

Come and hear: If the flesh of an old beast which was of the prescribed size had shrivelled up so that it is now less than the prescribed size, until now it could have been unclean but from now onwards it remains clean![24] — Rabbah explained the position thus: If a [forbidden] thing was of the

prescribed size but now it is not so, then it is not so;[25] and if at first it was not of the prescribed size and now it is, then it is so Rabbinically.[26]

---

(1) Ter. X, 2.

(2) To be eaten by any but a priest, since the dough which was hullin and not terumah was leavened by an apple which was of terumah.

(3) For the Rabbis, i.e., the first Tanna of the Baraitha, hold that apples cannot leaven.

(4) It is spoilt or hard leaven, and although it is not the best thing to use for leavening the meal-offering, it certainly has a leavening effect upon the substance into which it has been put.

(5) Since it was without oil, the taking of the handful was a difficult operation indeed, for when taking out the handful of dry flour and then smoothing away the flour that is bursting between the fingers, much skill would be required in preventing the flour from slipping out of the hand.

(6) So as to make the taking out of the handful easier. The Torah prohibited only the application of oil.

(7) R. Isaac.

(8) The handful is to be taken out after the flour has been mixed with water, when it is easy to do so.

(9) R. Ela.

(10) The measure is to be a handful of flour only, and therefore if taken out after the flour has been mixed with water, it would contain either too much or too little flour according to the consistency of the mixture.

(11) Lev. VII, 10.

(12) ‘Uk. II, 8.

(13) Less than an egg's bulk.

(14) To an egg's bulk.

(15) An egg's bulk.

(16) To less than an egg's bulk.

(17) With regard to the laws of uncleanness. Foodstuffs, if of an egg's bulk in quantity, can become unclean and can convey uncleanness.

(18) I.e., it can become unclean since it is now the size of an egg; contra Resh Lakish and the others.

(19) This means, presumably, that if a piece of flesh that was piggul or nothar, and which was less than an olive's bulk (which is the minimum in regard to forbidden food), had swelled to the size of an olive's bulk and one ate it, the penalty of kareth would thereby be incurred, for we estimate a thing according to its present size. For piggul and nothar v. Glos.

(20) That we must consider everything according to its present size.

(21) Surely there is no penalty incurred, since by the law of the Torah there was not the prescribed bulk.

(22) It is a Rabbinical ordinance that consecrated flesh that was rendered piggul or nothar is unclean and conveys uncleanness to the hands; v. Pes. 85a. We are now taught that if piggul or nothar less than an egg's bulk had swelled to the size of an egg, it will render the hands unclean.

(23) V. p. 324, n. 14.

(24) Thus contrary to Resh Lakish and the others who maintain that we must measure everything in the condition in which it was before.

(25) I.e., it is no longer a forbidden thing since it is not of the prescribed size. The term ‘forbidden’ is used here in an extended sense to include ‘defilement’.

(26) By Rabbinical ordinance it is regarded as a forbidden thing.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 54b

They differ only in the case where it was at first of the prescribed size but it shrivelled up and then it swelled up again. One is of the opinion that with forbidden things there can be an absolute rejection of the prohibition,[1] but the other maintains that there can be no such absolute rejection.[2]

Is there anyone who maintains that with forbidden things there can be an absolute rejection of the prohibition? But we have learnt:[3] If an egg's bulk of foodstuff was left in the sun and shrank, likewise if an olive's bulk of a corpse, an olive's bulk of nebelah,[4] a lentil's bulk of a [dead] reptile, an olive's bulk of [consecrated flesh that was] piggul[4] or nothar,[4] and an olive's bulk of forbidden fat

[shrank], they[5] are now clean, and one is not liable thereby[6] [to the penalties] for [eating] piggul or nothar or forbidden fat. If later they were left in the rain and swelled, they[5] become unclean and one is liable thereby[6] [to the penalties] for [eating] piggul or nothor or forbidden fat. This clearly refutes the view of him who says that with forbidden things there can be an absolute rejection of the prohibition! It is indeed a refutation.

Come and hear: One may give by number fresh figs [as tithe] in respect of pressed figs.[7] Now if you hold that we measure a thing in the condition in which it was before, it is well;[8] but if you hold that we measure in the condition in which it is now, then too much is given as tithe,[9] and it has been taught: If one gave too much tithe the produce is duly tithed but the tithe is unfit![10] — What then shall we say? That we measure in the condition in which it was before? But read the next clause: And [one may give] pressed figs by measure [as tithe] in respect of fresh figs.[11] Now if you hold that we measure In the condition in which it is now, then it is well;[12] but if you hold that we measure in the condition in which it was before, then too much is given as tithe?[13] — We are dealing here with the 'great terumah',[14] and the first clause as well as the second deals with the case of a man that is liberal.[15] If so, read the final clause: R. Eleazar son of R. Jose said, My father used to take ten pressed figs from the cake in respect of the ninety [fresh figs] in the basket. Now if we are dealing with the 'great terumah', why is 'ten' mentioned?[16] — We are really dealing here with the terumah of the tithe,[17] and it is in accordance with the teaching of Abba Eleazar b. Gomel. For it was taught: Abba Eleazar b. Gomel[18] says, It is written, And your heave-offering shall be reckoned unto you.[19] Scripture speaks of two heave-offerings,[20] one the 'great terumah' and the other the terumah from the tithe. Just as the 'great terumah' is set aside by estimate[21] and by intention,[22] so the terumah of the tithe is set aside by estimate

---

(1) Resh Lakish and his colleagues maintain that when the forbidden thing shrivelled up to less than the prescribed quantity the prohibition thereof vanished completely, and, by the law of the Torah, cannot return even though the substance later swelled up to the prescribed size.

(2) R. Johanan and his colleagues hold that the prohibition has only been suspended temporarily.

(3) Toh. III, 4.

(4) V. Glos.

(5) The first four cases mentioned which relate to uncleanness.

(6) If one ate this shrunken olive's bulk of piggul or nothar or of forbidden fat.

(7) Thus ten fresh figs may be given as tithe in respect of ninety pressed figs.

(8) Accordingly the pressed figs are considered in the condition in which they were before, namely fresh; and therefore ten fresh figs would be the exact quantity for the tithe, whether we reckon the tithe by number or by capacity.

(9) For reckoning by capacity ten fresh figs would probably take up as much as one fifth of the capacity of ninety pressed figs.

(10) For the tenth part only is the tithe, the excess being untithed produce (tebel), and as the two are inextricably mixed up the whole is forbidden, even to Levite or priest, until it has been made fit by the proper separation.

(11) Thus one kab of pressed figs may be given as tithe in respect of nine kabs of fresh figs.

(12) For reckoning by capacity or weight one measure of dried figs is given in respect of the remaining nine measures of fresh figs.

(13) For one kab of dried figs would very likely be as much as two kabs when fresh.

(14) The first levy of the produce of the field given to the priest. V. Glos.

(15) Lit. 'with a kindly eye'. A generous owner would give one-fortieth, one less generous one-fiftieth, and a mean person one-sixtieth of his produce as terumah. The clauses of the Baraitha apply to a generous owner, accordingly the objection that too much is given cannot stand.

(16) The use of the numbers ten and ninety suggests that the offering is the tithe and not the terumah.

(17) The heave-offering of one tenth given to the priest by the Levite form the tithe he receives. V. Num. XVIII, 25ff.

(18) Var. lec. 'Gimel', 'Gamala' (so Git. 30b), and 'Gamaliel' (Aruch).

(19) Num. XVIII, 27.

(20) For the verse continues, As though it (the terumah of the tithe) were the corn of the threshing-floor (the 'great

terumah'); thus the verse speaks of two terumoth.

(21) It was not necessary to measure out exactly the fiftieth part usually given for the terumah (Rashi). According to Tosaf. (s.v. ניטלת) it was not right to measure out the terumah but it should be given by estimate only.

(22) A man could mentally set aside one portion of a heap of produce as terumah and immediately eat of the rest.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 55a

and by intention; and just as the 'great terumah' should be given generously so the terumah of the tithe should be given generously.[1] But [there is yet a difficulty] from here, for R. Eleazar son of R. Jose said, My father used to take ten pressed figs from the cake in respect of the ninety [fresh figs] in the basket. Now if you hold that we measure in the condition in which it was before, it is well; but if you hold that we measure in the condition in which it is now, then too little is given [as tithe]![2] When R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he reported in the name of R. Eleazar that the case of the pressed figs is different since they can be boiled and so restored to their former condition.

Our Rabbis taught: One may give fresh figs[3] as terumah in respect of pressed figs in that place where it is the custom for figs to be pressed; but one may not give pressed figs as terumah in respect of fresh figs even in the place where it is the custom for figs to be pressed.

The Master stated: 'One may give fresh figs as terumah in respect of pressed figs in that place where it is the custom for figs to be pressed'. This is so, then, only where there is this custom, but not where there is no such custom. But what are the facts of the case? If there is a priest present, then why is this not allowed even where there is no such custom? Have we not learnt that wherever there is a priest present one must give the terumah from the choicest kind?[4] Obviously then there is no priest present.[5] Now read the next clause: 'But one may not give pressed figs as terumah in respect of fresh figs even in the place where it is the custom for figs to be pressed'. But if there is no priest present why is one not allowed to do so? Have we not learnt that where there is no priest one must give the terumah from that which is most durable?[6] Obviously then there is a priest present.[7] Must we then say that in the case of the first clause there is no priest present whilst in the case of the second clause there is a priest present? — Yes. In the case of the first clause there is no priest present but in the case of the second clause there is a priest present. Said R. Papa, You may infer from this that we endeavour to interpret [two clauses of] a passage by suggesting two sets of facts rather than suggest that they represent the views of two Tannaim.[8] MISHNAH. ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS MUST BE KNEADED WITH LUKEWARM WATER AND MUST BE WATCHED LEST THEY BECOME LEAVENED. IF ONE ALLOWED THE REMAINDER[9] TO BECOME LEAVENED ONE TRANSGRESSES A PROHIBITION, FOR IT IS WRITTEN, NO MEAL-OFFERING WHICH YE SHALL BRING UNTO THE LORD SHALL BE MADE LEAVENED.[10] ONE IS LIABLE FOR THE KNEADING AS WELL AS FOR THE SHAPING AND FOR THE BAKING.

GEMARA. Whence is this derived?[11] — Resh Lakish said, It is written, It shall not be baked leavened: their position,[12] that is, even their portion must not be baked leavened. And is this verse required for this purpose? But it is required for the following which was taught: Wherefore does the text say, It shall not

---

(1) I.e., even more than a tenth, accordingly the previous objection that too much is given cannot stand.

(2) For when reckoning by weight the quantity set aside, sc. ten pressed figs, would be much less than a tenth.

(3) By number.

(4) V. Ter. II, 4. Accordingly the best (i.e., fresh figs) must be given to the priest, irrespective of custom.

(5) And therefore only dried figs which last longer should be set aside for the priest.

(6) In this case pressed figs.

(7) And therefore dried figs may not be given to the priest but only fresh ones, even though the priest will press them later on, for it is the custom to do so.

(8) For one could have answered that in each case no priest was available and the reason why in the second clause one is not allowed to set aside dried figs is that the Tanna of this Baraitha is of the opinion that in every case the best must be given as terumah, even in the absence of a priest. This indeed is the opinion of R. Judah; v. Ter. loc. cit

(9) I.e., what is left of the meal-offering after the handful has been taken out.

(10) Lev. II, 11. The prohibition of this verse refers to the meal-offering as a whole, i.e., before the taking out of the handful. That the remainder must not be leavened is derived from another verse; v. Gemara, infra.

(11) That the remainder must not be leavened. V. prec. note.

(12) Ibid. VI, 10. The Heb. may be translated: 'their portion shall not be baked leavened'.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 55b

be baked leavened? Has it not already stated, It shall not be made leavened?[1] From the verse, It shall not be made leavened, I might have said that one is liable only once for all [the works involved], Scripture therefore says, It shall not be baked leavened. Now baking was included in the general prohibition; why was it specifically mentioned? So that every other work shall be like it; thus as the work of baking is described as a specific work and one is liable solely on account of it, so I will include the work of kneading and of shaping and every other specific work, including also the work of smoothing[2] which is also a specific work, that one is liable on account of each alone! — We derive our rule from the expression 'their portion'.[3] Perhaps then the whole verse refers to this only![4] — If so [the prohibition] should have been, 'Their portion shall not be baked leavened'; why does Scripture say, It shall not be baked leavened: their portion? You can therefore infer both [prohibitions]. But perhaps the interpretation should be thus: for the baking which is expressly prohibited by the Divine Law one is liable once, but as for the other works one is only liable once for all of them! — This is a case of a subject which though included in a general proposition is specifically mentioned in order to teach us something concerning it, in which case what is specifically mentioned is not stated only for its own sake but to teach that the same affects the whole general proposition.[5] But perhaps I should say that the verse 'it shall not be made leavened' is a general [prohibition] and the verse 'It shall not be baked leavened' is a particular [prohibition]; we thus have a general rule followed by a specific particular, in which case the general rule is limited to the particular specified, so that only the baking is prohibited but no other work! — R. Aptoriki explained, Here the general rule and the specific particular are far away from each other,[6] and in every case where the general rule and the specific particular are far away from each other the principle relating to a general rule followed by a specific particular does not apply.[7]

R. Adda b. Ahabah (some say, Kadi) objected, Do you say that where the general rule and the specific particular are far away from each other the principle relating to a general rule followed by a specific particular does not apply? Surely it has been taught: It is written, And he shall slaughter it in the place where they slaughter the burnt-offering before the Lord; it is a sin-offering.[8] Now where is the burnt-offering slaughtered? On the north side;[9] this too is slaughtered on the north side. But do we derive it from here?[10] Is it not written, In the place where the burnt-offering is slaughtered shall the sin-offering be slaughtered?[11] Why then is the former verse[8] necessary? It serves to make the rule absolute,[12] namely, that if it was not slaughtered on the north side it is invalid. You say that it serves to make this rule absolute, but perhaps it is not so but teaches rather that this [sin-offering] must be [slaughtered] on the north side but no other[13] requires the north side! The text therefore states, And he shall slaughter the sin-offering in the place of the burnt-offering;[14] this establishes the rule that all sin-offerings must be slaughtered on the north side. Now this is the conclusion because the Divine Law has also written, And he shall slaughter the sin-offering, but without this verse I would have held that only this [sin-offering] requires the north side but no other requires the north side. And why? Is it not because this would be a case of a general rule followed by a specific particular, which would be governed by the principle relating to a general rule followed by a specific particular, notwithstanding that the two are far away from each other?[15] Thereupon R. Ashi demurred, Is this an instance of a general rule followed by a specific particular? It is an instance of a

specific particular followed by a general rule,[16] in which case the general rule extends beyond the scope of the specific particular, and includes every [sin-offering][17] Rather the fact is that the Tanna's counter-argument was based upon the expression 'it';[18] and he argued thus: 'perhaps it is not so but teaches rather that this [sin-offering] must be [slaughtered] on the north side but no other requires the north side', since the Divine Law stated 'it'.

Now that the general rule[19] is derived from the verse, 'And he shall slaughter the sin-offering', what does the term 'it' exclude? — (Mnemonic: Nahshon, the slaughterer, a bird, the Passover-offering.) It teaches that it must be on the north side, but Nahshon's he-goat[20] 'was not [slaughtered] on the north side. For I might have thought that since the latter was included under the law of laying on of hands it was also included under the law requiring the north side; we are therefore taught [that it was not so]. And whence do we know that this was so concerning the laying on of hands?[21] — For it was taught: The verse, And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the he-goat,[22] includes also Nahshon's he-goat, for the requirement of the laying on of hands. So R. Judah. But R. Simeon says,

---

(1) Ibid. II, 11.

(2) Sc. the surface of the dough with moist hands (Rashi). Others: cutting away a lump of dough sufficient for each loaf (R. Gershom); or, shaping the loaf (Maim.).

(3) Which expression, following immediately upon the prohibition 'It shall not be baked leavened', signifies that even the remainder shall not be baked leavened.

(4) I.e., that the remainder shall not be leavened. Whence then do we know that the meal-offering as a whole, before the taking out of the handful, is subject to this prohibition?

(5) The general prohibition 'It shall not be made leavened' includes every work in connection with the meal-offering, and certainly the baking, but the latter was specifically prohibited to teach that for the baking alone, as well as for any single work in connection with the meal-offering, one is liable.

(6) The former is stated in Lev. II, 11, whilst the latter in VI, 10.

(7) V. Pes. 6b.

(8) Lev. IV, 24, with reference to the sin-offering brought by a ruler.

(9) Cf. ibid. I, 11.

(10) That the sin-offering must be slaughtered on the north side of the altar.

(11) Ibid. VI, 18.

(12) The repetition of this rule establishes it as an obligation and absolutely indispensable.

(13) E.g., the communal sin-offerings offered on the Festivals. V. Sh. Mek. n. 3.

(14) Ibid. IV, 29.

(15) In VI, 18 the rule is stated with regard to sin-offerings generally whilst in IV, 24 it is stated with regard to the special case of a sin-offering of a ruler.

(16) For the specific case is stated before the general rule, v. prec. note.

(17) Accordingly the verse, And he shall slaughter the sin-offering (ibid. IV, 29), is rendered superfluous.

(18) Heb. אותו, 'it' to the exclusion of others. The third verse (Lev. IV, 29) was therefore necessary to extend the rule generally so as to include all sin-offerings.

(19) That all sin-offerings must be slaughtered on the north side.

(20) The he-goat offered as a sin-offering by Nahshon, the prince of the tribe of Judah, (and likewise by each of the princes of the other tribes, v. Num. VII, 12ff) at the dedication of the altar. This sin-offering was peculiar in that it was offered not in expiation of any sin committed.

(21) That Nahshon's he-goat required the laying on of hands before slaughtering.

(22) Lev. IV, 24, with reference to the sin-offering brought by a ruler. Other offerings of a he-goat are included in this verse by reason of the fact that 'he-goat' is expressly mentioned here instead of the more usual expression 'upon its head'.

It includes the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry for the requirement of the laying on of hands.[1] Rabina demurred, [saying], It is well according to R. Judah's view,[2] but what is to be said if R. Simeon's view is followed?[3] Thereupon Mar Zutra the son of R. Mari said to Rabina, But even according to R. Judah should we not say that that which is expressly included[4] is included, and that which is not included[5] is not included? And if you retort that without a verse to exclude it[5] you would have included it by virtue of the general principle,[6] then with regard to the requirement of laying on of hands Scripture should have been silent concerning it since it would have been included by virtue of the general principle. But [you would answer that] we may not derive [the regulations applicable, to] a temporary enactment[7] from a permanent law, then with regard to this,[5] too, we may not derive a temporary enactment from a permanent law![8] — This then is the interpretation: 'It' must be [slaughtered] on the north side but the slaughterer need not stand at the north side.[9] But is not this to be derived from R. Ahiyah's teaching? For it was taught: R. Ahiyah says, Wherefore does the text state, And he shall slaughter it on the side of the altar northward?[10] It is because concerning the receiving [of the blood] we know that [the priest] must stand on the north side and receive [the blood] on the north side, and if he stood on the south side and received [the blood] on the north side the offering is invalid;[11] now I might have thought that it is the same here [with regard to the slaughtering], Scripture therefore stated 'it', signifying that 'it' must be on the north side but the slaughterer need not stand on the north side![12] — Rather [then interpret it thus]: 'It' must be on the north side but [the killing of] a bird-offering need not be on the north side. For I might have argued [that this was essential] by an a fortiori argument from a lamb-offering thus: if [the slaughtering of] a lamb-offering, which does not require the services of a priest, must be performed on the north side, is it not right that [the killing of] a bird-offering, which requires the services of a priest, shall be performed on the north side? But surely [one can retort,] this is so[13] with a lamb-offering because it requires an instrument [for the slaughtering]![14] — Rather then [we must interpret it as follows]: 'It' must be on the north side, but the slaughtering of the Passover-offering need not be on the north side. But is not the [exclusion of the] Passover-offering derived from the teaching of R. Eliezer b. Jacob? For it was taught: R. Eliezer b. Jacob said, One might think that the Passover-offering requires slaughtering on the north side by reason of this a fortiori argument: if the slaughtering of a burnt-offering, which has no fixed time for the slaughtering, must be performed on the north side, is it not right that the slaughtering of the Passover-offering, which has a fixed time for the slaughtering thereof,[15] shall be performed on the north side? But surely [one can retort,] this is so[13] with a burnt-offering because it is wholly burnt! — One can argue the case from the sin-offering. But surely [one can retort that] this is so with the sin-offering because it effects atonement for those that are liable to the penalty of kareth! — One can argue the case from the guilt-offering. But surely this is so with the guilt-offering because it is a Most Holy offering.[16] And if one were to argue the case from all these offerings, [one could retort that] this is so with all these mentioned because they are all Most Holy offerings! — Rather [we must say that the interpretation] is indeed as stated previously: 'It' must be on the north side but the slaughterer need not be on the north side; and as for your objection 'Is not this to be derived from R. Ahiyah's teaching?' [I say that] R. Ahiyah comes [not to teach] that the slaughterer need not be on the north side; he teaches rather that, in contradistinction from the slaughterer who need not be on the north side,[17] the receiver of the blood must be on the north side. But is not this rule regarding the receiver of the blood derived from [the fact that Scripture states], 'And he shall take'[18] and not 'he shall take'?[19] — He [R. Ahiyah] does not base any exposition on the fact that Scripture states 'And he shall take' and not 'he shall take'.

ONE IS LIABLE FOR THE KNEADING AS WELL AS FOR THE SHAPING AND FOR THE BAKING. R. Papa said, If a man baked [the meal-offering leavened], he has incurred stripes on two counts, once for shaping it [while leavened] and again for baking it.[20] But have you not said above[21] 'As the baking is described as a specific work and one is liable solely on account of it'? — This is no difficulty, for in the one case he shaped it and also baked it,[22] but in the other case another shaped it and he baked it.[23]

Our Rabbis taught: If a firstling[24] was attacked with congestion, it may be bled in a place where no blemish would result, but it may not be bled in a place where a blemish would result.[25] So R. Meir. The Sages say, It may be bled even in a place where a blemish would result, provided that it is not slaughtered by reason of that blemish.[26] R. Simeon says,

---

(1) V. infra 92b.

(2) For since he maintains that Nahshon's he-goat required laying on of hands just like an ordinary sin-offering, it would also have required slaughtering on the north side; therefore an express term was necessary in order to exclude the latter requirement.

(3) For according to him Nahshon's he-goat was different from ordinary sin-offerings, since it did not require laying on of hands, and presumably it did not require slaughtering on the north side; hence no term was necessary to exclude this.

(4) The rite of laying on of hands.

(5) The requirement of slaughtering on the north side.

(6) I.e., as all sin-offerings required slaughtering on the north side so this offering also required it.

(7) Sc. the offering of Nahshon's he-goat at the dedication of the altar.

(8) So that even according to R. Judah only that rite which was expressly stated as applying to Nahshon's he-goat did apply, but none other; hence slaughtering on the north side was not required for it; accordingly the term 'it' must be otherwise interpreted.

(9) He may stand on the south side and slaughter the animal which is on the north side by using a long knife for the purpose.

(10) Lev. I, 11.

(11) V. Zeb. 48a.

(12) So that the term 'it', stated in Lev. IV, 24, has not been satisfactorily interpreted.

(13) That slaughtering on the north side is essential.

(14) Whereas the killing of a bird sacrifice is performed by the priest nipping off the head with his thumb; cf. Lev. I, 15.

(15) It must be slaughtered on the eve of the Passover Festival on the fourteenth day of Nisan in the afternoon.

(16) Whereas the Passover-offering is of the Less Holy offerings.

(17) This is derived from the term 'it' (Lev. IV, 24) stated in connection with the sin-offering of a ruler.

(18) Ibid. IV, 25.

(19) The rule is derived from the superfluous waw 'and' (R. Gershom). According to Sh. Mek. the text should read: 'From (the fact that Scripture states), And he shall take, which signifies, and he shall take himself'. I.e., the receiver of the blood shall betake himself to the place where he is about to receive the blood, namely, the north side. V. Zeb. 48a.

(20) The baking is regarded as a twofold work, as the completion of the work of shaping and as the baking proper.

(21) Supra p. 329.

(22) In this case he would not be liable on two counts for the baking, since he has already incurred liability for the shaping as a separate work. Only in this sense can the baking be described as a single and specific work.

(23) The other would then be liable for the shaping, whilst he would be liable for the baking which involves two counts, the baking proper and the completion of the shaping. V. however, Tosaf. s.v. אפאה, and com. of R. Gershom.

(24) The firstling, after Temple times, since it can no longer be offered, is given to the priest, but he is forbidden to slaughter it unless it is blemished. It is, however, forbidden to blemish a firstling or any consecrated beast.

(25) E.g., to bleed the firstling at the ear or lip would leave a scar or blemish.

(26) For otherwise it is to be feared that the owner would bleed it deliberately, although it was not suffering from congestion, in order to be allowed to slaughter it.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 56b

It may even be slaughtered by reason of that blemish.[1] R. Judah says, It may not be bled[2] even though it would otherwise die.[3]

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan, All agree[4] that whosoever leavens [the meal-offering] after it was already leavened[5] is liable, for it is written, It shall not be made leavened,[6] and it is also written, It shall not be baked leavened.[7] And that whosoever castrates a

beast after it was already castrated[8] is liable, for it is written, That which hath its stones bruised or crushed or torn off or cut, [. . . neither shall ye do thus in your land].[9] Now if one is liable for cutting how much more so for tearing off! [Wherefore is the latter mentioned?] To teach that one is also liable if one tears them away after they were already cut. They[4] only differ as to whether one may blemish a blemished animal. R. Meir says, It is written, There shall be no blemish at all therein;[10] but the Rabbis say, It is written, It shall be perfect to be accepted.[11] Against R. Meir [it will be objected], is there not written, 'It shall be perfect to be accepted'? — That would only exclude what was born blemished.[12] But what was born blemished is no better than a tree! — It excludes rather consecrated animals that have been rendered unfit [by reason of a blemish] and have been redeemed; for I might have argued that since these may not be sheared of their wool nor put to any labour it is also forbidden to inflict any further blemish upon them, we are therefore taught [that it is not so]. And against the Rabbis [it will be objected], is it not written, 'There shall be no blemish at all therein'? — That verse is necessary for the following teaching: It is written, 'There shall be no blemish at all therein': I gather from this that one may not inflict any blemish upon it, but whence do I know that one may not cause it to suffer a blemish indirectly,[13] [e.g.] that one may not place a lump of dough or a pressed fig upon its ear so as to tempt a dog to take it?[14] The text therefore says, 'No blemish at all'; not only does it say 'no blemish' but also 'no blemish at all'.[15]

R. Ammi said, If a man placed leaven upon the dough [of a meal-offering] and went and sat him down, and the dough became leavened of its own, he is liable for it, just as it is an act of work on the Sabbath.[16] But would one be liable for doing such an act of work as this on the Sabbath? Has not Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said

---

(1) Since the bleeding was not intended to blemish the beast but merely to relieve it from its congestion, the blemish that results is regarded as accidental and the beast may be slaughtered on account of it; this being in accordance with R. Simeon's view that a result not intended is ignored; v. Shab. 133a.

(2) Even in a place from which no physical blemish would result for it is to be feared that in his anxiety to save the beast the owner would not be careful as to the place where he bleeds it and might do so even in a place from which a blemish would certainly result.

(3) V. Bek. 33b.

(4) I.e., R. Meir and the above Rabbis who differ concerning the propriety of blemishing a beast which is already blemished, for here the firstling is indeed blemished by reason of its congestion which would prove fatal if it were not bled.

(5) I.e., if one shaped or baked the dough of the meal-offering which had been made leavened by another person.

(6) Lev. II, 11.

(7) Ibid. VI, 10. Hence it is clear that for baking it leavened even after it had already been 'made' leavened one is liable.

(8) I.e., one man had wrenched the testicles away from the body and left them in the scrotum, and another came and cut them away entirely.

(9) Ibid. XXII, 24. The latter part of this verse is understood as a general prohibition against castration.

(10) Ibid. 21. Even though the beast is blemished there shall be no further blemish therein.

(11) Ibid. Only such as are fit for offering may not be blemished.

(12) And therefore was at no time holy. This certainly may be blemished.

(13) Lit., 'by other means'.

(14) And to bite its ear at the same time, thus causing a blemish.

(15) Including blemishes indirectly caused.

(16) E. g., if one placed meat on the coals on the Sabbath one would be liable for roasting, although the roasting was done of its own accord.

in the name of R. Johanan, If a man placed meat on coals [on the Sabbath] and also turned it over, he is liable, but if he did not turn it over he is not liable? — Raba answered; He meant to say, He is

liable for it just as the act of roasting on the Sabbath.[1]

The text [above stated]: 'Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan, If a man placed meat on coals [on the Sabbath] and also turned it over, he is liable, but if he did not turn it over he is not liable'. How is this to be understood? If I say that the meat would not have been roasted if he had not turned it over, then obviously [he is not liable if he did not turn it over]; and if it would have been roasted even though he had not turned it over, why then is he not liable [where he did not turn it over]? — It is necessary to be stated only for the circumstance where, had he not turned it over, it would have been roasted on one side only to the extent of that which was eaten by Ben Drusai,[2] but with turning it over it would have been roasted on both sides to that extent. Now we are here taught that whatsoever is done on one side only to the extent of that which was eaten by Ben Drusai is insignificant.

Raba said, If it had been [well] roasted[3] in one place the size of a dried fig, one would be liable.[4] Rabina said to R. Ashi, Is it then that only [if roasted] in one place [to the size of a dried fig] one is [liable], but not [if roasted] in two or three places?[5] But we have learnt: He who bores a hole, however small, is liable.[6] Now what can this mean? Will you say it means [a hole] in one place? But of what use can a tiny hole be? Obviously then it means [holes] in two or three places, [no matter how small], since they can be joined together.[7] — No, I still say it means a hole in one place, for it can serve as a keyhole.

Another version states: Raba said, Even if it had been roasted in two or three places [together making up the size of a dried fig, one would be liable]. Rabina said to R. Ashi, We have learnt in a Mishnah to the same effect: He who bores a hole, however small, is liable. Now what can this mean? Will you say it means a hole in one place? But of what use can a tiny hole be? It must mean [holes] in two or three places, [no matter how small,] since they can be joined together! — No, I still say it means a hole in one place, for it can serve as a keyhole.

Our Rabbis taught: Had Scripture only stated, Which ye shall bring unto the Lord shall not be made leavened,[8] I should have said that only the handful shall not be made leavened, but whence would I know [that this prohibition applies to] the whole meal-offering?[9] The text therefore added, 'Meal-offering'.[8] And whence would I know that this applies to other meal-offerings too?[10] The text therefore stated, 'Every meal-offering'.[8] 'Which ye shall bring unto the Lord' signifies what is valid, but not what is invalid;[11] hence they said, He who leavens a valid meal-offering is liable, but he who leavens what is invalid is not liable.

R. Papa enquired, What is the law if a man leavened the meal-offering and it was then taken out [of the Sanctuary], and afterwards he again leavened it?[12] [Shall I say,] since it has been taken out it has thereby become invalid, and consequently by leavening it thereafter he cannot be held liable for leavening what was already leavened; or perhaps I should say, since it has been leavened it cannot be affected by being taken out, and consequently by leavening it again he would be liable for leavening what was already leavened? This question remains undecided.

R. Mari enquired, What is the law if he leavened [the handful] at the head of the altar? Does not the Divine Law say, 'Which ye shall bring', and this has already been brought up;[13] or perhaps I should say, since it still requires to be burnt it is as though the act [of bringing] has not been completed? This question remains undecided.

And now that the general prohibition has been derived from 'every meal-offering', wherefore is the expression 'which ye shall bring'[14] stated? — It is required for the following which was taught: Which ye shall bring includes the meal-offering which is offered with the drink-offerings, so that it too comes within the prohibition of leavening.[15] So R. Jose the Galilean. R. Akiba says, It includes

the Shewbread, so that it too comes within the prohibition of leavening.[16] But is not the meal-offering which is offered with the drink-offerings prepared with fruit juice,[17]

---

(1) I.e., the placing of leaven on dough, which is the whole act of leavening, is equivalent to placing meat on coals and turning it over for the other side to roast, which two acts together constitute the act of roasting.

(2) The name of a bandit who used to eat his food slightly done; gen. a third done.

(3) Cur. edd. add here: 'on one side'. This is not found in MS.M. and is deleted by Sh. Mek.

(4) Even though it had not been turned over.

(5) Which together make up the size of a dried fig.

(6) Shab. 102b.

(7) To make one large hole. Similarly here, the parts roasted should be reckoned together so as to make up the size of a dried fig.

(8) Lev. II, 11.

(9) I.e., before the handful was taken out.

(10) For the prohibition is expressly stated in connection with a meal-offering prepared in a pan.

(11) E.g., if the meal-offering was taken out of the Sanctuary and thereby had become invalid or if it had become unclean.

(12) I.e., he performed another work with this dough which had already been leavened, e.g. he baked it.

(13) To the head of the altar before it was leavened.

(14) Which refers specifically to the handful only.

(15) For this meal-offering is different in that no part thereof is eaten but it is wholly burnt upon the altar; it was therefore necessary for this to be expressly included within the prohibition of leavening. On the other hand, the Shewbread does not come within this prohibition according to R. Jose, for he is of the opinion that the Shewbread was hallowed only when set upon the table and not before when the flour was measured out, for the measuring vessels for dry goods were not consecrated as vessels of ministry.

(16) R. Akiba maintains that the measuring vessels for dry goods were consecrated and so the flour was hallowed for a meal-offering (for such is the Shewbread) as soon as it was measured out; hence it comes within the prohibition of leavening.

(17) The meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings required a large quantity of oil, three logs to the tenth, and presumably no water was added to it; accordingly it cannot possibly become leavened.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 57b

and fruit juice cannot render aught leaven? — Resh Lakish answered that R. Jose the Galilean was of the opinion that it was permitted to mix the meal-offering which is offered with the drink-offerings with water.[1] But was not the [flour for the] Shewbread put into a measuring vessel for dry goods, and we know that R. Akiba is of the opinion that the measuring vessel for dry goods was not consecrated?[2] — Rabin[3] sent the following answer in the name of R. Johanan: That is, indeed, the proper construction of the teaching, but the authorities must be reversed: 'Which ye shall bring' includes the Shewbread, so that it too comes within the prohibition of leavening. So R. Jose the Galilean. R. Akiba says, It includes the meal-offering which is offered with the drink-offerings, so that it too comes within the prohibition of leavening.

R. Johanan is indeed consistent in his view, for R. Johanan has said that R. Jose the Galilean and one of the disciples of R. Ishmael — namely, R. Josiah-both hold the same view, For it was taught: It is written, And had anointed them and sanctified them.[4] R. Josiah says, The liquid-measures were anointed both inside and outside, while the dry-measures were anointed inside but not outside. R. Jonathan says, The liquid-measures were anointed inside but not outside, while the dry-measures were not anointed at all. This can be proved from the fact that they do not hallow [what was put into them], for it is written, Ye shall bring out of your dwellings two wave-loaves of two tenth parts of an ephah; they shall be of fine flour, they shall be baked with leaven, for firstfruits unto the Lord;[5] when are they appointed unto the Lord? Only after they have been baked.[6]

Wherein do they differ? In the interpretation of the word 'them'.[7] R. Josiah maintains that the word 'them' excludes the outside of the dry-measure; but R. Jonathan holds that the dry-measure was not holy at all and no verse is necessary to exclude it; the word 'them' can thus serve to exclude only the outside of the liquid-measure.

And why did not [R. Johanan] say that R. Akiba and one of the disciples of R. Ishmael — namely R. Jonathan — both said the same thing?[8] — Because they do not agree entirely about the liquid-measures.[9]

R. Papa said to Abaye, Was not a bowl used [for the kneading of the Shewbread], and that was [a measuring vessel] for liquids?[10] — He replied, It might have been kneaded on a slab.[11] But if so, when R. Jonathan said 'This can be proved from the fact that they do not hallow [what was put into them]', [his colleague] could have retorted that it might have been measured out in an unconsecrated tenth measure![12] — [The two cases] cannot be compared; for with regard to the bowl, since the Divine Law did not expressly prescribe a bowl for the kneading, if it was kneaded on a slab it did not matter in the least; but with regard to the tenth measure, since the Divine Law directed that a tenth measure be made wherewith the flour might be measured, would one reject the consecrated tenth measure and measure with an unconsecrated tenth measure?

Our Rabbis taught: Whence is it derived that whosoever offers of the flesh of a sin-offering or of a guilt-offering, of the flesh of a Most Holy[13] or of a Less Holy offering, of the residue of the 'Omer-offering, of the residue of the Two Loaves, of the Shewbread, or of the remainder of meal-offerings, transgresses a negative precept? Because the text states, For any leaven or any honey ye shall not burn of it as an offering made by fire unto the Lord,[14] signifying that any offering, if only a portion of it is offered upon the fire, comes under the prohibition of ye shall not burn.[15] But is any part of the Two Loaves or of the Shewbread offered upon the fire? Surely it has been taught: Thus the Two Loaves and the Shewbread are excluded[16] since no part of them is offered upon the fire! — R. Shesheth answered, It meant there that no part of them is actually offered upon the fire.[17]

It was reported: If a person brought up any of the abovementioned parts upon the ascent,[18] R. Johanan said, He is liable;[19] but R. Eleazar said, He is not liable. 'R. Johanan said, He is liable', for it was taught: The verse says, The altar:[20] I know this[21] only of the altar, whence do I know it of the ascent too? The text states: But they shall not come up for a sweet savour on the altar.[20] 'R. Eleazar said, He is not liable', because the verse says, Leaven and honey . . . as an offering of firstfruits ye may bring them unto the Lord;[20] only with regard to these[22] is it implied that the ascent is on a par with the altar, but with no other offering is it so.

---

(1) It can therefore become leavened.

(2) V. infra 90a. Hence it cannot be subject to the prohibition of leavening since it was not hallowed as a meal-offering until set upon the table, for even the kneading need not have been in a vessel of ministry.

(3) So MSS., Rashi, and Sh.Mek. Cur. edd.: 'R. Reuben'.

(4) Num. VII, 1. The reference is to the anointing of the altar vessels which were vessels for liquids.

(5) Lev. XXIII, 17.

(6) So that, although the flour must have been measured out in a measuring vessel, it was not hallowed 'unto the Lord' until after the baking in the oven of the Sanctuary.

(7) Heb. אותם. The suggestion is that this word signifies the essential part of the vessel, namely the inside only.

(8) Since R. Akiba and R. Jonathan both hold that the dry-measures were not consecrated.

(9) For R. Akiba maintains that the liquid-measures were anointed both inside and outside so as to hallow whatsoever was put inside them as well as what was on the outside; v. infra 90a.

(10) The kneading bowl, being a vessel of ministry, would assuredly have hallowed the loaves before they were put into the oven.

(11) Which was of leather and was not consecrated as a vessel of ministry.
(12) Just as the kneading was not done in the usual vessel of ministry, one can also say that the flour was measured out in an unconsecrated measure, and on that account the loaves were only hallowed at the baking and not before. Had they, however, been measured out in a consecrated measure they would have become hallowed forthwith.
(13) E.g., the two lambs offered on the Pentecost as peace-offerings. They would not include burnt-offerings which are wholly offered on the altar.
(14) Lev. II, 11. 'It is apparent that the expression 'of it', Heb. ממנו, is superfluous in the verse, and is interpreted therefore as the basis for the rule, that once the prescribed portion of an offering has been duly offered up on the altar the rest may not under any circumstances be burnt upon the altar.
(15) Accordingly each offering enumerated in this Baraitha is subject to the prohibition of 'ye shall not burn', since a portion of each has already been offered as an offering by fire on the altar. Thus, of the animal sacrifices the fat parts have been offered, of the meal-offerings the handfuls, of the Two Loaves the fat parts of the two lambs which accompanied them, and of the Shewbread the two dishes of frankincense.
(16) They are not to be 'presented' or brought near to the altar. V. infra 60b.
(17) In contradistinction from other offerings from which a handful is offered. Nevertheless since the offering consisted of the Loaves and the lambs or of the Shewbread and the frankincense, it is also true to say that part of the offering is offered upon the fire.
(18) The slope which leads to the altar.
(19) Just as if he had offered the part upon the altar.
(20) Lev. II, 12.
(21) That it is prohibited to burn the remainder of an offering whereof a part has been duly offered up.
(22) Limited by the pronoun 'them', אותם. The verse applies only to those offerings which are described as 'an offering of firstfruits', namely, the Two Loaves and the Firstfruits.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 58a

And to what purpose does R. Johanan employ the term 'them'? — He requires it for the following which was taught: One might think that an individual may make a freewill-offering [of two loaves] in the same manner and offer it; for I would apply the verse, That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt observe and do,[1] the text therefore states, As an offering of firstfruits ye may bring, meaning only the community may bring them but not an individual.[2] One might further think that an individual may not offer them since he does not offer the like as an obligation, but the community may offer them [as a freewill-offering] since it must offer the like as an obligation, the text therefore states 'them'; only these are to be offered, namely, the Two Loaves which are with leaven and the offering of firstfruits which includes honey.

But was it then not permissible to offer the Two Loaves as a freewill-offering? Surely it has been taught: Since Scripture has stated any leaven,[3] why has it also stated any honey?[3] Or since it has stated any honey, why has it also stated any leaven? It is because there is a condition which applies to leaven but not to honey, and there is also a condition which applies to honey but not to leaven. Leaven admits of an exception in that it is permitted in the Temple but honey does not admit of any exception in the Temple. Honey is permitted to be used in the remainder of a meal-offering[4] but leaven is not permitted to be used in the remainder of a meal-offering. Therefore, since there is a condition which applies to leaven but not to honey, and there is a condition which applies to honey but not to leaven, Scripture had to state 'any leaven' and also 'any honey'. Now to what did it refer when it said 'Leaven admits of an exception in that it is permitted in the Temple'? No doubt to the Two Loaves, which may be offered as a freewill-offering![5] — No, said R. 'Amram; it referred to what was offered with them.[6] But then it is the same with the firstfruits, is it not?[7] For we have learnt: The pigeons that were upon the baskets [of firstfruits] were sacrificed as burnt-offerings, but those which the people carried in their hands they gave to the priests![8] — Those were only for adorning the firstfruits.[9]

Rami b. Hama enquired of R. Hisda, What is the law if one offered upon the altar the flesh of a sin-offering of a bird? Does the Scriptural rule[10] refer only to that offering of which a portion has been offered upon the fire, and of this no portion has been offered upon the fire; or [does it refer] to everything that is called an offering, and this too is called an offering? — He answered, [It refers to] everything that is called an offering and this too is called an offering.[11]

Tannaim differ on this point. R. Eliezer says, [The prohibition[12] refers only to] that offering of which a portion has been offered upon the fire; but R. Akiba says, [It refers to] everything that is called an offering. Wherein lies the difference between them? — R. Hisda said, In regard to the flesh of the sin-offering of a bird.[13] Rab said, In regard to the log of oil of a leper.[13] (For Levi taught: The expression 'every offering of theirs'[14] includes the log of oil of the leper.)[15]

Our Rabbis taught: Leaven . . . ye shall not burn.[16] From this I only know the rule[17] for the whole, but whence do I know it for a part thereof? Because the text states, Any leaven.[16] And whence do I know it for the mixture? Because the text states, For any leaven.[16] What does this mean?[18] — Abaye said, It means this: 'Leaven . . . ye shall not burn'. From this I only know the rule for an olive's bulk,[19] but whence do I know it for a half-olive's bulk?[20] Because the text states, 'Any leaven'. And whence do I know it for the mixture?[21] Because the text states, For any leaven'. Raba said, It means this: 'Leaven . . . ye shall not burn'. From this I only know the rule for the [whole] handful, but whence do I know it for half of the handful? Because the text states, 'Any leaven'. And whence do I know it for the mixture? Because the text states, 'For any leaven.

Wherein do they differ? — Abaye maintains that the handful may be less than two olives' bulk

---

(1) Deut. XXIII, 24.

(2) For the verb תקריבו 'ye may bring', is in the plural.

(3) 'Any', Heb. כל need not have been stated in both cases, since whatever rule is derived from one (v. infra) would equally apply to the other.

(4) Cf. Hul. 132b.

(5) Upon the altar. For the Two Loaves which were brought as an obligation were not offered on the altar.

(6) I.e., the two lambs which were offered as an obligation together with the Two Loaves may also be offered as a freewill-offering upon the altar.

(7) For pigeons which were offered with the firstfruits may also be offered as a freewill-offering; hence it cannot be said that the rules concerning leaven do not apply to honey.

(8) Bik. III,5

(9) But were not offered as an obligation with the firstfruits.

(10) That what remains of the offering may not be burnt upon the altar.

(11) Cf. Lev. I, 14.

(12) That what remains of the offering may not be burnt upon the altar.

(13) Which is referred to as an offering (cf. Lev. I, 14 and XIV, 12) although none of it is burnt upon the altar.

(14) Num. XVIII, 9.

(15) This teaching of Levi is omitted in all MSS. and apparently was not in the text before Rashi. It is struck out here by Sh. Mek.

(16) Lev. II, 11.

(17) That it must not be burnt upon the altar leavened.

(18) What is meant by 'the whole' and 'the part'?

(19) Since this may be the whole handful.

(20) That this quantity is nevertheless reckoned as a 'burning' and therefore comes under the prohibition of 'ye shall not burn'.

(21) I.e., if the handful consisted of what was partly leavened and partly unleavened and the one was not distinguishable from the other.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 58b

and that the burning of a quantity less than an olive's bulk counts as an offering;[1] whereas Raba maintains that the handful may not be less than two olives' bulk and that the burning of a quantity less than an olive's bulk does not count as an offering.

It was stated: If a man offered leaven and honey[2] upon the altar, he has incurred stripes, said Raba, once for offering leaven, again for offering honey, again for offering leaven in a mixture, and yet again for offering honey in a mixture. But Abaye said, He does not suffer stripes for the breach of a negative precept which includes a number of prohibitions.[3] Some say that he suffers stripes but once;[4] but others say that he does not suffer stripes at all,[5] since the negative precept is not as specific as that of 'muzzling'.[6]

---

(1) Hence one is liable for burning a half-olive's bulk of leaven upon the altar.

(2) In one mixture (Rashi). According to Tosaf. he offered some leaven, some honey, and a mixture of leaven and honey. Hence he suffers stripes four times.

(3) Accordingly he does not suffer stripes for offering the mixture, since the negative precept of the mixture (implied in the term 'for any' v. supra) includes prohibitions for the mixture of leaven and the mixture of honey. V. Tosaf. s.v. המעלה and אין.

(4) For the inclusive negative precept. In the case in question, therefore, he would suffer stripes three times, once for offering the leaven, again for the honey, and a third time for the mixtures.

(5) For the inclusive negative precept; so that he would suffer stripes but twice.

(6) Sc. the ox when treading the corn, Deut. XXV, 4. This is given as an example of a specific negative precept because it follows immediately upon the law concerning stripes, Deut. XXV, 1ff.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 59a

MISHNAH. SOME [MEAL-OFFERINGS] REQUIRE OIL AND FRANKINCENSE, SOME REQUIRE OIL BUT NOT FRANKINCENSE, SOME FRANKINCENSE BUT NOT OIL, AND SOME NEITHER OIL NOR FRANKINCENSE. THESE REQUIRE OIL AND FRANKINCENSE: THE MEAL-OFFERING OF FINE FLOUR,[1] THAT PREPARED ON A GRIDDLE, THAT PREPARED IN A PAN, THE CAKES AND THE WAFERS,[2] THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE PRIESTS, THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED HIGH PRIEST,[3] THE MEAL-OFFERING OF A GENTILE,[4] THE MEAL-OFFERING OF WOMEN,[5] AND THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE 'OMER.[6] THE MEAL-OFFERING OFFERED WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS[7] REQUIRES OIL BUT NOT FRANKINCENSE. THE SHEWBREAD REQUIRES FRANKINCENSE BUT NOT OIL. THE TWO LOAVES,[8] THE SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING[9] AND THE MEAL-OFFERING OF JEALOUSY[10] REQUIRE NEITHER OIL NOR FRANKINCENSE.

GEMARA. R. Papa said, All [the meal-offerings] enumerated in the Mishnah must consist of ten [cakes].[11] He thus rejects R. Simeon's view who said, He may offer half in cakes and half in wafers;[12] and so he teaches us [that it is not so].

Our Rabbis taught: It is written, And thou shalt put oil upon it,[13] — upon it but not upon the Shewbread. For [without the verse] I would have argued by an a fortiori argument thus: if the meal-offering that is offered with the drink-offerings, which does not require frankincense, nevertheless requires oil, how much more does the Shewbread, which requires frankincense, require oil! The text therefore stated 'Upon it', — upon it shall be oil but not upon the Shewbread. [It is further written], And thou shalt lay frankincense upon it,[14] — upon it shall be frankincense but not upon the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings. For [without the verse] I would have argued by an a fortiori argument thus: if the Shewbread, which does not require oil, nevertheless requires

frankincense, how much more does the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings, which requires oil, require frankincense! The text therefore stated, 'Upon it' — upon it shall be frankincense but not upon the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings. Meal-offering[14] — this includes the meal-offering offered on the eighth day[15] [of consecration], so that it too required frankincense. It is[14] — this excludes the Two Loaves, so that they require neither oil nor frankincense.

The Master said, 'Upon it shall be oil but not upon the Shewbread'. Might I not say, Upon it shall be oil but not upon the meal-offering of the priests? — It is more reasonable to include the meal-offering of the priests, since [like the meal-offering of the 'Omer it consists of] a tenth [of an ephah],[16] [requires] a vessel of ministry,[17] is prepared outside,[18] [becomes unfit when] its appearance [is spoilt],[19] requires bringing near [to the altar],[20] and [is burnt upon] the fire [of the altar].[21] On the contrary it is more reasonable to include the Shewbread since [like the meal-offering of the 'Omer it is an offering on behalf of] the community,[22] is obligatory,[22] [may be offered in] uncleanness,[23] is eaten,[24] [is subject to] piggul,[25] [and is offered] on the Sabbath![26] — The former is the more plausible since there is written, Any one.[27]

The Master said, 'Upon it shall be frankincense but not upon the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings'. Might I not say, Upon it shall be frankincense but not upon the meal-offering of the priests? — It is more reasonable to include the meal-offering of the priests, since [like the meal-offering of the 'Omer it consists of] a tenth, is mixed [with a log of oil],[28] is brought [near the altar], [and is offered] by itself.[29] On the contrary it is more reasonable to include the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings, since [like the meal-offering of the 'Omer it is an offering on behalf of] the community,[30] is obligatory, [and may be offered in] uncleanness [and] on the Sabbath? — The former is the more plausible since there is written, Any one.[31]

'Meal-offering-this includes the meal-offering offered on the eighth day [of consecration], so that it too required frankincense'. Perhaps it excludes it? — It is out of the question; if you say that it includes it, it is well,[32] but if you say that it excludes it, the expression is then superfluous, for surely we would not infer a temporary enactment from a permanent law!

'It is — this excludes the Two Loaves, so that they require neither oil nor frankincense'. Might I not say that it excludes the meal-offering of priests? — It is more reasonable to include the meal-offering of priests, since [like the meal-offering of the 'Omer it consists of] a tenth, [requires] a vessel [of ministry], is unleavened, [is offered] by itself, must be brought near [to the altar], [and is burnt upon] the fire [of the altar].[33] On the contrary,

---

(1) Cf. Lev. II, 1. A promise of a meal-offering without further specification, entails the bringing of a tenth of an ephah of fine flour, together with oil and frankincense; they were mixed together and then the priest took out a handful from it and burnt it on the altar. This is the only individual meal-offering for which the Torah expressly prescribes oil and frankincense. The others enumerated in the Mishnah are derived by analogy from this meal-offering.

(2) Of the meal-offering baked in an oven, Lev. II, 4. It may consist either of ten unleavened cakes or ten unleavened wafers; v. Gemara.

(3) The daily meal-offering of the High Priest known as חביתי כהן גדול cf. Lev. VI, 13ff.

(4) All freewill-offerings may be accepted from gentiles, v. Shek. I, 5.

(5) I.e., when a woman offers a meal-offering of her free will.

(6) V. Lev. II, 14, and XXIII, 9-14.

(7) V. Num. XV, 4ff.

(8) Of Pentecost. V. Lev. XXIII, 17.

(9) Brought by a person of poor means as a sin-offering on the commission of any one of the transgressions mentioned in Lev. V, 1-4.

(10) Brought by a woman suspected by her husband of adultery; v. Num. V, 15.

(11) The first four meal-offerings mentioned in our Mishnah must each be baked into ten cakes, so that even the fourth kind of meal-offering, namely that baked in an oven, for which an alternative is allowed, must consist nevertheless either of ten cakes or of ten wafers, but not of five cakes and five wafers, contra R. Simeon. Another interpretation is: The meal-offerings enumerated in our Mishnah (as requiring both oil and frankincense) are ten in number, reckoning 'THE CAKES AND THE WAFERS' as two. According to R. Simeon, however, it must be reckoned as three, since the meal-offering baked in an oven may consist of either ten cakes or ten wafers or five cakes and five wafers.
(12) V. infra 63a and b.
(13) Lev. II, 15, with reference to the meal-offering of the 'Omer.
(14) Ibid.
(15) Cf. Lev. IX, 4.
(16) Whereas each cake of the Shewbread was of two tenths of flour.
(17) Wherein to knead the meal-offering, at which time it was hallowed. The Shewbread, on the other hand, was not hallowed until it was baked in the oven of the Sanctuary.
(18) The offering is performed upon the altar in the Temple court, whereas the offering of the Shewbread, i.e., the setting of the loaves on the table, was performed in the Temple proper, in the היכל.
(19) An expression signifying that it must not be kept overnight, as it belonged to the Most Holy class of offerings. The Shewbread, however, was kept for seven days upon the table, from Sabbath to Sabbath,
(20) Which is not the case with the Shewbread.
(21) The priest's meal-offering was wholly burnt upon the altar, and from the 'Omer-offering a handful was burnt; but no part of the Shewbread was burnt upon the altar.
(22) Which is not the case with the meal-offering of the priests.
(23) Every offering brought by the community as an obligation overrides the laws of uncleanness, cf. Pes. 76b. This is not so with the offering of an individual.
(24) The Shewbread and the remainder of the 'Omer-offering were shared amongst the priests and eaten, whereas the priests' meal-offering was wholly burnt.
(25) V. Glos. It is established law that every offering which is rendered permissible, either for the altar or for man, by a certain rite (the mattir, v. Glos.), is subject to the law of piggul. V. Zeb. 43a. The priests' meal-offering, however, since it is wholly burnt is outside the scope of this rule.
(26) The 'Omer-offering was brought even on the Sabbath (v. infra 63a), and the Shewbread was regularly offered, i.e., set, on the Sabbath; but no individual offering was brought on the Sabbath.
(27) Lev. II, 1. Lit., 'a soul', i.e., an individual. Since here in connection with the meal-offering of fine flour, where oil (as well as frankincense) is expressly prescribed, Scripture uses the term 'any one', it is inferred that every individual meal-offering requires oil (and also frankincense, v. infra). Hence the priests' meal-offering is included.
(28) Whereas the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings varied in quantity: one tenth for a lamb, two for a ram, and three for a bullock; and the quantities of oil also varied, the tenth of the lamb requiring to be mixed with three logs of oil, and each tenth of the ram and the bullock with two logs of oil. V. Num. XV, 4ff.
(29) The meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings did not require bringing near the altar; moreover it was not offered by itself but always accompanied an animal-offering.
(30) For it was offered as an obligation with the communal Daily Offerings, accordingly it overrode the rules of uncleanness and the laws of Sabbath.
(31) V. p. 349, n. 7.
(32) For otherwise, without the Scriptural direction, I should have thought that that meal-offering of consecration was without frankincense, as one could not apply the general law of the meal-offering to a particular temporary enactment.
(33) The Two Loaves, on the other hand, consisted of two tenths, had to be leavened, and were only hallowed when baked in the oven of the Sanctuary. They were not an offering by themselves but were brought together with the two lambs of Pentecost, and were subsequently eaten by the priests.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 59b

it is more reasonable to include the Two Loaves since [like the meal-offering of the 'Omer] they are offered on [behalf of] the community, are obligatory, [may be offered] in uncleanness, are eaten, [are subject to] piggul, [may be offered] on the Sabbath, render aught permissible,[1] [require] waving,

[must be from the produce of] the land [of Israel],[2] [are offered on a fixed] date,[3] [and must be offered from the] new [produce]; and here we have more points in common![4] — The former is the more plausible since there is written, Any one.[5]

MISHNAH. [A MAN IS] LIABLE BECAUSE OF THE OIL BY ITSELF AND BECAUSE OF THE FRANKINCENSE BY ITSELF.[6] IF HE PUT IN OIL, HE HAS RENDERED IT INVALID, BUT IF FRANKINCENSE, HE MUST PICK IT OFF AGAIN. IF HE PUT OIL ON THE REMAINDER, HE HAS NOT THEREBY TRANSGRESSED A NEGATIVE PRECEPT. IF HE PUT ONE VESSEL ABOVE THE OTHER VESSEL,[7] HE HAS NOT THEREBY RENDERED IT INVALID.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: He shall put no oil upon it,[8] but if he put oil thereon he has made it invalid. I might also say, Neither shall he put any frankincense thereon,[8] but if he did, he has made it invalid, the text therefore states for a sin-offering.[9] I might then say that this is so with the oil too, the text therefore states it is.[8] But why do you declare it invalid if oil was put thereon and valid if frankincense was put thereon? I declare it invalid if oil was put thereon, since it cannot be picked off again, but I declare it valid if frankincense was put thereon, since it can be picked off again.

Raba son of R. Huna enquired of R. Johanan, How is it if he put upon it fine frankincense? Is it [valid if frankincense was put thereon] because it can be picked off again, but in this case it cannot be picked off again; or is it because it does not become absorbed,[10] and this too does not become absorbed? Come and hear: AND IF FRANKINCENSE, HE MUST PICK IT OFF AGAIN,[11] — Perhaps there are two reasons for it: firstly, that it does not become absorbed, and another reason is that it can be picked off again.[12]

Come and hear: 'I declare it valid if frankincense was put thereon, since it can be picked off'! — Here again we can reply that there are two reasons for it.

How is it then? — R. Nahman b. Isaac answered, It was taught: If a man put frankincense upon the sinner's meal-offering or upon the meal-offering of jealousy, he must pick it off again and the meal-offering is valid. If before he had picked off the frankincense he expressed an intention [concerning an act to be performed] outside its proper time[13] or place, it is invalid but the penalty of kareth[14] is not incurred.[15] But if after he had picked off the frankincense[16] he expressed an intention [concerning an act to be performed] outside its proper place, it is invalid and the penalty of kareth is not incurred, but if outside its proper time, it is piggul[14] and the penalty of kareth is incurred.

Surely it should be regarded as rejected![17] — Abaye answered, Scripture still refers to it as a sin-offering.[18] Raba said, This represents the view of Hanan the Egyptian who does not consider anything as absolutely rejected. For it was taught: Hanan the Egyptian says, Even though the blood is still in the bowl he may, without casting lots, bring another goat and pair it with the other.[19] R. Ashi said, Whatsoever still remains in his power [to rectify] is never regarded as rejected.[20]

R. Adda said that R. Ashi's view is the more probable; for who is it that regards a matter as absolutely rejected? It is R. Judah, as we have learnt: Moreover, said R. Judah, if the blood[21] was poured out, the Scapegoat must be left to die;[22] and if the Scapegoat died, the blood must be poured out.[23] Nevertheless, in regard to a matter which is still in his power [to rectify], it has been taught: R. Judah says, A cup was filled with the mingled blood [that was spilt on the ground][24] and it was sprinkled in one action towards the base [of the altar].[25]

R. Isaac b. Joseph said in the name of R. Johanan, If a man put the minutest quantity of oil upon an olive's bulk of the [sinner's] meal-offering, he has thereby rendered it invalid. What is the reason? For 'he shall not put'[26] implies the putting of any quantity, however little; whilst 'upon it'[26] implies

at least the minimum quantity.[27]

R. Isaac b. Joseph also said in the name of R. Johanan, If a man put an olive's bulk of frankincense upon the minutest quantity of the [sinner's] meal-offering, he has thereby rendered it invalid. What is the reason? Because it is written, He shall not give [any frankincense],[28] which signifies that there must be a quantity thereof worthy to be given. And as for the term 'upon it',

---

(1) The 'Omer rendered the new produce permissible to be eaten in the land of Israel, while the Two Loaves rendered it permissible to be used henceforth in the Temple.

(2) Whereas all other meal-offerings could be brought from produce grown outside Palestine.

(3) The 'Omer on the sixteenth day of Nisan and the Two Loaves at Pentecost.

(4) As all these features are absent in the meal-offering of the priests the points in common between the 'Omer-offering and the Two Loaves certainly outnumber those enumerated above as common between the 'Omer-offering and the meal-offering of the priests.

(5) V. supra p. 349, n. 7.

(6) I.e., if he put either oil or frankincense upon the sinner's meal-offering or upon the meal-offering of jealousy.

(7) A vessel containing oil for frankincense was put over the one containing the sinner's meal-offering.

(8) Lev. V, 11, with reference to the sinner's meal-offering.

(9) Ibid. It is a valid sin-offering even though it has had frankincense put upon it.

(10) In the flour, as is the case with the oil.

(11) Evidently the main reason is that it can be picked off again; consequently where this is not possible, as in our case where the frankincense was ground fine, it would be invalid.

(12) And one reason is valid without the other so that even though it cannot be picked off again it is still valid since it is not absorbed in the flour.

(13) E.g., if during the taking out of the handful he intended to burn it outside its proper time or to eat of the remainder outside its proper time.

(14) V. Glos.

(15) For since the meal-offering is invalid by reason of the frankincense thereon the penalty for piggul cannot be incurred. V. supra 16b.

(16) And the meal-offering is valid once again. It is evident, therefore, that the sole reason why the addition of frankincense to the meal-offering does not render it absolutely invalid is that it can be picked off and so become valid once again.

(17) This is the text strongly supported by Tosaf. and for which there is MS. authority (v. Dik. Sof. a.l. n. 60), and the interpretation is as follows: Why is it taught in our Mishnah and in the Baraitha quoted in the Gemara that the frankincense may be picked off from the meal-offering? But surely, once the meal-offering has had frankincense put upon it, it became invalid and so absolutely rejected as a meal-offering! How then can it become valid after it had once been made invalid? Cf. the similar question in Zeb. 34b and the identical answers of Raba and R. Ashi. The text in cur. edd. reads: 'Let it be regarded as though a cruse (of oil had been poured out over the meal-offering); wherefore then is it rendered invalid by any wrongful intention? Surely it has become absolutely rejected!' And the interpretation is: why is it stated in the last-mentioned Baraitha that if a person expressed a wrongful intention with regard to the meal-offering whilst it had the frankincense upon it he has thereby rendered it invalid? But surely the wrongful intention cannot affect it since it has been already rejected as a meal-offering by reason of the frankincense that is upon it.

(18) Lev. V, 11. It is still valid as a sin-offering even after it has had frankincense upon it.

(19) Where the Scapegoat had died before the blood of the goat that was to be offered unto the Lord on the Day of Atonement had been sprinkled, the latter is by no means rejected as invalid so as to necessitate the bringing anew of two goats and to cast lots over them, but rather this blood becomes fit again for its purpose as soon as another goat is brought as a Scapegoat, v. Yoma 63b.

(20) Accordingly this meal-offering is not regarded as rejected as the frankincense can easily be picked off and so become valid once again.

(21) Of the goat that was to be offered inside unto the Lord.

(22) For it is absolutely rejected, and two goats must be brought anew.

(23) Yoma 62a.

(24) After all the Passover lambs had been slaughtered.

(25) The purpose being to render valid by this sprinkling any Passover-offering whose blood might have been spilt on the ground. V. Pes. 64a. Hence it is clear that a matter is not absolutely rejected provided it lies within one's power to set it right again.

(26) Lev. V,11.

(27) Namely an olive's bulk.

(28) Ibid. Usually translated He shall not lay thereon. The Heb. נתן 'give', however, is used, which verb in another context, Lev. XXII, 14, clearly implies something worthy to be given, at least an olive's bulk. V. Sh. Mek. n. 9.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 60a

it is an amplification following an amplification, and whenever an amplification follows another amplification it signifies limitation only.[1]

Others report it as follows: R. Isaac b. Joseph said that R. Johanan raised the following question, What is the law if a man put the minutest quantity of oil upon an olive's bulk of the [sinner's] meal-offering? Are we to say that in the putting [of oil] there must be the same quantity as the giving [of frankincense],[2] or not? The question remains unanswered.

IF HE PUT OIL ON THE REMAINDER. Our Rabbis taught: It is written, 'He shall not put', and 'He shall not give'. I might think that these prohibitions refer to two priests,[3] the text therefore states 'upon it'; thus the [prohibitions in the] verse clearly refer to the meal-offering itself and not to the priest. I might also think that he should not put one vessel above the other vessel, and that if he did so he has rendered it invalid, the text therefore states 'upon it', the verse clearly refers to the actual meal-offering.[4] MISHNAH. SOME [MEAL-OFFERINGS] REQUIRE BRINGING NEAR[5] BUT NOT WAVING,[6] SOME REQUIRE BRINGING NEAR AND ALSO WAVING, SOME REQUIRE WAVING BUT NOT BRINGING NEAR, AND SOME REQUIRE NEITHER BRINGING NEAR NOR WAVING. THESE REQUIRE BRINGING NEAR BUT NOT WAVING: THE MEAL-OFFERING OF FINE FLOUR,[7] THAT PREPARED ON A GRIDDLE, THAT PREPARED IN A PAN, THE CAKES AND THE WAFERS, THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE PRIESTS, THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED HIGH PRIEST, THE MEAL-OFFERING OF A GENTILE, THE MEAL-OFFERING OF WOMEN, AND THE SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING. R. SIMEON SAYS, THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE PRIESTS AND THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED HIGH PRIEST DO NOT REQUIRE BRINGING NEAR, SINCE NO HANDFUL IS TAKEN OUT OF THEM, AND WHERE NO HANDFUL IS TAKEN OUT BRINGING NEAR IS NOT NECESSARY.

GEMARA. R. Papa said,[8] All [the meal-offerings] enumerated in the Mishnah must consist of ten [cakes]. What does he teach us?-He wishes to exclude thereby R. Simeon's view who said, He may offer half in cakes and half in wafers; and so he teaches us [that it is not so].

Whence is it derived?[9] — Our Rabbis taught:[10] Had [Scripture] stated, And thou shalt bring that which is made of these things unto the Lord, and he shall present it unto the priest and he shall bring it unto the altar,[11] I would have said that I learn from this that the handful alone required bringing near; but whence would I know this of the whole meal-offering?[12] The text therefore states 'meal-offering'. And whence would I know this of the sinner's meal-offering? The text therefore states 'the meal-offering'. But surely this could be derived by the following argument:[13] [Scripture] speaks of the offering of

---

(1) The fact that the term 'upon it', which is an amplification signifying a minimum of an olive's bulk, is repeated indicates that in the second case, re frankincense, this minimum quantity is not essential.

(2) Namely at least an olive's bulk.

(3) But if the same priest put both oil and frankincense upon it he would only be liable once.

(4) The oil (or frankincense) must not be put actually upon the flour of the meal-offering and mixed with it, but it is of no consequence if the oil, being in a vessel, was placed over the meal-offering.

(5) I.e., to be taken by the priest to the south-west corner of the altar.

(6) The ceremony in which the priest put his hands under those of the person bringing the meal-offering and waved it to and fro before the altar; v. infra 61a Mishnah.

(7) For the explanation of the various kinds of meal-offerings v. foregoing Mishnah, supra p. 346 and notes thereon.

(8) For the two interpretations of this statement of R. Papa v. supra p. 347, n. 10.

(9) That the meal-offerings enumerated in our Mishnah require bringing near.

(10) The whole of the following Gemara till the next Mishnah is to be found in the Sifra, Lev. II, 8.

(11) The reference is to Lev. II, 8, and the verse in full reads: And thou shalt bring the meal-offering that is made etc.

(12) That the whole meal-offering must be brought near before the taking of the handful.

(13) That the sinner's meal-offering requires bringing near, so that "the" in the above verse is rendered superfluous.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 60b

a meal-offering as an obligation and it also speaks of the offering of a meal-offering as of free will: just as the freewill meal-offering requires bringing near, so the obligatory meal-offering requires bringing near. And [if it be objected that] this[1] is so of the freewill meal-offering since it requires both oil and frankincense,[2] then the meal-offering of a suspected adulteress can prove [the contrary].[3] And [if it be objected that] this is so of the meal-offering of the suspected adulteress since it requires waving, then the freewill meal-offering can prove [the contrary].[4] The argument thus goes round. The distinguishing feature of this [meal-offering] is not that of the other [meal-offering], and the distinguishing feature of the other [meal-offering] is not that of this one.[5] Their common features,[6] however, are that they are alike with regard to the taking of the handful and also with regard to bringing near; I will then also include the sinner's meal-offering, that since it is like unto them with regard to the taking of the handful it shall be like unto them also with regard to the bringing near. But [it will be objected that] there is yet another common feature, namely that the same offering is valid for the rich as for the poor, whereas in the case of the sinner's meal-offering the same offering is not valid for the rich as for the poor.[7] The text therefore [must] state ‘the meal-offering’. R. Simeon says, ‘And thou shalt bring’ — this includes the meal-offering of the ‘Omer, so that it too requires bringing near, as it is said, Ye shall bring the sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest unto the priest.[8] ‘And he shall present it’ — this includes the meal-offering of a suspected adulteress, so that it too requires bringing near, as it is said, And he shall present it unto the altar.[9] But surely this could be derived by the following argument:[10] if the sinner's meal-offering, which does not require waving, nevertheless requires bringing near, how much more does the meal-offering of a suspected adulteress, which requires waving, require bringing near! But [if it be objected that] this[11] is so of the sinner's meal-offering since it is offered from wheat,[12] then the meal-offering of the ‘Omer can prove [the contrary].[13] And [if it be objected that] this is so of the meal-offering of the ‘Omer since it requires both oil and frankincense, then the sinner's meal-offering can prove [the contrary]. The argument thus goes round. The distinguishing feature of this [meal-offering] is not that of the other, and the distinguishing feature of that [meal-offering] is not that of this one. Their common features,[14] however, are that they are alike with regard to the taking of the handful and also with regard to bringing near; I will then also include the meal-offering of a suspected adulteress, that since it is like unto them with regard to the taking of the handful it shall be like unto them also with regard to the bringing near. But [it will be objected that] there is yet another common feature, namely that coarse flour is not valid in either case,[15] whereas in the case of the meal-offering of the suspected adulteress [only] coarse flour is valid. The text [must] therefore state, ‘And he shall present it’. R. Judah says, ‘And thou shalt bring’, includes the meal-offering of a suspected adulteress, so that it too requires bringing near, as it is said, And he shall bring her offering for her.[16] For the meal-offering of the ‘Omer, however, no verse is necessary,[17] since it can be inferred from the following argument: if the sinner's meal-offering, which does not require

waving, requires bringing near, how much more does the meal-offering of the ‘Omer, which requires waving, require bringing near! But [if it be objected that] this is so of the sinner's meal-offering since it is offered of wheat, then the meal-offering of the suspected adulteress can prove [the contrary]. And [if it be objected that] that this is so of the meal-offering of the suspected adulteress since it is brought to discover guilt,[18] then the sinner's meal-offering can prove [the contrary].[19] The argument thus goes round. The distinguishing feature of this [meal-offering] is not that of the other, and the distinguishing feature of the other [meal-offering] is not that of this one. Their common features,[20] however, are that they are alike with regard to the taking of the handful and also with regard to bringing near; I will then include the meal-offering of the ‘Omer, too, that since it is like unto them in respect of the taking of the handful it shall be like unto them in respect of bringing near. And what objection can you now raise against this? R. Simeon, however, objects to it on this ground: there is yet another common feature, namely that those may happen frequently.[21] But R. Judah maintains that, on the contrary; this[22] is more frequent, whereas the others may never happen at all.

But perhaps the expression ‘And thou shalt bring’[23] serves rather to intimate that an individual may of his free will bring a meal-offering other than those mentioned in the context![24] And this can even be supported by the following argument: the community brings a meal-offering of wheat[25] as an obligation and it also brings a meal-offering of barley[26] as an obligation, then likewise an individual, since he brings a meal-offering of wheat of his free will, may also bring a meal-offering of barley of his free will. The text therefore states these:[23] only these that are mentioned in the context. But perhaps the expression ‘these’ serves only to signify that a person who says ‘I take upon myself to offer a meal-offering’ must bring the five kinds.[27] The text therefore states ‘of these’, implying that if he so wishes he may bring one only, and if he so wishes he may bring the five kinds.

R. Simeon says, The expression ‘the meal-offering’[23] includes other meal-offerings,[28] so that they too require bringing near. But I might say that it includes also the Two Loaves and the Shewbread, the text therefore states of these. And why do you prefer to include other meal-offerings and to exclude the Two Loaves and the Shewbread [rather than the reverse]?[29] include other meal-offerings since part thereof is put upon the fire of the altar,’ but I exclude the Two Loaves and the Shewbread since no part thereof is put upon the fire of the altar. But the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings is put entirely upon the fire, is it not? Then I would say that it requires bringing near! The text therefore states, And he shall present it.[30] But have you not employed this expression for another purpose?[31] — [For that alone, Scripture could have stated] ‘And he shall present’, but it says, And he shall present it.[32] And why do you prefer to include other meal-offerings and to exclude the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings [rather than the reverse]?

---

(1) The rite of bringing near.

(2) Whereas the obligatory meal-offering, namely the sinner's meal-offering, requires neither oil nor frankincense; and that being so, it would also not require bringing near.

(3) This meal-offering requires neither oil nor frankincense and yet requires bringing near; the same would be said of the sinner's meal-offering.

(4) The freewill meal-offering does not require waving yet requires bringing near; the same could be said of the sinner's meal-offering.

(5) The rite of waving prescribed in the meal-offering of the suspected adulteress cannot be said to be the cause entailing the bringing near since this cause is not found with the freewill meal-offering. And, on the other hand, the need for oil and frankincense in the freewill meal-offering cannot be the cause entailing the bringing near since this cause is not found with the meal-offering of the suspected adulteress.

(6) Between the freewill meal-offering and the meal-offering of a suspected adulteress.

(7) The meal-offering brought as a sin-offering is prescribed only for a person in poor circumstances; a person of better means must bring a pair of doves, and a rich person a lamb, for a sin-offering. V. Lev. V, 6, 7, 11.

(8) Ibid. XXIII, 10, where the same expression ‘bring’ is used.

(9) Num. V, 25, where the same expression ‘present’ is used,

(10) That the meal-offering of a suspected adulteress requires bringing near, so that the verse which expressly includes it becomes superfluous.
(11) The rite of bringing near.
(12) Whereas the meal-offering of a suspected adulteress was of barley; cf. Num. V, 15.
(13) The 'Omer meal-offering was of barley and yet required bringing near; the same would then be said of the meal-offering of a suspected adulteress.
(14) Between the 'Omer meal-offering and the sinner's meal-offering.
(15) The sinner's meal-offering must be of fine flour of wheat and the 'Omer meal-offering, although of barley, must also be fine and not coarse.
(16) Num. V, 15, where the same expression 'bring' is used.
(17) To teach that it requires bringing near. According to R. Judah the expression 'And he shall present it' is utilized later for another purpose; v. infra.
(18) To ascertain whether this woman committed adultery or not. The 'Omer meal-offering, on the other hand, has no relation to sin.
(19) For it is not brought in order to discover sin but rather to atone for a sin committed, and yet requires bringing near; the same would be said of the meal-offering of the 'Omer, namely, although it has no relation to any sin it requires bringing near.
(20) Between the sinner's meal-offering and the meal-offering of the suspected adulteress.
(21) Those two meal-offerings (v. p. 358, n. 6) may be offered quite frequently, whereas the 'Omer meal-offering is offered but once a year, on the sixteenth day of Nisan.
(22) The 'Omer meal-offering.
(23) Lev. II, 8.
(24) I.e., that an individual be allowed to offer a meal-offering of barley of his free will, for all the meal-offerings mentioned in the context are of wheat.
(25) The Two Loaves at Pentecost.
(26) The meal-offering of the 'Omer.
(27) That are enumerated in this passage viz., the meal-offering of fine flour, that prepared on a griddle, that prepared in a pan, and that, baked in the oven which is of two kinds, of cakes and of wafers.
(28) Namely, the sinner's meal-offering, thus in agreement with the view of the first Tanna stated supra 60a, ad fin. The additional words in the text, e.g., 'the meal-offering of a gentile and the meal-offering of women' are not found in the MSS., or in the parallel passage in the Sifra, and evidently were not in the text before Rashi. They are struck out by Sh. Mek.
(29) Sc. the handful. And in this respect they are like those meal-offerings mentioned in the context.
(30) Lev. II, 8.
(31) Supra p. 357. The expression, as stated above, includes the meal-offering of a suspected adulteress.
(32) It is therefore the pronominal suffix 'it' which excludes this meal-offering that is offered with the drink-offerings.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 61a

I include other meal-offerings since they may be offered by themselves,[1] but I exclude the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings since it may not be offered by itself. But the meal-offering of the priests and the meal-offering of the anointed High Priest are offered by themselves, are they not? Then I would say that they require bringing near! The text therefore states, 'And he shall bring it near', But surely this expression is required for its own sake, namely that [the meal-offerings mentioned in the context] require bringing near! — [For that alone Scripture could have stated] 'And he shall bring near', but it says, And he shall bring it near.[2] And why do you prefer to include other meal-offerings and to exclude the meal-offering of the priests and the meal-offering of the anointed High Priest [rather than the reverse]? I include the other meal-offerings since [like the meal-offerings stated in the context] part thereof is put upon the fire of the altar, they are offered by themselves, and part thereof[3] is eaten by the priests, but I exclude the Two Loaves and the Shewbread since no part thereof is put upon the fire of the altar, [I exclude] the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings since it is not offered by itself, and [I exclude] the meal-offering of

the priests and the meal-offering of the anointed High Priest since no part thereof is eaten by the priests.

And he shall take out:[4] I might think with a vessel; the text therefore states [elsewhere], And he shall take out therefrom with his handful;[5] as the taking out in the latter case is with his handful, so the taking out in the former is with his handful.

MISHNAH. THESE REQUIRE WAVING BUT NOT BRINGING NEAR: THE LOG OF OIL OF THE LEPER AND HIS GUILT-OFFERING,[6] THE FIRSTFRUITS ACCORDING TO R. ELIEZER B. JACOB, THE SACRIFICIAL PORTIONS OF AN INDIVIDUAL'S PEACE-OFFERINGS AND THE BREAST AND THIGH THEREOF, WHETHER THEY ARE THE OFFERINGS OF MEN OR OF WOMEN, BY ISRAELITES BUT NOT BY OTHERS;[7] THE TWO LOAVES AND THE TWO LAMBS OF PENTECOST. HOW IS IT PERFORMED? HE PLACES THE TWO LOAVES UPON THE TWO LAMBS AND PUTS HIS TWO HANDS BENEATH THEM AND WAVES THEM FORWARD AND BACKWARD AND UPWARD AND DOWNWARD, FOR IT IS WRITTEN, WHICH IS WAVED AND WHICH IS HEAVED UP.[8] THE WAVING WAS PERFORMED ON THE EAST SIDE[9] [OF THE ALTAR] AND THE BRINGING NEAR ON THE WEST SIDE. THE CEREMONY OF WAVING COMES BEFORE THAT OF BRINGING NEAR.[10] THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE 'OMER AND THE MEAL-OFFERING OF JEALOUSY REQUIRE BRINGING NEAR AND WAVING. THE SHEWBREAD AND THE MEAL-OFFERING WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS REQUIRE NEITHER BRINGING NEAR NOR WAVING.

R. SIMEON SAYS, THERE ARE THREE KINDS OF OFFERING WHICH [BETWEEN THEM] REQUIRE THREE RITES; TWO [OF THE THREE RITES] APPLY TO EACH KIND OF OFFERING, BUT THE THREE ARE WITH NONE. AND THESE ARE THEY: THE PEACE-OFFERING OF THE INDIVIDUAL, THE PEACE-OFFERING OF THE COMMUNITY[11] AND THE GUILT-OFFERING OF THE LEPER. THE PEACE-OFFERING OF THE INDIVIDUAL REQUIRES THE LAYING ON OF HANDS FOR THE LIVING ANIMAL AND WAVING[12] AFTER IT IS SLAUGHTERED, BUT IT DOES NOT REQUIRE WAVING FOR THE LIVING ANIMAL. THE PEACE-OFFERING OF THE COMMUNITY REQUIRES WAVING FOR THE LIVING ANIMAL AND ALSO AFTER IT IS SLAUGHTERED, BUT IT DOES NOT REQUIRE THE LAYING ON OF HANDS. THE GUILT-OFFERING OF THE LEPER REQUIRES THE LAYING ON OF HANDS AND ALSO WAVING FOR THE LIVING ANIMAL, BUT IT DOES NOT REQUIRE WAVING AFTER IT IS SLAUGHTERED.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: And he shall offer it for a guilt-offering, and the log of oil, and shall wave them for a wave-offering;[13] this teaches us that they[14] are to be waved together. But whence is it inferred that it is valid even if each was waved separately? The text therefore states, And he shall offer it for a guilt-offering, and the log of oil, and shall wave.[15] Perhaps then they[14] should first be waved [together] and again be waved [separately]?[16] The verse clearly states, 'For a wave-offering', and not for wave-offerings. Before the Lord,[17] that is, on the east side of the altar.[18] But has it not been said, 'Before the Lord:[19] perhaps this means on the west side'?[20] — I answer, That was said only of the meal-offering for it is designated a sin-offering, and a sin-offering requires the base of the altar,[21] whereas at the south-east corner there was no base;[22] here,[23] however, we certainly can speak of the east side as 'before the Lord'.

THE FIRSTFRUITS ACCORDING TO R. ELIEZER B. JACOB. What is the teaching of R. Eliezer b. Jacob? — It was taught: And the priest shall take the basket out of thy hand:[24] this indicates that the firstfruits require waving; so R. Eliezer b. Jacob. What is the reason of R. Eliezer b. Jacob? — It is derived from the occurrence of the word 'hand' both here and in connection with the peace-offerings. Here it is written, 'And the priest shall take the basket out of thy hand', and there it

is written, His[25] own hands shall bring the offerings.[26]

---

(1) And in this respect it is like the meal-offerings mentioned in this context.

(2) The former general expression informs us of the requirement of bringing near, whilst the suffix 'it' excludes others from this ceremony.

(3) I.e., the remainder after the handful has been burnt.

(4) Lev. II, 9.

(5) Ibid. VI, 8.

(6) Brought by the leper on the day of his cleansing, cf. ibid. XIV, 10, 12.

(7) Explained in the Gemara, infra p. 364.

(8) Ex. XXIX, 27.

(9) According to Rashi this means, even on the east side, but it is all the better if performed on the west side which is the side nearest to the inner Sanctuary and thus best fulfils the expression 'before the Lord' used in connection with the waving (Lev. XIV, 12). According to Maim. it is to be performed on the east side only; v. Yad, Ma'aseh ha-Korbanoth IX, 7.

(10) In those offerings where both ceremonies must be performed.

(11) These are the two lambs of Pentecost.

(12) Sc. of the breast and thigh.

(13) Lev. XIV, 12.

(14) The log of oil and the lamb of the guilt-offering.

(15) Interpreting 'and shall wave' as referring to the last mentioned, namely the log of oil by itself.

(16) So as to fulfil both possible interpretations of the verse.

(17) Lev. XIV, 12.

(18) I.e., even on the east side, v. supra p. 361, n. 7.

(19) Ibid. VI, 7.

(20) V. supra 19b. It is clear therefore that the expression 'before the Lord' could well mean the west side.

(21) Where the residue of the blood of the sin-offering must be tossed.

(22) V. Mid. 35b. Accordingly 'before the Lord' in connection with the bringing near of the meal-offering must be interpreted as the south-west corner; west being essential on account of the base; and south also, so as to fulfil the requirement 'to the front of the altar' (Lev. VI, 7), since that is considered as the front of the altar, for there the ascent begins.

(23) In the case of the waving.

(24) Deut. XXVI, 4.

(25) Sc. the owner's.

(26) Lev. VII, 30, with reference to the waving of the breast and thigh of the peace-offering.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 61b

Just as here the priest [is stated], so there too the priest [is meant]; and just as there the owner [is referred to], so here too the owner [is required]. How is it to be done? The priest places his hand under the hands of the owner and waves.

And why does not [the Mishnah] say, 'The firstfruits also according to R. Judah'? For it was taught: R. Judah says, And thou shalt set it down:[1] this refers to the rite of waving. You say that it refers to the waving, but perhaps it means literally 'setting it down!' As it has already said, And set it down, setting down [in the literal sense] has already been indicated. What then is the meaning of, 'And thou shalt set it down'? It can only refer to the waving! — Raba answered, It is only because his[2] verse is stated earlier in the chapter.[3] R. Nahman b. Isaac answered, It is because his[2] knowledge was exceptional.[4]

THE SACRIFICIAL PORTIONS OF AN INDIVIDUAL'S PEACE-OFFERINGS AND THE BREAST AND THE THIGH THEREOF, WHETHER THEY ARE THE OFFERINGS OF MEN OR

OF WOMEN, BY ISRAELITES BUT NOT BY OTHERS. What does this mean? Said Rab Judah: It means this: WHETHER THEY ARE THE OFFERINGS OF MEN OR OF WOMEN these offerings require waving, but the rite of waving shall be performed by Israelites and not by women.[5]

Our Rabbis taught: The children of Israel may perform the rite of waving but not gentiles; the children of Israel may perform the rite of waving but not women. R. Jose said, Since we find that Scripture has distinguished between the offering of an Israelite and the offering of a gentile or of a woman with regard to the laying on of hands,[6] should we not also make this distinction with regard to the rite of waving?[7] No; for whereas there is good reason to make such a distinction with regard to the laying on of hands, by virtue of the fact that the laying on of hands must be performed by the owner of the offering,[8] is there any reason to make such a distinction with regard to the rite of waving, seeing that the priests [also] perform the waving?[9] Why then[10] does the text expressly state 'the children of Israel'?[11] To teach that the children of Israel may perform the waving but not gentiles;[12] the children of Israel may perform the waving but not women.[13]

Another [Baraitha] taught: It is written, The children of Israel. I know from this that the children of Israel [perform the waving]; whence do I know to include also proselytes and freed slaves? The text therefore states, He that offereth.[14] Perhaps 'he that offereth' refers only to the priest! But since the verse states subsequently, His own hands shall bring the offerings,[15] the owners are already indicated. How is it then to be explained?[16] The priest places his hand under the hands of the owner and waves.

---

(1) Deut. XXVI, 10.

(2) Sc. R. Eliezer b. Jacob's.

(3) Since R. Eliezer b. Jacob based his exposition on Deut. XXVI, 4, and R. Judah on v. 10, the Tanna of the Mishnah therefore only quoted R. Eliezer b. Jacob.

(4) Lit., 'his strength was great'. Cf. 'Er. 62b.

(5) A woman's peace-offering was waved by the priest on her behalf.

(6) For the offering of a woman or a gentile does not require the laying on of the hands, not even by proxy.

(7) That the offering of women or of gentiles shall not be waved at all, not even by a priest on their behalf.

(8) Personally and not by proxy; hence the rite of laying on the hands cannot apply to the offerings of women and gentiles as it is not proper for them to enter the Sanctuary for this purpose.

(9) So that in the case of women and gentiles the priest may act on their behalf.

(10) Seeing that as a result of the foregoing argument the offerings of women and gentiles require waving by the priest on their behalf.

(11) Lev. VII, 29, stated with reference to the rite of waving.

(12) Personally; the priest, however, waves it on their behalf.

(13) V. Dik. Sof. for a variant text that is inserted here. V. also Sh. Mek. n. 2.

(14) Lev. VII, 29, stated with reference to the rite of waving.

(15) Ibid. 30.

(16) The latter verse speaks of the owner himself performing the waving, whereas the previous verse, it has been suggested, refers to the rite as being performed by the priest. How are these verses to be reconciled?

How was it arranged?[1] The sacrificial portions were put upon the palm of the hand and the breast and thigh above them; and whenever there were cakes [to be waved] the cakes were always on top, Where [is this seen]?[2] — R. Papa said, At the consecration [of the priests].[3]

Why is it so?[4] Shall I say it is because it is written, The thigh of heaving and the breast of waving they shall put upon the fat of the fire-offering, to wave it for a wave-offering?[5] But is it not also written, He shall bring the fat upon the breast?[6] — Abaye answered, The latter refers to the manner in which the priest brings them from the slaughtering place and turns them over [into the hands of the priest that is about to wave them].[7] But is it not also written, And they put the fat upon the breasts?[8] — This refers to the handing over of these to the priest that is about to burn them.[9] These verses incidentally teach us that three priests are required [for this part of the service], as it is said, In the multitude of people is the king's glory.[10]

THE TWO LOAVES AND THE TWO LAMBS OF PENTECOST. Our Rabbis taught: [It is written,] And the priest shall wave then, upon [‘al] the bread of the firstfruits [for a wave-offering before the Lord upon [‘al] the two lambs].[11] I might think that he should put the lambs upon the bread, the text therefore states, Upon the two lambs.[11] If [I had only the expression] ‘upon the two lambs’ [to go by], I might think that he should put the bread upon the lambs, the text therefore states, ‘upon the bread of the firstfruits’. Now the verse is equally balanced and I know not whether the bread shall be upon the lambs or the lambs upon the bread; since, however, we find that in all cases the bread is on top, then here, too, the bread shall be on top. (Where was it so? — R. Papa said, At the consecration [of the priests].)[12] R. Jose b. ha-Meshullam says, The lambs shall be on top. And how can I explain, ‘Upon the two lambs’? to exclude the seven lambs.[13] Hanina b. Hakinai says, He must put the two loaves between the thighs of the lambs and wave them;[14] thus fulfilling both verses, the bread upon the lambs and the lambs upon the bread. Said Rabbi, Surely before a king of flesh and blood one would not do so,[15] how much less before the King of Kings, the Holy One, blessed be He! Therefore, he should put one beside the other and wave them. But we have to conform with [the expression] ‘al![16] — R. Hisda said to R. Hamnuna (others say, R. Hamnuna said to R. Hisda), Rabbi follows his general view that ‘al means ‘near to’; as it was taught: It is written, And thou shalt put pure frankincense ‘ai each row.[17] Rabbi says, ‘Al means near to’. You say that ‘al means ‘near to’; but perhaps it is not so but rather it signifies literally ‘upon’? Since it states, And thou shalt put a veil ‘al the ark,[18] conclude that ‘al means ‘near to’.

AND WAVES THEM FORWARD AND BACKWARD AND UPWARD AND DOWNWARD. R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan, FORWARD AND BACKWARD,[19] that is to Him unto Whom the [four] directions belong; UPWARD AND DOWNWARD, that is to Him unto Whom heaven and earth belong. In the West[20] it was taught as follows: R. Hama b. ‘Ukba said in the name of R. Jose b. R. Hanina, FORWARD AND BACKWARD, in order to keep off violent winds; UPWARD AND DOWNWARD, in order to keep off harmful dews.

R. Jose son of R. Abin said, This proves that even the dispensable rites of a precept[21] [when performed] ward off punishment, for the rite of waving is dispensable in the precept and yet it keeps off violent winds and harmful dews.

Rabbah said, Likewise with the lulab.[22] R. Aha b. Jacob used to swing it forward and backward, and hold it out and say, ‘An arrow in the eyes of Satan!’[23] But it is not proper to do so, for it is a challenge [to Satan] to contend with him.

Our Rabbis taught: The peace-offerings of the community require waving [also] after they are slaughtered, and the waving must be of them as they are.[24] So Rabbi. But the Sages say, Only of the

breast and thigh. Wherein do they differ? — R. Hisda said to R. Hamnuna (others say, R. Hamnuna said to R. Hisda), They differ as to whether we say 'Deduce from it and again from it', or 'Deduce from it and establish it in its own place'.[25] The Rabbis maintain the principle, 'Deduce from it and again from it'. ['Deduce from it':] as the individual's peace-offering requires waving after it is slaughtered, so the peace-offerings of the community also require waving after they are slaughtered; and 'again from it': just as the waving there[26] is of the breast and thigh, so here it is also of the breast and thigh. Rabbi, however, maintains the principle 'Deduce from it and establish it in its own place'. ['Deduce from it':] as the individual's peace-offering requires waving after it is slaughtered, so the peace-offerings of the community also require waving after they are slaughtered; and 'establish it in its own place': whereas there[26] the waving is of the breast and thigh only, here it is of them as they are, that is, as they are when alive.

---

(1) For the waving.

(2) That the cakes were put on top.

(3) Cf. Lev. VIII, 26, 27. where it is expressly stated that the cakes were put on top.

(4) That the breast and thigh shall be placed above the sacrificial portions i.e., above the fat.

(5) Lev. X, 15.

(6) Ibid. VII, 30.

(7) So that now in the hands of the priest that waves them the breast and thigh are above the fat.

(8) Ibid. IX, 20.

(9) The priest that waved them when handing them to another priest to be burnt would naturally turn them over into that other priest's hands, so that now the fat would be on top.

(10) Prov. XIV, 28.

(11) Lev. XXIII, 20. The Heb. עַל usually connotes 'upon', but this term precedes 'the bread' and also 'the two lambs', hence the difficulty as to which was in fact 'upon' the other.

(12) V. supra p. 365, n. 8.

(13) The seven lambs brought as burnt-offerings with the bread (ibid. 18) were not waved with it.

(14) He must lay down the lambs on their sides, place the loaves between their legs, i.e., above the lower but beneath the upper leg, and thus wave them.

(15) It is most undignified to present the bread in this manner.

(16) Which usually means 'upon'.

(17) Lev. XXIV, 7, with reference to the two rows of the Shewbread.

(18) Ex. XL, 3. The veil was not 'upon' the ark but 'near to' i.e., in front of it, Screening it off and serving as a partition between the holy place and the Holy of Holies.

(19) I.e., in all four directions.

(20) In Palestine.

(21) Lit., 'the remainder of a precept', i.e., those rites which even if omitted do not affect the validity of the service. Among such are the rites of laying on the hands and waving.

(22) The palm branch required for the Festival of Tabernacles must be waved in the same manner as the waving of the offering. viz., 10 the four directions and upward and downward.

(23) An expression of defiance, as if to say, 'I defy you Satan!' Or: 'this is an arrow or weapon against your wiles, Satan!' (R. Gershom).

(24) I.e., the whole of the slaughtered beast must be waved and not only the breast and thigh.

(25) Whenever a subject is inferred from another by means of analogy or by 'the common features' the question always arises as to the extent to which the inference must be carried. The rule 'deduce from it and again from it' clearly suggests that the two subjects must in the end be brought to absolute agreement on every point. On the other hand, 'deduce from it and establish it in its place' suggests that the inference is to be made with regard to one point only, and as for the rest each subject is regulated by the rules governing its other aspects.

(26) The individual's peace-offering.

R. Papa said, All accept the principle 'Deduce from it and again from it', but this is Rabbi's reason, namely, it[1] must be analogous with the rule there: and as in that case all that which is given as a gift to the priest [must be waved], so here also all that which is given as a gift to the priest [must be waved].[2] Rabina said, All accept the principle 'Deduce from it and establish it in its own place', but this is the reason of the Rabbis: It is written, Their peace-offerings,[3] which is an inclusive term.

R. SIMEON SAYS, THERE ARE THREE KINDS OF OFFERING WHICH [BETWEEN THEM] REQUIRE THREE RITES; TWO [OF THE THREE RITES] APPLY TO EACH KIND OF OFFERING, BUT THE THREE ARE WITH NONE. AND THESE ARE THEY: THE PEACE-OFFERING OF THE INDIVIDUAL, THE PEACE-OFFERING OF THE COMMUNITY AND THE GUILT-OFFERING OF THE LEPER, THE PEACE-OFFERING OF THE INDIVIDUAL REQUIRES THE LAYING ON OF HANDS FOR THE LIVING ANIMAL AND WAVING AFTER IT IS SLAUGHTERED, BUT IT DOES NOT REQUIRE WAVING FOR THE LIVING ANIMAL. THE PEACE-OFFERING OF THE COMMUNITY REQUIRES WAVING FOR THE LIVING ANIMAL AND ALSO AFTER IT IS SLAUGHTERED, BUT IT DOES NOT REQUIRE THE LAYING ON OF HANDS. THE GUILT-OFFERING OF THE LEPER REQUIRES THE LAYING ON OF HANDS AND ALSO WAVING FOR THE LIVING ANIMAL, BUT IT DOES NOT REQUIRE WAVING AFTER IT IS SLAUGHTERED. But [surely one could argue by the following] a fortiori argument that the peace-offering of the individual should require waving for the living animal: for if the peace-offering of the community, which does not require the laying on of hands for the living animal, requires waving for the living animal, how much more does the peace-offering of the individual, which requires the laying on of hands for the living animal, require waving for the living animal! — The Divine Law stated in connection with the peace-offering of the community the exclusive term 'them'[4] in order to exclude the peace-offering of the individual. Again [one could argue by the following] a fortiori argument that the' peace-offering of the community should require the laying on of hands: for if the peace-offering of the individual, which does not require waving for the living animal, requires the laying on of hands, how much more does the peace-offering of the community, which requires waving for the living animal, require the laying on of hands! — Said Rabina: There is a tradition that among the offerings of the community only two require the laying on of hands.[5] And again [one could argue by the following] a fortiori argument that the guilt-offering of the leper should require waving after it is slaughtered: for if the peace-offering of the individual, which does not require waving for the living animal, requires waving after it is slaughtered, how much more should the guilt-offering of the leper, which requires waving for the living animal, require waving after it is slaughtered! — The Divine Law therefore stated the exclusive term 'it'[6] in connection with the peace-offering of the individual in order to exclude the guilt-offering of the leper.

Our Rabbis taught: If five persons brought one offering [jointly], one of them performs the rite of waving on behalf of them all. In the case of a woman, the priest waves [the offering] on her behalf. And so, too, if a person sent his offerings from across the seas, the priest waves them on his behalf.

---

(1) The peace-offering of the community.

(2) Here the whole beast is a gift to the priest, whilst in the case of an individual's peace-offering only the breast and thigh 'are given to the priest.

(3) Lev. VII, 34. with reference to the peace-offering of an individual. The use of the plural 'peace-offerings' signifies that even in another kind of peace-offering, namely that of the community, only the breast and the thigh are to be waved.

(4) Lev. XXIII, 20.

(5) And these are: the bullock offered when the whole community sinned in error and the Scapegoat on the Day of Atonement,

(6) Lev. VII, 30.

MISHNAH. IF A MAN SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF [TO OFFER A MEAL-OFFERING] PREPARED ON A GRIDDLE', HE MUST NOT BRING ONE PREPARED IN A PAN; IF 'IN A PAN', HE MUST NOT BRING ONE PREPARED ON A GRIDDLE. WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A GRIDDLE [MAHABATH][1] AND A PAN [MARHESHETH]?[2] THE PAN HAS A LID TO IT, BUT THE GRIDDLE HAS NO LID. SO R. JOSE THE GALILEAN. R. HANINA B. GAMALIEL SAYS, A PAN IS DEEP AND WHAT IS PREPARED THEREIN IS SPONGY,[3] A GRIDDLE IS FLAT AND WHAT IS PREPARED THEREON IS HARD.

GEMARA. What is R. Jose's reason?[4] Shall I say that marhesheth is so called because it is offered for the stirrings of the heart,[5] as it is written, My heart is stirred [rahash] by a goodly matter,[6] and mahabath because it is offered for the pratings of the mouth,[7] as people remark 'He is prating' [menabah nabuhe]?[8] But the reverse might just as well be said, namely, mahabath is so called because it is offered for the secrets of the heart, as it is written, Wherefore didst thou flee secretly [nahbetha],[9] and marhesheth because it is offered for the whispering [of the lips], as people remark 'His lips were whispering [merahshan]'![10] — We must say that it is established so by tradition.[11]

R. HANINA B. GAMALIEL SAYS etc. The pan is a deep vessel, for so it is written, And all that is prepared in the pan;[12] the griddle is flat, for so it is written, And on the griddle.[12]

Our Rabbis taught: Beth Shammai say, If a man said, 'I take upon myself [to offer] a marhesheth',[13] [the vow] must stand over until Elijah comes. They are in doubt as to whether [these terms][12] refer to the vessel or to the pastry prepared therein. But Beth Hillel say, There was a vessel in the Temple called marhesheth, resembling a deep mould, which gave the dough that was put into it the shape of Cretan apples and Grecian nuts. Furthermore it is written, And all that is prepared in the pan and on the griddle;[12] we thus see that these terms refer to the vessels and not to the pastry prepared therein.

MISHNAH. [IF A MAN SAID,] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF [TO OFFER A MEAL-OFFERING BAKED] IN AN OVEN', HE MUST NOT BRING WHAT IS BAKED IN A STOVE[14] OR ON TILES OR IN THE FIREPLACE OF THE ARABS.[15] R. JUDAH SAYS, IF HE SO WISHES HE MAY BRING WHAT IS BAKED IN A STOVE. [IF HE SAID,] I TAKE UPON MYSELF [TO OFFER] A BAKED MEAL-OFFERING', HE MAY NOT BRING HALF IN CAKES AND HALF IN WAFERS.[16] R. SIMEON PERMITS IT SINCE BOTH KINDS BELONG TO THE SAME OFFERING.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: Baked in the oven[17] — but not baked in a stove or on tiles or in the fireplaces of the Arabs. R. Judah says, Oven[18] is stated twice, in order to permit even what is baked in a stove. R. Simeon says, 'Oven' is stated twice, once to teach that it must be baked in an oven, and once that it is hallowed by the oven. But is R. Simeon of this view?[19] Surely we have learnt:[20] R. Simeon says, Accustom thyself to say, The Two Loaves and the Shewbread were valid whether made in the Temple court or in Beth Page![21] — Raba answered, Say rather, it should be consecrated for the oven.[22]

[IF HE SAID,] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF [TO OFFER] A BAKED MEAL-OFFERING', HE MAY NOT BRING HALF IN CAKES etc. Our Rabbis taught: And when thou bringest,[17] that is, when thou bringest, doing so as a matter of free choice. An offering of a meal-offering:[17] R. Judah said, Whence do I know that if a man said, 'I take upon myself [to offer] a baked meal-offering', he may not bring half in cakes and half in wafers? Because the text states, 'An offering of a meal-offering': I spoke to thee of one offering but not of two or three offerings. Said to him R. Simeon,

---

(1) מחבת.
(2) מרחשת.
(3) Heb. רוחשין, from the root רחש, 'to move', 'vibrate'. 'Every thing that is soft and spongy, because of the liquid contained therein, appears as though it were creeping and moving' (Rashi on Lev. II, 7).
(4) For his view that the מרחשת, the pan, is covered with a lid and that the מחבת, the griddle, has no lid.
(5) I.e., sinful thoughts which are covered and hidden from all; accordingly the offering must be prepared in a covered vessel.
(6) Ps. XLV, 2. Heb. רחש which is also the root of מרחשת.
(7) I.e., sinful talk, like slander; as it is spoken openly without concealment the offering too must be prepared in an open vessel without a cover.
(8) מנבח נבוחי, which words resemble מחבת. There are many variants of these words in MSS., v. Rabbinowicz, Dik. Sof. n. 90.
(9) Gen. XXXI, 27. Heb. נחבאת which word resembles מחבת. Accordingly the מרחשת should be a covered vessel.
(10) מרחשן which word resembles מרחשת. Accordingly the מרחשת should be an open vessel.
(11) That the מרחשת is a covered vessel and the מחבת an open one.
(12) Lev. VII, 9.
(13) The expression used is ambiguous. He did not say 'a meal-offering prepared in a marhesheth'; neither did he say 'a marhesheth meal-offering'. By 'marhesheth' he might have meant to offer this kind of vessel to the Temple. (8) Marhesheth and Mahabath.
(14) A small oven only large enough for one pot to be placed on it.
(15) Improvised fireplaces of the Arabs, a cavity in the ground laid out with clay (Jast.).
(16) For the baked meal-offering either ten cakes or ten wafers must be offered, but not, e.g., five of one kind and five of the other.
(17) Lev. II, 4.
(18) Ibid. and in VII, 9.
(19) That the oven hallows the offering.
(20) Infra 95b.
(21) בית פאגי, a place outside the Temple court but within the walls of Jerusalem. V. infra 78b, P. 468, n. 6. Now if R. Simeon were of the opinion that the oven hallowed the offering, it would surely become invalid as soon as it was taken out of the Temple court! V. however, Tosaf. s.v. ובשרות, and Sh. Mek. n. 27.
(22) I.e., when setting aside the flour for this meal-offering one should expressly state that it is to be baked in the oven.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 63b

Is the term 'offering' stated twice in the verse?[1] 'Offering' is stated only once, and concerning it are mentioned cakes and wafers; so that if he so desires he may bring cakes or he may bring wafers or he may 'bring half in cakes and half in wafers. He must mingle them [with oil] and the handful must be taken from the two [kinds].[2] If when taking the handful there came into his hand only one of the two [kinds], it is valid. R. Jose son of R. Judah says, Whence do I know that if a man said, 'I take upon myself [to offer] a baked meal-offering', he may not bring half in cakes and half in wafers? Because it is written, And every meal-offering that is baked in the oven, and every [meal-offering] that is prepared in the pan, and on the griddle, shall be the priest's that offereth it. And every meal-offering mingled with oil or dry, shall all the sons of Aaron have.[3] Just as the term 'every' in the latter cases refers to two distinct kinds,[4] so the term 'every' in the former case refers to two distinct kinds.[5]

And what can R. Judah [say]? R. Simeon is quite right in his argument![6] — [R. Judah] can reply, since the expression 'with oil'[7] is stated twice in the verse it is as though the expression 'offering' had been repeated. And R. Simeon, [what would he say to this]? — Had not the expression 'with oil' been repeated I would have said that the offering must consist half of cakes and half of wafers, but not of cakes alone or of wafers alone; we are therefore taught [otherwise].

Is not the view of R. Jose son of R. Judah identical with that of his father? — There would be a difference between them in the case where one actually did so.[8]

CHAPTER VI[9]

MISHNAH. R. ISHMAEL SAYS, ON THE SABBATH[10] THE OMER[11] WAS TAKEN OUT[12] OF THREE SE'AHS[13] [OF BARLEY]. AND ON A WEEKDAY OUT OF FIVE. BUT THE SAGES SAY, WHETHER ON THE SABBATH OR ON A WEEKDAY IT WAS TAKEN OUT OF THREE SE'AHS. R. HANINA THE VICE-HIGH PRIEST[14] SAYS, ON THE SABBATH IT WAS REAPED BY ONE MAN WITH ONE SICKLE INTO ONE BASKET, AND ON A WEEKDAY IT WAS REAPED BY THREE MEN INTO THREE BASKETS AND WITH THREE SICKLES. BUT THE SAGES SAY, WHETHER ON THE SABBATH OR ON A WEEKDAY IT WAS REAPED BY THREE MEN INTO THREE BASKETS AND WITH THREE SICKLES.[15]

GEMARA. The opinion of the Rabbis is quite clear, for they hold that a tenth of the finest [flour] can be obtained out of three se'ahs, and therefore it is all one whether it was a Sabbath or a weekday. But what can be the opinion of R. Ishmael? If he holds that a tenth of the finest [flour] can be obtained only out of five se'ahs, then on a Sabbath too [five should be necessary]; and if it can be obtained out of three se'ahs then on a weekday too [three should be sufficient]! — Raba said, R. Ishmael is of the opinion that a tenth of the finest [flour] can be obtained out of five se'ahs without much labour, but with much labour out of three. On a weekday, therefore, it is taken out of five se'ahs, as this would give the best results;[16] but on the Sabbath it is better that [the Sabbath be profaned] by one work, namely sifting, [being repeated many times,][17] rather than by many works [being performed once only].[18]

Rabbah said, R. Ishmael and R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka both hold the same view. For it was taught: If the fourteenth of Nisan fell on a Sabbath, one should flay the Passover-offering only as far as the breast:[19] such is the opinion of R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka. But the Sages say, One should flay the whole of it. Now did not R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka say there that where it is possible [to manage with a little] we must not trouble to do more on the Sabbath? Here, too, since it is possible [to manage with less] we must not trouble [to do more on the Sabbath]! Whence [do you know this]? Perhaps R. Ishmael only said so[20] here, since there is no disrespect to the offering. but there, since there is actual disrespect to the offering.[21]

---

(1) To suggest that the cakes constitute a separate offering and the wafers a separate offering.

(2) The cakes and the wafers must be crushed fine and mixed together, then mingled with oil, and the handful taken from the mixture which contains the two kinds.

(3) Lev. VII, 9, 10.

(4) Viz., the marhesheth meal-offering and the mahabath meal-offering in the one case, and the dry meal-offering and the meal-offering mingled with oil in, the other case. There is no doubt at all that part of the one kind of meal-offering cannot combine with part of the other to constitute a valid offering.

(5) And the two kinds, cakes and wafers, cannot combine to constitute one offering.

(6) That the two kinds belong to the same offering since the term ‘offering’ is stated only once in the verse.

(7) Lev. II, 4.

(8) According to R. Jose son of R. Judah a baked meal-offering consisting partly of cakes and partly of wafers is absolutely invalid, just as the meal-offering would be invalid if brought partly dry and partly mingled with oil. According to the father, however, if a person brought cakes and wafers for his meal-offering it would be accepted as valid.

(9) In the separate editions of the Mishnah this chapter is inserted after chapter nine, which is indeed its proper place.

(10) I.e., if the second day of the Passover, which is the sixteenth day of Nisan, fell on a Sabbath. As the work in connection with the Omer involved the infringement of the laws of Sabbath, on the Sabbath therefore a smaller quantity of barley was used and fewer men employed.

(11) The tenth of an ephah of barley flour offered as a meal-offering. Cf. Lev. XXIII, 10ff.
(12) Lit., 'came'.
(13) Which amount to one ephah. This quantity was sifted again and again so as to produce the tenth of choicest flour.
(14) Segan, v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 97, n. 1.
(15) In order to give the matter greater publicity. V. Gemara.
(16) Since only the choicest of each se'ah would be taken.
(17) In order to obtain the finest out of the smaller quantity of three se'ahs.
(18) Since the extra two se'ahs would entail the infringement of many acts of works on the Sabbath, such as reaping, winnowing, cleaning, grinding, etc.
(19) I.e., sufficient only to take out from the lamb the sacrificial portions. Since the rest of the saying is only for the purpose of preparing the meat for the table it must be left over till the evening.
(20) That no more than is absolutely necessary may be done on the Sabbath.
(21) By leaving the carcass of the offering, partly flayed, hanging on the hook the whole day until nightfall.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 64a

I would say that he is in agreement with the Sages.[1] And, on the other hand, perhaps R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka only said so there, since the requirements for the Most — High have been fulfilled,[2] so that there is no further need to profane the Sabbath; but here, since the requirements for the Most High have not yet been fulfilled,[3] so that there is a need to profane the Sabbath, I would say that he is in agreement with the Sages![4] — Said Rabbah, R. Ishmael and R. Hanina the Vice-High Priest both hold the same view. For we have learnt: R. HANINA THE VICE-HIGH PRIEST SAYS, ON THE SABBATH IT WAS REAPED BY ONE MAN WITH ONE SICKLE INTO ONE BASKET, AND ON A WEEKDAY IT WAS REAPED BY THREE MEN INTO THREE BASKETS AND WITH THREE SICKLES. BUT THE SAGES SAY, WHETHER ON THE SABBATH OR ON A WEEKDAY IT WAS REAPED BY THREE MEN INTO THREE BASKETS AND WITH THREE SICKLES. Now did not R. Hanina the Vice-High Priest say there that where it is possible [to manage with one] we must not trouble [more to work on the Sabbath]? Here, too, since it is possible [to manage with less] we must not trouble [to do more on the Sabbath]. Whence [do you know this]? Perhaps R. Ishmael only said so here, since there is no opportunity for making the matter public,[5] but there, since there is an opportunity for making the matter public,[6] I would say that he is in agreement with the Rabbis.[7] And, on the other hand, perhaps R. Hanina the Vice-High Priest only said so there, for after all, whether one man or three are employed, the service to the Most High is performed according to its prescribed rites, but here, since the service to the Most High is not performed according to its prescribed rites,[8] I would say that he is in agreement with the Sages![9] — Rather. said R. Ashi, R. Ishmael and R. Jose both hold the same view. For we have learnt: Whether [the new moon] was clearly visible or not, they may profane the Sabbath because of it.[10] But R. Jose says. If it was clearly visible they may not profane the Sabbath because of it.[11] Now did not R. Jose say there that wherever it is possible [to manage without them] we do not trouble [them to profane the Sabbath]? Here, too, since it is possible [to manage with less] we must not trouble [to do more on the Sabbath]. Whence [do you know this]? Perhaps R. Ishmael only said so here, since the reason 'it will result that you will prevent them from coming in the future' does not apply, but there, since the reason 'it will result that you will prevent them from coming in the future[12] applies, I would say that he is in agreement with the Rabbis.[13] And, on the other hand, perhaps R. Jose only said so there, since the matter in question is no service to the Most High,[14] and moreover the Sabbath has not been overridden [by another service], but here, since it is a service to the Most High.[15] and the Sabbath has already been overridden [by other acts of work].[16] I would say that he is in agreement with the Rabbis.

It was stated: If a man slaughtered [on the Sabbath] two sin-offerings for the community when only one was necessary, Rabbah (others say. R. Ammi) said, He is liable[17] for the slaughtering of the second but not for the first, even though atonement was effected through the second offering.[18] and

even though the first proved to be a lean animal.[19] But could Rabbah have really said so? Surely Rabbah has said, If a man had before him [on the Sabbath] two sin-offerings [for the community],[20] one beast being fat and the other lean, and he first slaughtered the fat beast and then the lean one, he is liable; if he first slaughtered the lean beast and then the fat one, he is not liable; and not only that but we even bid him [after he has slaughtered the lean one]. Go at once and fetch a fat one and slaughter it![21] — If you wish, you can say, Strike out the clause about the lean beast in the first statement; or if you prefer you may say, That first statement was taught by R. Ammi.

Rabina asked R. Ashi, What is the law if the first beast was found [after the slaughtering of the second] to be lean in its entrails?[22] Are we to decide the issue by his intention and this man certainly intended to do what was forbidden, or by his actual deed? — He replied; Is this not the case agreed upon by Rabbah and Raba? For it was stated: If a man heard that a child had fallen into the sea and he spread nets [on the Sabbath] to catch fish[23] and he caught fish, he is liable. If he spread nets to catch fish and he caught fish and also the child, Rabbah says, He is not liable; but Raba says, He is liable. Now only in that case says Rabbah that he is not liable, for since he heard [of this accident], we say that his intention was also concerning the child; but where he did not hear of it [Rabbah] would not [say that he was not liable].[24] Others say that he[25] answered him as follows: This is a matter of dispute between Rabbah and Raba. For It was stated: If a man had not heard that a child had fallen into the sea and he spread a net [on the Sabbath] to catch fish and he caught fish, he is liable. If he spread the net to catch fish and he caught fish and also the child, Rabbah says, He is not liable; but Raba says, He is liable. 'Rabbah says, He is not liable' because we decide the matter by his actual deed. 'Raba says, He is liable' because we decide the matter by his intention.

Rabbah said, If one fig was prescribed for a sick person[26] and ten men ran[27] and returned together bringing ten figs, they are all not liable, and [it is the same] even if they brought them one after the other, and even if the sick person had recovered after he had taken the first one.

Raba raised this question. If two figs were prescribed for a sick person and there happened to be two figs on two stalks[28] and also three figs on one stalk, which are we to bring? Should we bring the two figs as they only are required, or the three, for then there is less plucking? — Surely it is obvious that we should bring the three figs [on the one stalk].

---

(1) That the whole must be flayed.

(2) By the removal and offering of the sacrificial portions.

(3) For it is more commendable to derive the tenth from a larger quantity, thereby obtaining the choicest.

(4) That in regard to the 'Omer there is no distinction between the Sabbath and a weekday. But the Sages are satisfied that the choicest is obtainable even out of three se'ahs.

(5) For whether the 'Omer is obtained out of five or three se'ahs the people will learn nothing of importance thereby.

(6) The employment of more persons in the service of the 'Omer obviously gives the matter greater publicity and impresses immediately the mind of the people with the Rabbinic standpoint that the 'Omer must be offered on the second day of the Passover irrespective of the day of the week, thus creating stronger opposition to the Sadducees who held that the 'Omer must always be offered on a Sunday; v. infra 65a.

(7) That although one person would be sufficient three are to be employed to create greater publicity.

(8) For according to R. Ishmael the 'Omer must be taken out of five se'ahs and not three in order to obtain the choicest flour.

(9) V. supra n.1.

(10) Any who saw the new moon may transgress the Sabbath limits to go and give evidence before the court of the appearance of the new moon. As the calendar was not fixed the evidence of witnesses was a matter of the greatest importance for the determination of the dates of the Festivals.

(11) As it is most probable that the members of the court themselves had also seen the appearance of the new moon, so that it would be unnecessary for any to profane the Sabbath for this purpose; R.H. 21b.

(12) For even when the new moon was not clearly visible to all, those who did see it might refrain from going to give

their evidence believing that they were not justified in profaning the Sabbath on its account as others too might have seen the appearance of the new moon like themselves.

(13) That whatever the circumstances people should be encouraged to go and give their evidence.

(14) For it is no offering, neither is it an important need of the community since the new moon was seen clearly everywhere.

(15) To offer the choicest of five se'ahs.

(16) Viz., the reaping, winnowing, etc. of the three se'ahs.

(17) Since he acted in error, believing that he may slaughter any number of beasts on the Sabbath for the community, he is liable to bring a sin-offering.

(18) E.g., where the blood of the first beast was poured away after the second had been slaughtered, so that it was necessary in the end to use the blood of the second beast. In this case therefore it might be said that the slaughterer was not liable since in fact two beasts were necessary. On the other hand, when he slaughtered the second beast he had no reason to believe that the first would be unfit.

(19) Before the slaughtering of the second beast. It is a meritorious act to offer for a sacrifice a fine beast; cf. Mal. I, 8.

(20) And only one sin-offering was necessary.

(21) Thus contradicting Rabbah's previous statement that he is liable for slaughtering the fat beast after the lean one.

(22) When slaughtering the second beast he had no knowledge that the entrails of the first beast were lean and not fit to be offered, consequently the slaughtering of the second beast was undoubtedly a forbidden act. On the other hand, it might be said that he is not liable, since it was proved in the end that it was right to have slaughtered the second beast.

(23) An act forbidden on the Sabbath.

(24) And, therefore, in the case stated by Rabina, since he did not know of the unfitness of the first beast when he slaughtered the second, he is certainly liable according to all views.

(25) R. Ashi.

(26) For a sick person not only is it permitted to profane the Sabbath but it is even a meritorious act to do so.

(27) And profaned the Sabbath by plucking the figs.

(28) The stalks in either case were attached to the tree so that in any event it was necessary to transgress the Sabbath by breaking off the stalks from the tree. In the one case, however, two stalks would have to be broken off, whilst in the other case only one.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 64b

for even R. Ishmael only said so[1] in that case, since the less one uses[2] the less one reaps, but in this case, where the less one uses the more one has to pluck,[3] we should certainly bring the three [figs]. MISHNAH. THE PRECEPT OF THE 'OMER IS THAT IT SHOULD BE BROUGHT FROM [WHAT GROWS] NEAR BY. IF [THE CROP] NEAR JERUSALEM WAS NOT YET RIPE, IT COULD BE BROUGHT FROM ANY PLACE. IT ONCE HAPPENED THAT THE OMER WAS BROUGHT FROM GAGGOTH ZERIFIN[4] AND THE TWO LOAVES FROM THE PLAIN OF EN SOKER.[4]

GEMARA. Why is this So?[5] — If you wish. I may say, Because it is written, Fresh corn shalt thou bring;[6] or if you wish, I may say, Because of the rule 'One must not pass over [the first occasion for performing] the precept'.[7]

IT ONCE HAPPENED THAT THE 'OMER WAS BROUGHT FROM GAGGOTH ZERIFIN. Our Rabbis taught: When the Kings of the Hasmonean house fought one another,[8] Hyrcanus was outside and Aristobulus within [the city wall]. Each day [those that were within] used to let down [to the other party] denars in a basket, and haul up [in return] animals for the Daily Offerings. An old man there, who was learned in Greek wisdom, spoke with them in Greek wisdom,[9] saying. 'As long as they carry on the Temple service they will never be delivered into your hands'. On the morrow they let down denars in a basket and hauled up a pig. When it reached halfway up the wall, it stuck its claws into the wall, and the land of Israel was shaken over a distance of four hundred parasangs by four hundred parasangs. At that time they declared, 'Cursed be the man who rears pigs and cursed

be the man who teaches his son Greek wisdom!' It was concerning this time [of siege] that we learnt: IT ONCE HAPPENED THAT THE 'OMER WAS BROUGHT FROM GAGGOTH ZERIFIN AND THE TWO LOAVES FROM THE PLAIN OF EN SOKER. For when the time for the 'Omer arrived they did not know from whence they could take it.[10] They at once proclaimed the matter, whereupon a deaf-mute came forward and pointed[11] with one hand to the roof and with the other to a cone-shaped hut. Then spake Mordecai,[12] 'Is there anywhere a place by name Gaggoth Zerifin[13] or Zerifin Gaggoth?' Thereupon they searched and found the place. When they should have brought the Two Loaves they did not know from whence they could take it. They at once proclaimed the matter, whereupon a deaf-mute came forward and put one hand on his eye and the other hand on the socket of the bolt. Then spake Mordecai,[12] 'Is there anywhere a place by name En Soker[14] or Soker En?' Thereupon they searched and found the place.

Once three women brought three pairs of doves to the Temple. One said, 'It is for my zibah'; the other said, 'It is for my yammah'; and the third said, 'It is for my 'onah'. Now they [the priests] thought that by zibah[15] [the woman] actually meant her flux, by yammah[16] her stream, and by 'onah[17] her period, and therefore of each pair of doves, one bird was to be offered for a sin-offering and the other for a burnt-offering.[18] Then spake Mordecai, 'Perhaps the one had been in danger by reason of her flux, the other had been in danger by reason of a sea journey,[19] and the third had been in danger by an infection of the eye,[20] and therefore all the doves were to be offered for burnt-offerings!'[21] Thereupon they enquired into the matter and found that it was so.

---

(1) That on the Sabbath one must reap less for the 'Omer.

(2) Lit., 'eats'.

(3) For to obtain the two figs one must break off two stalks.

(4) These places are identified respectively with Sarafand near Lydda and Assaker near Nablus. V. Neub. Geog. pp. 81, 170.

(5) That the 'Omer must be brought from barley growing near Jerusalem.

(6) Lev. II, 14. If the barley were brought from a distance it would lose its freshness on the way and would not be fit.

(7) And therefore the crops found growing outside Jerusalem should be used for the religious purpose.

(8) V. parallel passages in B.K. 82b (Sonc. ed. p. 469. and notes) and Sot. 49b (Sonc. ed. p. 268, and notes). V. also Graetz, Geschichte III, pp. 710ff on this passage.

(9) This old man was in Jerusalem and addressed his words of betrayal to the besiegers outside. 'Greek wisdom', according to Rashi means 'gestures and signs', but most probably it means the Greek language which was not understood by the people in the city.

(10) This was due to the devastation of the land round about Jerusalem by the hostile forces.

(11) Lit., 'put'.

(12) A high Temple official who on account of his sagacity bore the name of Mordecai (Tosaf.). V. infra.

(13) A place-name whose literal meaning is 'roofs, cone-shaped huts'.

(14) A place-name whose literal meaning is 'eye, the socket of the bolt'.

(15) זיבה the usual term for an issue or flux. This woman had apparently suffered from an issue and now being cleansed was offering a pair of doves as her prescribed sacrifice. V. Lev. XV, 25ff.

(16) ימה an excessive flux, from ים 'the sea'. Here, too, the doves were offered on her being cleansed of her issue.

(17) עונה 'period'. The period of her seven clean days having been fulfilled she now offers a pair of doves as her prescribed sacrifice; v. ibid. 28, 29.

(18) Cf. ibid. 30.

(19) Taking ימה in its usual meaning 'the sea'.

(20) עונה is thus interpreted as עינה 'her eye'.

(21) For they were no doubt brought as freewill-offerings or in fulfilment of vows which the women vowed to bring on their delivery out of danger. In these circumstances the offerings were to be dealt with as burnt-offerings.

This is indeed what we have learnt: Petahiah was over the bird-offerings.[1] This same Petahiah was Mordecai; why was his name called Petahiah?[2] Because he was able to open matters and interpret them,' and he knew seventy languages.[3] But did not every member of the Sanhedrin know seventy languages? For R. Johanan said, None are to be appointed members of the Sanhedrin but men of wisdom, of good appearance, of fine stature, of mature age. men with a knowledge of sorcery and who know seventy languages, in order that the court should have no need of an interpreter![4] — Say, rather, that he used to mix together[5] expressions and explain them; and on that account it is written of Mordecai 'Bilshan'.[6]

MISHNAH. WHAT WAS THE PROCEDURE? THE MESSENGERS OF THE BETH DIN USED TO GO OUT ON THE DAY BEFORE THE FESTIVAL AND TIE THE UNREAPED CORN IN BUNCHES TO MAKE IT THE EASIER TO REAP. ALL THE INHABITANTS OF THE TOWNS NEAR BY ASSEMBLED THERE,[7] SO THAT IT MIGHT BE REAPED WITH MUCH DISPLAY. AS SOON AS IT BECAME DARK HE[8] CALLED OUT, 'HAS THE SUN SET'? AND THEY ANSWERED. 'YES.' HAS THE SUN SET'? AND THEY ANSWERED, 'YES.' WITH THIS SICKLE'?[9] AND THEY ANSWERED, 'YES'. 'WITH THIS SICKLE'? AND THEY ANSWERED, YES'. 'INTO THIS BASKET'? AND THEY ANSWERED, 'YES'. INTO THIS BASKET'? AND THEY ANSWERED. 'YES'. ON THE SABBATH HE CALLED OUT FURTHER, ON THIS SABBATH'? AND THEY ANSWERED. 'YES'. 'ON THIS SABBATH'? AND THEY ANSWERED. 'YES'. 'SHALL I REAP'?[10] AND THEY ANSWERED, REAP'. 'SHALL I REAP'? AND THEY ANSWERED, 'REAP'. HE REPEATED EVERY MATTER THREE TIMES, AND THEY ANSWERED, 'YES.' 'YES.' 'YES'. AND WHY WAS ALL THIS? BECAUSE OF THE BOETHUSIANS[11] WHO MAINTAINED THAT THE REAPING OF THE 'OMER WAS NOT TO TAKE PLACE AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE [FIRST DAY OF THE] FESTIVAL.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught:[12] 'On the following days fasting, and on some of them also mourning, is forbidden: From the first until the eighth day of the month of Nisan, during which time the Daily Offering was established, mourning is forbidden;[13] from the eighth of the same until the close of the Festival, during which time the date for the Feast of Weeks was re-established, fasting is forbidden.[14] 'From the first until the eighth day of the month of Nisan, during which time the Daily Offering was established, mourning is forbidden'. For the Sadducees used to say that an individual may of his own free will defray the cost[15] of the Daily Offering. What was their argument? — It is written, [said they]. The one lamb shalt thou offer in the morning and the other lamb shalt thou offer at dusk.[16] And what was the reply [of the Rabbis]? — It is written, My food which is presented unto Me for offerings made by fire, of a sweet savour unto Me, shall ye observe.[17] Hence all sacrifices were to be taken out of the Temple fund.[18]

'From the eighth of the same until the close of the Festival [of Passover], during which time the date for the Feast of Weeks was re-established, fasting is forbidden'. For the Boethusians held that the Feast of Weeks[19] must always be on the day after the Sabbath.[20] But R. Johanan b. Zakkai entered into discussion with them saying, 'Fools that you are! whence do you derive it'? Not one of them was able to answer him, save one old man who commenced to babble and said, 'Moses our teacher was a great lover of Israel, and knowing full well that the Feast of Weeks lasted only one day he therefore fixed it on the day after the Sabbath so that Israel might enjoy themselves for two successive days'. [R. Johanan b. Zakkai] then quoted to him the following verse, 'It is eleven days' journey from Horeb unto Kadesh-Barnea by the way of mount Seir.[21]

---

(1) He was the officer in charge of the chest inscribed 'Bird-offerings' in the Temple. As the bird-offerings gave rise to complicated problems (v. Tractate Kinnim) he was chosen for his sagacity and profound understanding.

(2) The literal meaning of this name is 'The Lord has opened'.

(3) V. Shek., Sonc. ed., p. 18 notes.

(4) V. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 87.
(5) I.e., transfer the meanings of expressions from one sense to another; cf. supra in connection with Gaggoth Zerifin.
(6) Neh. VII, 7. The name בלשן is regarded as made up of בלל to mix, and לשן expression.
(7) On the night after the first day of the Passover.
(8) The reaper to the people assembled.
(9) I.e., shall I reap the corn with this sickle and into this basket?
(10) On the Sabbath.
(11) A sect in opposition to the Pharisees and often regarded as synonymous with the Sadducees. They held that the expression (Lev. XXIII, 11), ממחרת השבת, 'the morrow after the Sabbath', must be taken in its literal sense, the day following the first Saturday in Passover. The Pharisees, however, argued that the Sabbath meant here 'the day of cessation from work', i.e., the Festival of Passover. Accordingly the 'Omer was to be offered on the second day of the Festival, and the reaping of the corn on the night preceding, at the conclusion of the first day of the Festival.
(12) V. Megillath Ta'anith, I.
(13) And needless to say that fasting is forbidden. V. Tosaf. s.v. אילין
(14) But mourning is permitted. So according to Rashi, Sh. Mek. and most MSS. In cur. ed. 'mourning is forbidden'. V. Tosaf. s.v. מריש. Cf. also Ta'anith 17b.
(15) Lit., 'may offer and bring'.
(16) Num. XXVIII, 4. The precept is stated in the singular, directed to the individual.
(17) Ibid. 2. The use of the pronoun 'ye' clearly imposes the obligation upon the community.
(18) Lit., 'the offering of the Chamber'.
(19) Azereth, lit., 'the closing'; the Feast of Weeks being regarded as the closing festival to Passover.
(20) l.e., on a Sunday, at the completion of seven full weeks from the offering of the 'Omer which, according to them, was offered on a Sunday.
(21) Deut. I, 2.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 65b

If Moses was a great lover of Israel, why then did he detain them in the wilderness for forty years'? 'Master', said the other, 'is it thus that you would dismiss me'? 'Fool', he answered, 'should not our perfect Torah be as convincing as your idle talk! Now one verse says. Ye shall number fifty days.[1] while the other verse says, Seven weeks shall there be complete.[2] How are they to be reconciled?[3] The latter verse refers to the time when the [first day of the] Festival [of Passover] falls on the Sabbath,[4] while the former to the time when the [first day of the] Festival falls on a weekday.[5] (Mnemonic: R. Eliezer 'numbers'; R. Joshua 'counts'; R. Ishmael 'from the 'Omer'; R. Judah 'below'.)[6] R. Eliezer says, This is not necessary, for Scripture says, Thou shalt number unto thee,[7] that is, the numbering depends upon the [decision of the] Beth din;[8] accordingly the Sabbath of the creation cannot be intended,[9] as the numbering would then be in the hands of all men.[10] R. Joshua says. The Torah says. Count days[11] and sanctify the new moon,[12] count days and sanctify the Feast of Weeks.[13] Just as in regard to the new moon there is something distinctive at the commencement [of the counting],[14] so with the Feast of Weeks there is something distinctive at the commencement [of the counting].[15]

R. Ishmael says. The Torah says. Bring the 'Omer-offering on the Passover, and the Two Loaves on the Feast of Weeks. Just as the latter are offered on the Festival, and indeed at the beginning of the Festival, so the former, too. Is offered on the Festival, and indeed at the beginning of the Festival.[16] R. Judah b. Bathyra says. There is written 'Sabbath' below[17] and also 'Sabbath' above;[17] just as in the former case the Festival, and indeed the beginning of the Festival, is near [to the Sabbath].[18] so in the latter case, too, the Festival, and indeed the beginning of the Festival, is near [to the 'Omer].[19]

Our Rabbis taught: And ye shall count unto you.[20] that is, the counting is a duty upon every one. On the morrow after the Sabbath,[20] that is, on the morrow after the Festival. Perhaps it is not so but

rather on the morrow after the Sabbath of Creation. R. Jose b. Judah says, Scripture says, Ye shall number fifty days,[21] that is, every time that you number it shall not be more than fifty days. But should you say that the verse refers to the morrow after the Sabbath of Creation, then it might sometimes come to fifty-one and sometimes to fifty-two and fifty-three and fifty-four and fifty-five and fifty-six.[22] R. Judah b. Bathyra says. This is not necessary.

---

(1) Lev. XXIII, 16.

(2) Ibid. 15.

(3) For the former verse speaks of counting fifty days irrespective of the completeness of the weeks, whereas the latter verse speaks of seven weeks complete, by which it is understood full weeks each commencing on a Sunday.

(4) In this case there are seven complete weeks.

(5) It is evident therefore that the Feast of Weeks may fall on any day of the week and not only on Sunday. On the motives underlying this controversy v. Lichtenstein HUCA VIII-IX. pp. 276ff and Finkelstein, The Pharisees, I. p. 115ff.

(6) And aid for remembering the various proofs adduced by the Rabbis mentioned.

(7) Deut. XVI, 9.

(8) For inasmuch as the Beth din fixed the date of the Festivals, it is left to them to inform the community the time from which to commence counting the days of the 'Omer. Cur. edd. insert here the following gloss: For they know to interpret 'the morrow after the Sabbath' as the morrow after the Festival.

(9) In the expression 'the morrow after the Sabbath'.

(10) Obviously no guidance would be necessary were the counting always to commence on the Sunday, after the Sabbath of Creation, i.e., the ordinary Sabbath of the week.

(11) Cf. the expression 'a month of days', Num. XI, 20.

(12) I.e., after counting twenty-nine days the thirtieth day should be sanctified as the new moon.

(13) Lev. XXIII, 15,16.

(14) Namely the new moon, for the twenty-nine days are counted from the first day of the new month.

(15) Namely the Festival of Passover. Now if the counting always commenced on Sunday, this distinctiveness would not always be evident, for sometimes the counting might commence on the seventeenth day of Nisan, and sometimes on the eighteenth, or on the nineteenth of that month. V. Tosaf. s.v. מה חדש. Cur. edd. insert here the gloss: And should you say that the Feast of Weeks always falls on the day after Sabbath, how would there be anything distinctive at its commencement?

(16) Save that in order to fulfil the expression 'on the morrow after the Sabbath' it must be offered on the second day of the Festival. If, however, it was to be offered always on a Sunday it might happen sometimes that it is offered at the end of the Festival; v. prev. note.

(17) Below, in respect of the Feast of Weeks, unto the morrow of the seventh Sabbath, Lev. XXIII, 16; and above, in respect of the 'Omer, On the morrow after the Sabbath, ibid. 11.

(18) Since the Festival follows immediately the 'Sabbath'. Here, of course, the word Sabbath signifies 'week', as the Festival must be at the end of seven complete Sabbaths or weeks.

(19) Thus the Festival of Passover is to immediately precede the 'Omer; accordingly 'Sabbath' clearly means the Festival.

(20) Lev. XXIII, 15.

(21) Ibid. 16.

(22) Just as in that year when the Passover falls on a Sabbath and the counting, according to all views, begins on the Sunday, only fifty days are numbered from the second day of the Festival, so also in the other years when the Festival falls on a weekday only fifty days are to be numbered from the second day of the Festival. Now if it is held that the numbering must always begin on a Sunday, then as compared with the former year, the number of days from the second day of the Festival would be fifty-one, if the Festival fell on a Friday, or fifty-two if it fell on a Thursday, and so on.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 66a

for Scripture says, Thou shalt number unto thee,[1] that is, the numbering depends upon [the decision of] the Beth-din; accordingly the Sabbath of the Creation cannot be intended as the numbering would then be in the hands of all men.[2] R. Jose says. On the morrow after the Sabbath means on the

morrow after the Festival. You say that it means on the morrow after the Festival, but perhaps it is not so, but rather on the morrow after the Sabbath of Creation! I will prove it to you. Does Scripture say, 'On the morrow after the Sabbath that is in the Passover week'? It merely says, 'On the morrow after the Sabbath'; and as the year is full of Sabbaths, then go and find out which Sabbath is meant.[3] Moreover, 'Sabbath' is written below,[4] and 'Sabbath' is written above; just as in the former case it refers to the Festival, and indeed to the beginning of the Festival, so in the latter case, too, it refers to the Festival, and indeed to the beginning of the Festival.[4] R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, One verse says. Six days thou shalt eat unleavened bread,[5] whereas another verse says, Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread.[6] How are they to be reconciled?' [In this way:] you may not eat unleavened bread of the new produce the seven days. but you may eat unleavened bread of the new produce six days.[7] From the day that ye brought [the 'Omer of the waving]...shall ye number:[8] now I might think that the 'Omer must be reaped and offered [on the day stated], but the counting may begin whenever one wishes,[9] the text therefore also states, From the time the sickle is first put to the standing corn thou shalt begin to number.[10] But from [this verse], 'From the time the sickle is first put to the standing corn thou shalt begin to number', I might think that the 'Omer must be reaped and then one begins to count, but it is to be offered whenever one wishes, the text therefore states, From the day that ye brought [the 'Omer...shall ye number].[11] But from [this verse], 'From the day that ye brought', I might think that it must be reaped and offered and the counting begun all by day, the text therefore states 'Seven weeks shall there be complete;[12] and when do you find seven weeks complete? Only when you begin to count from the [previous] evening.[13] I might think, then, that it must be reaped and offered and the counting begun all by night, the text therefore, states, 'From the day that ye brought'. How is it to be then? The reaping and the counting must be on the [previous] night, but the bringing on the [following] day.[14]

Said Raba: All the above interpretations can be refuted, excepting those of the last two Tannaim of the first Baraitha and of the last two Tannaim of the second Baraitha,[15] which cannot be refuted, If [it were to be derived from] R. Johanan b. Zakkai's interpretation it can be refuted thus: Perhaps [the explanation of the conflicting verses is] as given by Abaye; for Abaye said, It is the precept to count the days and also the weeks.[16] If from R. Eliezer's and R. Joshua's interpretations it can be refuted thus: How do they know that it[17] refers to the first day of the Festival? It may refer to the last day of the Festival! R. Ishmael's and R. Judah b. Bathyra's interpretations cannot be refuted. If from R. Jose son of R. Judah's interpretation it can be refuted thus: Perhaps the fifty days excludes those six days![18] If from R. Judah b. Bathyra's interpretation[19] it can be refuted thus: How does he know that it[17] means' the first day of the Festival? Perhaps it means the last day of the Festival! R. Jose also realized this same difficulty, and he therefore added the second interpretation 'Moreover.

The [above] text [stated]: Abaye said, It is the precept to count the days and also to count the weeks. The Rabbis of the school of R. Ashi used to count the days as well as the weeks. Amemar used to count the days but not the weeks, saying, It is only in commemoration of Temple times.[20]

MISHNAH. THEY REAPED IT, PUT IT INTO THE BASKETS, AND BROUGHT IT TO THE TEMPLE COURT; THEN THEY PARCHED IT[21] WITH FIRE IN ORDER TO FULFIL THE PRECEPT THAT IT SHOULD BE PARCHED [WITH FIRE].[22] SO R. MEIR. BUT THE SAGES SAY, THEY FIRST BEAT IT WITH REEDS OR STEMS OF PLANTS THAT THE GRAINS SHOULD NOT BE CRUSHED,[23] AND THEN THEY PUT IT INTO A PIPE THAT WAS PERFORATED SO THAT THE FIRE MIGHT TAKE HOLD OF ALL OF IT. THEY SPREAD IT OUT IN THE TEMPLE COURT SO THAT THE WIND MIGHT BLOW OVER IT.[24] THEN THEY PUT IT INTO A GRISTMILL[25] AND TOOK OUT OF IT A TENTH [OF AN EPHAH OF FLOUR] WHICH WAS SIFTED THROUGH THIRTEEN SIEVES. WHAT WAS LEFT OVER WAS REDEEMED AND MIGHT BE EATEN BY ANY ONE; IT WAS LIABLE TO THE DOUGH-OFFERING[26] BUT EXEMPT FROM TITHES.[27] R. AKIBA DECLARES IT LIABLE BOTH TO THE DOUGH-OFFERING AND TO TITHES.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: 'Abib':[28] this signifies fresh ears of corn; 'parched with fire': this teaches us that Israel used to parch it with fire in order to fulfil the precept 'parched'. So R. Meir. But the Sages say,

---

(1) Deut. XVI,9.
(2) V. supra p. 386. n. 8.
(3) Obviously then 'the Sabbath' means the Festival.
(4) V. supra p. 387 nn. 2,3 and 4.
(5) Ibid. 8.
(6) Ex. XII, 15.
(7) For after the offering of the 'Omer, on the second day of the Festival, there are left six days of the Festival on which one may eat unleavened bread of the new produce; thus the verses are reconciled. If, however, the 'Omer was always to be offered on a Sunday, then it would frequently happen that there would be less than six days from the offering of the 'Omer to the end of the Festival.
(8) Lev. XXIII, 15, 16.
(9) On any day after the bringing of the 'Omer.
(10) Deut. XVI, 9. From this verse it appears that the counting must begin immediately after the reaping and apparently even before the offering of the 'Omer.
(11) We thus learn that the reaping and the offering of the 'Omer and the commencement of the counting must all take place on the same day.
(12) Lev. XXIII, 15.
(13) Since the complete day consists of the day and the preceding night.
(14) And it is arrived at in this way: the reaping must clearly be before the counting, since it is written, 'From the time that the sickle is put to the standing corn thou shalt begin to number'; and the counting must be at night because of the verse which says, 'Seven weeks shall there be complete'. The counting. however, precedes the bringing of the 'Omer, the verse 'From the day that ye brought the 'Omer shall ye number' notwithstanding, as this verse does necessarily indicate precedence but rather that both shall take place on the same day.
(15) I.e., R. Jose in his second interpretation and R. Simeon b. Eleazar.
(16) Cf. P.B. p. 270ff. This is established by Abaye from the fact that one verse speaks of counting the days and the other of counting the weeks.
(17) The expression 'Sabbath'. Granted that it cannot mean the ordinary Sabbath of the week, it may mean nevertheless the last day, and not necessarily the first day, of the Festival.
(18) For it might be said that the counting of the fifty days is to commence from the first Sunday in the Passover festival, exclusive of the six (or less) intervening days between the second day of the Festival and the Sunday.
(19) In the second Baraitha.
(20) He maintains that after the destruction of the Temple, when the 'Omer is no longer offered, the counting is no absolute obligation; hence it is sufficient if only the days are counted.
(21) The whole ears of corn.
(22) Lev. II, 14.
(23) It was not threshed in the usual manner with flails as these would bruise the fresh and tender corn.
(24) In order to dry it.
(25) Which grinds very coarsely so that only the husk is separated from the grain.
(26) Cf. Num. XV, 18ff. Since at the time when dough becomes liable to the dough-offering, i.e. at the rolling out of the dough, it is no longer consecrated, it is therefore liable to the dough-offering.
(27) Since the obligation of tithes falls due at the last work in connection with the corn (i.e. the smoothing of the pile), and at that time the corn was still consecrated, it is therefore exempt from tithes.
(28) 'Corn in the ear'. Lev. II, 14.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 66b

By koli[1] we do not mean [what is parched] over the fire but [what is parched] with something

[intervening between the fire and the grain]. (Another version reads: By koli we understand what is parched in a vessel.)[2] How was it done then? There was there [in the Temple] a pipe for parching corn which was perforated like a sieve so that the fire might take hold of it on all sides. Corn in the ear, parched...crushed: now I know not whether the fresh ears of corn must be parched or the crushed grain must be parched;[3] but when the verse says '[parched] with fire', it thus interrupts the subject.[4] Karmel [fresh corn] means, rak [tender] and mal [easily crushed].[5] In like manner[6] [we interpret the word in the following] verse: And there came a man from Baal-shalishah, and brought the man of God bread of the firstfruits, twenty loaves of barley, and fresh corn beziklono. And he said, Give unto the people that they may eat.[7] [Beziklono means]: He came and poured out for us, and we ate, and it was fine. And so, too, [when it says, Let us solace ourselves [nith'alsah] with loves,[8] [nith'alsah means:] Let us talk together and then let us go up [on the couch] and rejoice and revel in caresses. And so, too, [when] it says, The wing of the ostrich [ne'elasah] beateth joyously,[9] [ne'elasah means:] It carries [the egg], flies upwards [with it] and deposits it [in the nest]. And so, too, [when] it says, Because thy way is contrary [yarat] unto me,[10] [yarat means:] She [the ass] feared when she saw [the angel] and she turned aside. In the school of R. Ishmael it was taught: Karmel means, kar [rounded, and male [full].[11]

R. AKIBA DECLARES IT LIABLE BOTH TO THE DOUGH-OFFERING AND TO TITHES. R. Kahana said, R. Akiba used to say that the smoothing of the pile of [corn belonging at the time to] the Temple does not exempt it [from tithes].[12]

R. Shesheth raised the following objection: What did they do with what remained of those three se'ahs?[13] It was redeemed and could be eaten by any one; it was liable to the dough-offering but exempt from tithes. R. Akiba declares it liable both to the dough-offering and to tithes. But [the Sages] said to him, Let what is redeemed from the hand of the Temple treasurer prove the case,[14] for that is liable to the dough-offering yet is exempt from tithes. Now if it is right to say, [R. Akiba holds the view that] the smoothing of the pile of [corn belonging to] the Temple does not exempt [from tithes], then what was the point of their argument, it is just the same case?[15] Furthermore, R. Kahana b. Tahlifa raised an objection against R. Kahana's statement [from the following Baraitha]: R. Akiba declares it liable both to the dough-offering and tithes, for Temple money was only used for what was necessary![16] — Rather, said R. Johanan,it is an accepted teaching in the mouth of R. Akiba that Temple money was only used for what was necessary.[17]

Raba said, I am quite certain that the smoothing of the pile of [corn belonging at the time to] the Temple exempts it [from tithes], for even R. Akiba only declares it liable [to tithes] in that case alone, since Temple money was only used for what was necessary, but elsewhere [all agree that] the smoothing of the pile of [corn belonging to] the Temple exempts from tithes.

With regard to the smoothing of the pile of [corn belonging at the time to] a gentile there is a difference of opinion between Tannaim. For it was taught: One may give terumah from produce bought from an Israelite for other produce also bought from an Israelite, and from produce bought from a gentile for other produce also bought from a gentile,[18] and from produce bought from a Cuthean[19] for other produce also bought from a Cuthean, and from produce bought from any one of these for other produce also bought from any one of these.[20] So R. Meir and R. Judah. But R. Jose and R. Simeon say, One may give terumah from produce bought from an Israelite for other produce also bought from an Israelite, and from produce bought from a gentile for other produce bought from a Cuthean, and from produce bought from a Cuthean for other produce bought from a gentile, but one may not give terumah from produce bought from an Israelite for other produce bought from a gentile or a Cuthean, nor from produce bought from a gentile or a Cuthean for other produce bought from an Israelite.[21]

---

(1) Heb. קלי. The reference is to the word קלוי in Lev. ibid. The text is in a very bad state here; v. the parallel passage

in Sifra (ed.' Friedmann, p. 121-2) and notes thereon where all the parallel texts are collected and examined. V. also Dik. Sof. n. 9. The translation is based on the text as emended by Sh. Mek

(2) Heb. קליל: a receptacle of burnished bronze (Rashi).

(3) The term קלי 'parched' appears in the verse between two substantives, so that it is uncertain whether it refers to the preceding expression 'corn in the ear', in which case the fresh ears of corn must first be parched and then crushed, or to the subsequent expression 'crushed', in which case the corn must first be crushed and then parched.

(4) Hence it cannot refer to the subsequent expression but only to the one preceding, so that the fresh ears of corn must be parched.

(5) The Heb. כרמל is interpreted as two words: רך (by transposing the first two letters of the word) 'soft', 'tender', and מל 'brittle', 'easily crushed'.

(6) Lit., 'and thus it says'. Here follow some examples of interpretation of words by the method known as נוטריקון (stenographic or abbreviated), whereby any particular word is regarded as a combination of the initial or characteristic letters of the words in a sentence.

(7) II Kings IV, 42. The Heb. word בצקלונו (translated in the versions 'in his sack') is here expanded into the following sentence: בא ויצק לנו ואכלנוונוה

(8) Prov. VII, 18. The word נתעלסה is expanded into: נשא ונתן ונעלה ונשמח ונתחטא It must be noted that the letter 'sin' is often substituted for 'samech'; similarly the 'heth' for 'he'.

(9) Job XXXIX, 13. The word נעלסה is expanded into: נושא עולה ונתחטא V. Rashi. Jastrow, Dict. p. 449. translates 'He raises his wings and rises and enjoys himself'.

(10) Num. XXII, 32. Heb. ירט expanded into:יראה ראתה נתטה

(11) Heb. כר and מלא; the ears of corn must be quite ripe, each grain filling the husk. According to R. Gershom, Aruch and Rashi: Each ear must be full (מלא) of grain as a cushion (כר) is stuffed with feathers.

(12) When later the corn is acquired by an Israelite.

(13) That were reaped for the purposes of the 'Omer; v. Mishnah supra 63b.

(14) I.e., corn produced and grown by the Temple authorities. Such produce apparently even R. Akiba would agree is exempt from tithes when it is acquired by an Israelite.

(15) For just as R. Akiba declares the remainder of the 'Omer-offering liable to tithes he also declares any corn redeemed from the Temple treasurer liable, so that the proof adduced by the Sages in their argument fails in its purpose.

(16) I,e., the tenth for the 'Omer-offering. The remainder, however, was not covered by Temple money and was not regarded as consecrated hence it is subject to tithes. It follows, however, that if the corn was produced by the Temple authorities and the pile was smoothed whilst it still belonged to the Temple, it is exempt from tithes.

(17) R. Kahana's statement thus stands refuted.

(18) For R. Meir and R. Judah are of the opinion that a gentile cannot own property in the Land of Israel so fully as to release it from the obligation of tithe; so that produce bought from a gentile is liable to tithe even though at the time that the pile of corn was smoothed it belonged to the gentile.

(19) A member of one of the tribes that settled in the Northern Kingdom after the deportation of the Ten Tribes of Israel by the Assyrian king. Some of the peoples came from Cutha and so gave their name to the new settlers as a whole. They are also known as Samaritans. They accepted a form of semi-Judaism, and their status as Jews varied at different times.

(20) So that it is permitted to give terumah from produce bought from a gentile or a Cuthean for produce bought from an Israelite, or vice versa, for the smoothing of the pile belonging at the time to a gentile does not exempt it from tithes.

(21) For R. Jose and R. Simeon hold the view that produce which was finished and stacked into a pile and smoothed off whilst in the possession of a gentile or a Cuthean is exempt henceforth from tithes; and clearly what is exempt from tithe may not be given as tithe for other produce that is liable.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 67a

The rolling out of dough[1] belonging [at the time] to the Temple exempts it [from the dough-offering]. For we learnt:[2] If a woman dedicated her dough [to the Temple] before she had rolled it out, and redeemed it,[3] it is still liable to the dough-offering. If [she dedicated it] after she had rolled it out and then redeemed it, it is still liable. If she dedicated it before she had rolled it out and the Temple treasurer rolled it out, and afterwards she redeemed it, it is exempt, since at the time when dough becomes liable [to the dough-offering] it was exempt.

Raba, however, raised the question. What is the law if the dough when it was rolled out belonged to a gentile? We have indeed learnt:[4] If a man became a proselyte and he had dough that was already rolled out[5] before he became a proselyte he is exempt [from the dough-offering].[6] If [the dough was rolled out] after he became a proselyte, he is liable. If it is in doubt, he is liable. Now whose opinion is represented in this Mishnah? [Is it] the opinion of all? For even R. Meir and R. Judah who in that other case[7] declare it liable [to the tithe], in this case declare it exempt; [their argument being that] in the other cases Scripture stated 'thy corn' several times,[8] [each expression serving to exclude the corn of a gentile,] we thus have a limitation followed by a limitation, and wherever a limitation is followed by a limitation its purpose is nothing else but to include, so that even [the corn] of a gentile is liable [to tithe]; whereas in this case, since the expression 'your dough'[9] is stated twice only, the one expression 'your dough' excludes the dough of a gentile, and the other expression 'your dough' excludes the dough that belongs to the Temple.[10] Or perhaps this Mishnah represents the opinions of R. Jose and R. Simeon only who in that other case declare it exempt, but according to R. Meir and R. Judah [the dough of a gentile would be liable to the dough-offering, for they] infer this case from the other case by reason of the common expression 'the first'?[11] — May it be the will [of God], prayed Raba, that I behold [the answer to my question] in a dream! Afterwards Raba came to the conclusion that he who holds that the smoothing of the pile of corn belonging to a gentile exempts it [from tithes], also holds that the rolling out of dough belonging to a gentile exempts it [from the dough-offering]; and he who holds that the smoothing of the pile of corn belonging to a gentile does not exempt it, also holds that the rolling out of dough belonging to a gentile does not exempt it.

R. Papa raised the following objection against Raba: If a gentile [now a proselyte] set apart the firstling[12] of his ass, or the dough-offering,[13] he must be informed that he is exempt therefrom; his dough-offering may therefore be eaten by non-priests, and the firstling may be shorn and put to work. It follows, however, that the terumah [that he had set apart from his corn] is forbidden.[14] Accordingly this Tanna is of the opinion that the smoothing of the pile of corn belonging to a gentile does not exempt it [from tithes], and [yet he holds] that the rolling out of the dough belonging to a gentile exempts it [from the dough-offering]! Furthermore, Rabina raised the following objection against Raba: As to the dough-offering set apart by a gentile [now a proselyte] in the lands [of Israel], or his terumah outside the land [of Israel]. he must be informed that he is exempt therefrom; his dough-offering may therefore be eaten by non-priests, and his terumah would not render [the other produce into which it may fall] subject to the laws of terumah. It follows, however, that the terumah he set apart in the land [of Israel] is forbidden [to non-priests] and also renders [the other produce into which it may fall] subject to the laws of terumah. Accordingly this Tanna holds that the smoothing of the pile of corn belonging to a gentile does not exempt it [from tithes], and yet [he holds] that the rolling out of the dough belonging to a gentile exempts it [from the dough-offering]! — It is only so Rabbinically,[15] as a precautionary measure against men of wealth.[16]

---

(1) At this moment the dough becomes liable to the dough-offering; cf. Num. XV, 18-21. If at that moment the dough belongs to the Temple it is exempt from the dough-offering, but if to a lay person it is liable.

(2) Hal. III, 3.

(3) And after she had redeemed it she rolled it out, so that at the time of rolling out it no longer belonged to the Temple.

(4) Hal. III, 6.

(5) Lit. 'prepared'.

(6) For at the time of the rolling out the dough belonged to a gentile.

(7) In the matter of corn belonging to a gentile at the time when it becomes liable to the tithe, i.e., when the pile is smoothed off.

(8) In fact the expression 'thy corn' is stated three times viz., Deut. XII, 17; XIV, 23; and XVIII, 4, but one serves to exclude that which belongs to the Temple; each of the other two would serve to exclude that which belongs to a gentile.

(9) Num. XV. 20 and 21.

(10) So MS.M., Tosaf. and Sh. Mek. Cur. edd. read: The one expression 'your dough' teaches that there must be as

much as your dough (v. Hul. 135b). and the other expression ‘your dough’ excludes the dough belonging to a gentile or to the Temple.

(11) ‘The first’ is stated with regard to the dough-offering. Num. XV, 20, and also with regard to the tithe of corn, Deut. XVIII, 4; therefore, as in the latter case the corn is liable to tithe even though at the time the obligation falls due it belongs to a gentile, so it is too with the dough-offering.

(12) I.e., he set apart a lamb as the redemption of the firstling of the ass; cf. Ex. XIII, 13. So Rashi, but v. Tosaf. s.v. עובד

(13) The firstling had been born while he was still a gentile; similarly the dough had been rolled out while he was still a gentile.

(14) To be eaten by non-priests, although at the time when he smoothed the pile he was a gentile. (5) I.e., of produce grown in the land of Israel.

(15) Strictly even his terumah is no terumah and may be eaten by non-priests, for the smoothing of the pile by the gentile exempts the corn from terumah and tithes; but it is forbidden by Rabbinic decree.

(16) Lit., ‘men of purses’, i.e., Jewish merchants who purchase large quantities of corn from Jews and non-Jews; and if what they purchase from non-Jews is exempt from terumah and tithes, they might hold that even what they purchase from Jews is also exempt. Another interpretation: they are men with large estates and in order to avoid giving large quantities as terumah and tithe they would arrange to dispose of the field temporarily to a gentile, so that the smoothing of the pile be done by the gentile, and thus be exempt from terumah and tithes.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 67b

Then the same should be said of the dough-offering, should it not?[1] — It is always possible [to avoid the dough-offering] by baking [quantities of dough each] less than five quarters of a kab and a little more[2] of flour. Then with the terumah, too, it is always possible [to avoid the terumah] by acting according to R. Oshaia's ruling; for R. Oshaia said, A man can resort to a device with his produce and bring it in [to his house] together with the chaff, so that his cattle may eat of it and it is exempt from the tithe; or he can bring it in by way of the roof or by way of a back enclosure![3] — In the latter case,[4] since it is done openly, he would be ashamed of it;[5] but in the former case[6] it is done in private and he would not be ashamed of it.[7]

MISHNAH. HE[8] THEN CAME TO THE TENTH, PUT IN OIL[9] AND ITS FRANKINCENSE, POURED IN THE OIL, MINGLED IT, WAVED IT, BROUGHT IT NEAR [TO THE ALTAR], TOOK FROM IT THE HANDFUL AND BURNT IT; AND THE REMAINDER WAS EATEN BY THE PRIESTS. AFTER THE OMER WAS OFFERED THEY USED TO GO OUT AND FIND THE MARKET OF JERUSALEM ALREADY FULL OF MEAL AND PARCHED CORN [OF THE NEW PRODUCE]; THIS, HOWEVER, DID NOT MEET WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE SAGES.[10] SO R. MEIR. R. JUDAH SAYS, THEY DID SO WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE SAGES.[11] GEMARA. And does not R. Judah apprehend lest one might eat of it? But I can point out a contradiction to this, for we have learnt: Judah says, One searches on the night [preceding] the fourteenth day [of Nisan], or[12] on the morning of the fourteenth, or[12] at the time for its removal.[13] But the Sages say, If a man has not searched etc.[14] — Rabbah answered, It is different with the new produce,

---

(1) Even the dough that was rolled out by a gentile should also, Rabbinically, be subject to the dough-offering, for otherwise men might avoid the dough-offering by arranging that a gentile should roll out the dough.

(2) This is the minimum quantity of dough liable to the dough-offering. cf. ‘Er. 83b. ‘Ed. I, 2.

(3) Produce is not liable to the tithe unless (a) its preparation has been finished, i.e. it has reached that stage when the pile of grain has been smoothed off, and (b) it is brought, when finished, into the house or store-room in the usual manner, i.e., through the door. Otherwise it is not liable, and a man's cattle may eat of it at all times, and even the man himself may eat of it casually. In this case, therefore, the produce is not liable to the tithe at all, since it was brought into the house with the chaff, i.e., unfinished, or it was brought in in an unusual manner.

(4) Concerning terumah.

(5) To resort to the device mentioned above, for it would be obvious to all what his purpose was; hence in order to avoid giving terumah he would have to resort to the subterfuge of transferring the produce to a gentile that he should smooth the pile. The Rabbis therefore decreed that this act of the gentile should not exempt it from terumah.
(6) With regard to the dough.
(7) To bake the dough in small quantities; so that he would not have to resort to the subterfuge of transferring the dough to a gentile that he should roll it out in order to be exempt from the dough-offering.
(8) I.e., the person chosen for this service, not necessarily a priest, for only the taking out of the handful and the services subsequent thereto had to be performed by a priest.
(9) A part of the log of oil was first poured into the vessel and then the flour was put in, thereafter more oil was poured in and the whole was mingled together, and finally the remainder of the oil was poured in. V. infra 74b;
(10) For the produce that is now sold in the market must have been reaped before the offering of the ‘Omer, and this in most cases is forbidden, v. infra 70a; moreover, even if it was the produce of those fields that may be reaped before the offering of the ‘Omer, v. infra 71a, it is to be feared, according to R. Meir, that the people whilst reaping would eat of it.
(11) And it is not to be feared lest the people eat of it whilst reaping, since they are accustomed to abstain from the new produce until the offering of the ‘Omer.
(12) I.e., if he did not search for leaven on the first mentioned time he must search for it on the second time stated or the third.
(13) At the sixth hour of the fourteenth day. After this, however, he must not make the search for leaven, since it is to be feared that during his search if he finds any leaven he might eat it and so transgress the law. This view clearly contradicts that expressed by R. Judah in our Mishnah.
(14) Pes. 10b.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 68a

for since you have only permitted a man to pluck [the corn with the hand],[1] he would remember.[2] Said Abaye to him: This is satisfactory with regard to reaping, but what about the grinding and the sifting?[3] — This is really no difficulty, for the grinding could be done in a hand-mill, and the sifting on the back of the sieve. But what is to be said of irrigated fields where reaping is permitted, for we have learnt: One may reap [before the ‘Omer the corn] in irrigated fields in the plain, but one may not stack it?[4] — Abaye therefore answered thus, From the new produce a man is accustomed to abstain,[5] but from leaven he is not accustomed to abstain.[6] Said Raba, Is there only a contradiction between the views of R. Judah and not between the views of the Rabbis?[7] — Raba therefore answered, There is no contradiction between the views of R. Judah. as we have already answered;[8] and there is also no contradiction between the views of the Rabbis, for the sole purpose of his searching [for leaven] is in order to burn it, would he then eat of it?[9] R. Ashi said, There is no contradiction between the views of R. Judah, because our Mishnah speaks of MEAL AND PARCHED CORN.[10] But this statement of R. Ashi is beside the mark;[11] for this is very well when the corn has been parched, but what can be said for the time before the corn has been parched?[12] Should you say that here too the corn will only be plucked,[13] as Rabbah suggested above, then it will be asked, What is to be said in the case of an irrigated field where reaping is permitted? We must therefore say that R. Ashi's statement is beside the mark.

MISHNAH. AFTER THE ‘OMER WAS OFFERED THE NEW CORN WAS PERMITTED FORTHWITH; BUT FOR THOSE THAT LIVED FAR OFF[14] IT WAS PERMITTED ONLY AFTER MIDDAY. AFTER THE TEMPLE WAS DESTROYED R. JOHANAN B. ZAKKAI ORDAINED THAT IT SHOULD BE FORBIDDEN THROUGHOUT THE DAY OF THE WAVING.[15] R. JUDAH SAID, IS IT NOT SO FORBIDDEN BY THE LAW OF THE TORAH, FOR IT IS WRITTEN, UNTIL THIS SELFSAME DAY?[16] WHEREFORE WAS IT PERMITTED FOR THEM THAT LIVED FAR OFF IMMEDIATELY AFTER MIDDAY?[17] BECAUSE THEY KNOW THAT THE BETH DIN ARE NOT DILATORY THEREWITH.

GEMARA. Rab and Samuel both stated that when the Temple stood the offering of the ‘Omer

rendered [the new corn] permitted, and when the Temple was no more the daybreak [of the sixteenth day] rendered it permitted. What is the reason for this? Because two expressions are written; it is written, Until ye have brought,[18] and also, Until this selfsame day.[18] How are they to be reconciled? The former refers to the time when the Temple stood, the other to the time when the Temple was no more. R. Johanan and Resh Lakish both stated that even when the Temple stood the daybreak [of the sixteenth day] rendered it permitted. But is it not written also, Until ye have brought? — This is only a recommendation.[19] [But have we not learnt:] AFTER THE 'OMER WAS OFFERED THE NEW CORN WAS PERMITTED FORTHWITH?[20] — This, too, is only a recommendation. [And have we not learnt:] The 'Omer rendered the new corn permitted throughout the land and the Two Loaves rendered it permitted in the Temple?[21] — This. too, is only a recommendation.

---

(1) But not to reap it in the ordinary manner with a sickle.

(2) Not to eat thereof whilst plucking the corn.

(3) What restriction or change from the usual manner in these works is suggested to remind him that it is new produce with which he is working and so abstain from eating thereof?

(4) Infra 71a.

(5) For he has not eaten of it the whole year round.

(6) As he has been eating it until this day, he might forget himself and eat of it when he is forbidden so to do.

(7) Of course there is a contradiction between the views of the Sages! More correctly the contradiction is between the view of R. Meir, the opponent of R. Judah, in our Mishnah, according to which we must apprehend the danger of one eating of the new corn while reaping it, and the view of the Sages, also the opponents of R. Judah, in the Mishnah in Pes., according to which view a man, if he had not made any search for leaven before the Festival, must search for it during the Festival whenever he reminds himself of it, and there is no fear that he will eat any leaven that he finds.

(8) The answer suggested by Abaye.

(9) Of course not; hence there is no reason to be apprehensive.

(10) קמח קלי, and these are not fit to be eaten as they are, uncooked. Apparently PARCHED CORN in the Mishnah means meal prepared from parched ears of corn; so Rashi and R. Gershom. A variant of this expression in the Mishnah is קמח קלי 'meal of parched corn'.

(11) ברותא; var. בדותא V. B.M., Sonc. ed., p. 47. n. 1.

(12) When the ears of corn are fit for eating.

(13) By the hand and not reaped, and this will serve as a reminder not to eat of it.

(14) Those that dwell outside Jerusalem and do not know whether the 'Omer has already been offered or not.

(15) I.e., the day on which the 'Omer was offered, which included the rite of waving, namely the sixteenth day of Nisan.

(16) Lev. XXIII, 14. R. Judah takes the view that the term 'until' is inclusive, accordingly the whole of this day is forbidden. R. Judah

(17) This question refers to Temple times. Perhaps the 'Omer will not have been offered by midday, why then are those far off permitted immediately after midday?

(18) Lev. XXIII, 14.

(19) It is proper to abstain from the new corn until the offering of the 'Omer, but there is no transgression if one did not observe this rule.

(20) But surely not before the offering of the 'Omer.

(21) infra 68b.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 68b

But we have learnt: AFTER THE TEMPLE WAS DESTROYED R. JOHANAN B. ZAKKAI ORDAINED THAT IT SHOULD BE FORBIDDEN THROUGHOUT THE DAY OF THE WAVING. What is the reason? The Temple may speedily be rebuilt and people would then say, 'Did we not eat last year [of the new corn] immediately at the daybreak [of the sixteenth day]? This year too we shall eat it [from the same time]', but they will not realize that last year when there was

admits, however, that this was the law only after the destruction of the Temple, but during Temple

times it was permitted immediately after the ‘Omer was offered. no ‘Omer-offering the daybreak rendered it permitted, but now that there is an ‘Omer-offering it is only the ‘Omer-offering that renders it permitted.[1] Now if it is only a recommendation to do so, would we impose a restriction on account of a recommendation only? — R. Nahman b. Isaac said that R. Johanan b. Zakkai ruled in accordance with the view enunciated by R. Judah who said that it[2] is forbidden by the law of the Torah, for it is written, ‘Until this selfsame day’, that is, until this very day itself, and he is also of the opinion that the expression ‘until’ is inclusive.[3] But does [R. Johanan b. Zakkai] concur with him [R. Judah]? Do they not in fact disagree? for we have learnt: AFTER THE TEMPLE WAS DESTROYED R. JOHANAN B. ZAKKAI ORDAINED THAT IT SHOULD BE FORBIDDEN THROUGHOUT THE DAY OF THE WAVING. R. JUDAH SAID, IS IT NOT SO FORBIDDEN BY THE LAW OF THE TORAH, FOR IT IS WRITTEN, UNTIL THIS SELFSAME DAY? — R. Judah misunderstood [the other's view]; he thought that R. Johanan b. Zakkai regarded the prohibition as Rabbinic, but in fact it was not so; he meant it as a prohibition by the law of the Torah. But does not our Mishnah say ‘ORDAINED’? — ‘ORDAINED’ means, he expounded [the verse] and established the law accordingly.

R. Papa and R. Huna the son of R. Joshua used to eat the new corn on the night of the sixteenth day which is really the beginning[4] of the seventeenth day, for they hold the view that the prohibition of the new corn outside the land [of Israel] is only Rabbinical[5] and that the doubt[6] need not be taken into account. The Rabbis of the school of R. Ashi used to eat it on the morning of the seventeenth, for they hold that the prohibition of the new corn outside the land of Israel is Biblical,[5] but that the ruling of R. Johanan b. Zakkai was only a Rabbinic ordinance; and this ordinance, they maintain, was intended to apply only to the actual day of the waving but not to the day of doubt.[7] Rabina said, ‘My mother told me that your father did not eat of the new corn until the night of the seventeenth which is the beginning of the eighteenth, for he is of the same opinion as R. Judah[8] and also takes into account the day of doubt’.

MISHNAH. THE ‘OMER RENDERED [THE NEW CORN] PERMITTED THROUGHOUT THE LAND, AND THE TWO LOAVES[9] RENDERED IT PERMITTED IN THE TEMPLE.[10] ONE MAY NOT OFFER MEAL-OFFERINGS,[11] FIRST-FRUITS, OR MEAL-OFFERINGS THAT ACCOMPANY ANIMAL OFFERINGS, BEFORE THE ‘OMER; AND IF ONE DID SO, IT WAS INVALID. NOR MAY ONE OFFER THESE BEFORE THE TWO LOAVES; BUT IF ONE DID SO IT WAS VALID.

GEMARA. R. Tarfon was sitting and asked this question: What [is the reason for the difference in law] between [what is offered] before the ‘Omer and [what is offered] before the Two Loaves?[12] Said Judah b. Nehemiah before him, No; you can say [that what is offered] before the ‘Omer [is invalid]. for the prohibition [of the new corn] does not admit of any exception to the private individual,[13] but can you say so [of what is offered] before the Two Loaves, seeing that the prohibition does admit of an exception to the private individual?[14] R. Tarfon remained silent, and at once the face of Judah b. Nehemiah brightened with joy. Thereupon R. Akiba said to him, ‘Judah. your face has brightened with joy because you have refuted the Sage; I wonder whether you will live long’ — Said R. Judah b. Ila'i, ‘This happened a fortnight before the Passover,[15] and when I came up for the ‘Azereth[16] festival I enquired after Judah b. Nehemiah and was told that he had passed away’.

R. Nahman b. Isaac said, According to the view of Judah b. Nehemiah,if drink-offerings [of wine], made from the first-fruits which ripened [before the ‘Omer], were offered before the ‘Omer, they are valid,[17] Is not this obvious?- [No.] for you might argue that only in that case[18] [is the offering valid], because the prohibition[19] admits of an exception to the individual, but not in this case where the prohibition does not admit of any exception; he therefore teaches us that it is all the more so in this case where there is no prohibition at all![20]

(Mnemonic: Order. In bud. Dung. Elephant.)[21] Rami b. Hama raised the question: Do the Two Loaves render permitted when not in the usual order?[22] What are the circumstances?-For instance, corn was sown [in the period] between the offering of the 'Omer and the Two Loaves, and then the time of the offering of the Two Loaves and the [next] 'Omer passed by. Shall we say that they [the Two Loaves] render permitted only in the usual order but not when not in the usual order, or that they render permitted even when not in the usual order? Rabbah said, Come and hear: The verse, And if thou bring a meal-offering of first-fruits.[23] refers to the meal-offering of the 'Omer. Of what was it offered? Of barley. You say 'of barley'. but perhaps it is not so but rather of wheat! Said R. Eliezer, The expression 'in the ear'[24] is stated In regard to [the incidents in] Egypt, and the expression 'in the ear'[23] is also stated [as an ordinance] for generations: just as 'in the ear' stated in regard to [the incidents in] Egypt referred to barley,[24] so 'in the ear' stated [as an ordinance] for generations refers to barley. R. Akiba said, We find that an individual must offer wheat as an obligation[25] and also barley as an obligation;[26] likewise we find that the community must offer wheat as an obligation and also barley as an obligation. Should you say. therefore, that the 'Omer was offered of wheat, then we do not find a case when the community must offer barley as an obligation! Another explanation: Should you say that the 'Omer was offered of wheat, then the Two Loaves would not be the first-fruits![27] Now if it is right to say that the Two Loaves render permitted even when not in the usual order, then why do you say that the Two Loaves would not be the first-fruits? It can happen that the 'Omer is offered — of that corn which had taken root before the offering of the Two Loaves but after last year's 'Omer, and the Two Loaves of that corn which had taken root before this year's 'Omer[28] but after

of the 'Omer and then the period of the Two Loaves. The question here raised is whether the corn is always permitted for meal-offerings after the passing of these two periods, irrespective of their sequence. or not. last year's Two Loaves!-Do you think

---

(1) V. R.H. 36b.

(2) After the destruction of the Temple the new corn is forbidden the whole of the sixteenth day of Nisan by Biblical injunction.

(3) Of the terminus of the prohibition; so that the new corn is forbidden the whole of the sixteenth day and is only permitted on the following day.

(4) Lit., 'light'.

(5) V. Kid. 37a.

(6) Owing to the absence of a fixed calendar the duration of a month varied between twenty-nine and thirty days; consequently the day that is regarded as the seventeenth of the month may really be the sixteenth, if the preceding month consisted of thirty days.

(7) Accordingly after daybreak on the seventeenth day the new corn is permitted.

(8) First that the prohibition of the new corn outside the land of Israel is Biblical, and secondly, that the prohibition during the day of the waving of the 'Omer is also Biblical.

(9) Offered on the Feast of Weeks, cf. Lev. XXIII, 17.

(10) The new corn may henceforth be used for meal-offerings. The Two Loaves were to be the first offering from the new corn, as it is written, And ye shall present a new meal-offering unto the Lord, ibid. 16.

(11) Of new corn.

(12) Why is it that in the former case the offering is invalid and in the latter valid?

(13) For before the 'Omer the new corn is forbidden to all without exception.

(14) For after the 'Omer an individual may enjoy the new corn and the prohibition is restricted to the Temple only.

(15) Lit., 'that time was half the period (of preparation) for the Passover'; the period of preparation for the Passover being thirty days. v. Pes. 6a.

(16) The Feast of Weeks, v. supra p. 385. n. 5.

(17) According to the reasoning advanced by Judah b. Nehemiah, that where the prohibition of the new corn admits of an exception to the individual whatsoever is offered before the prohibition has been absolutely raised is valid, these drink-offerings are certainly valid, for the prohibition of the new produce not only admits of an exception but does not

apply at all, as it applies only to corn and not to fruits. It must now be observed that the FIRST-FRUITS mentioned In our Mishnah, which may not be offered before the ‘Omer, clearly refer to the species of corn that are included in the first-fruits and not to fruits.

(18) Sc. where meal-offerings are offered before the Two Loaves.

(19) Sc. of the new corn.

(20) For the new season wine or fruits are not prohibited before the ‘Omer.

(21) These are the four subjects of the questions raised by Rami b. Hama in this passage.

(22) In the ordinary course corn is sown some time before the offering of the ‘Omer, so that before the corn is permitted for use as meal-offerings (i.e., after the offering of the Two Loaves) the two periods affecting corn have passed by in the normal sequence, namely. first the period

(23) Lev. II, 14.

(24) Ex. IX, 31.

(25) In ordinary meal-offerings.

(26) In the meal-offering of a woman suspected of adultery; cf. Num. V, 15.

(27) The Two Loaves, termed ‘first-fruits’ (Lev. XXIII, 17), were intended to be the first meal-offering of wheat of the year. This, however, would not be the case if the ‘Omer were offered of wheat.

(28) It must here be assumed that wheat was sown at two periods during the one year; first, after the ‘Omer but

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 69a

that we require [the Two Loaves] to be the first-fruits of any particular fruit?[1] [No.] we require them to be the first-fruits of the altar,[2] and in this case the altar has consumed of this year's produce.[3] Rami b. Hama raised the question. Do [the Two Loaves] permit what is in bud[4] or only what is in distinct formation?[5] What is meant by ‘in bud’ and what by ‘distinct formation’? Shall I say [that it means] the budding of the fruit and the distinct formation of the fruit? But surely if they permit [corn] which has only taken root, they will certainly permit fruits which are in bud or are distinctly formed! — Rather [we must say that it means] the budding of the leaves and the distinct formation of the leaves; and the question is: which of these stages corresponds to the taking root[6] [of corn]?-This remains unanswered.

before the Two Loaves; and a second time, after the Two Loaves. Now the wheat of the first sowing could be used for the next ‘Omer, and thereafter all the wheat of that sowing would be permitted, for it is now held that grain over which there have passed the two periods, even though not in the usual sequence (for here the Two Loaves passed by it first), is permitted; and the wheat of the second sowing would be used for the Two Loaves, which would truly be first-fruits, as this crop of wheat has not been used before. The fact the Tanna does not accept this position proves that the grain is not permitted unless the various periods pass by it in the proper sequence; so that, in the above case, the grain of the first sowing would not be permitted until after the Two Loaves had been offered; and as the wheat of this sowing was offered for the ‘Omer the offering of the Two Loaves would not be firstfruits.

Raba son of R. Hanan raised the question, Does the ‘Omer permit the wheat that is sown in the soil or not?- But what are the circumstances? If it took root,[7] we have learnt it; and if not, we have also learnt it. For we learnt: If they had taken root before the ‘Omer, the ‘Omer permits them; and if not, they are forbidden until the next [year's] ‘Omer.[8] — The case must be that one reaped [the wheat] and resowed [the grains] before the ‘Omer, and then the ‘Omer came and went by;[9] and the question is: may one take them[10] out and eat them, for they are regarded as though they were lying in a pitcher, and the Omer has rendered them permitted; or perhaps they have become assimilated to the soil?[11] Does the law of overreaching apply to it[12] or not?[13] — But what are the circumstances? Shall we say that he[14] said, ‘I cast therein six [measures of grain]’, and witnesses came forward and testified that he cast therein but five? But Raba has said, On account of any fraud in measure, weight or number, even though it is less than the standard of overreaching, one can retract![15] -The case must

be that he[14] said, 'I cast therein as much as was necessary', but witnesses came forward and testified that he did not cast therein as much as was necessary. Now the question is this: does the law of overreaching apply to it, for it is as though it were lying in a pitcher;[16] or perhaps it has become assimilated to the soil?[17]

Is an oath taken concerning it or not?[18] Is it as though it were lying in a pitcher, so that it is regarded as movables and an oath must be taken on account of it; or perhaps it has become assimilated to the soil, so that it is regarded as land and no oath may be taken on account of it? — These questions remain unanswered. Rami b. Hama raised the question. What is the position with regard to the grains of wheat found in cattle dung or the grains of barley found in animal dung? — In what connection does this question arise? If you say in connection with their suffering food uncleanness, but we have learnt it: Grains of wheat found in cattle dung or grains of barley found in animal dung, even though one intended them as food, do not suffer food uncleanness; if one intended them as food for a child, they do suffer food uncleanness.[19] And if you say in connection with meal-offerings, but it is obvious [that they may not be used for this purpose]; Present it now unto thy governor; will he be pleased with thee? or will he accept thy person?[20] — The case can only arise where one gathered [these grains] and sowed them, and one now wishes to bring [out of the new growth] a meal-offering. Is it on account of repulsiveness [that they must not be used for meal-offerings], but when they have been sown their repulsiveness is gone;[21] or is it on account of their leanness,[22] and now, too, they are lean?-The question remains undecided.

Rami b. Hama raised the question. What is the law if an elephant swallowed an osier basket and passed it out with its excrement? In what connection does the question arise? If you say with regard to the annulment of its uncleanness,[23] but we have learnt it: All articles are rendered susceptible to uncleanness through intention.[24] and divest themselves of their uncleanness only by an act which changes them![25] -The case must be that it swallowed twigs and [the twigs when passed out] were made into an osier basket, and the question is: are [the twigs] regarded as 'digested' so that now [what is made from them is accounted]

---

(1) And therefore as long as no corn of any particular sowing has been used in the Temple it is suitable for the Two Loaves as first-fruits.

(2) I.e., the first-fruits of the year's produce to be offered on the altar.

(3) For the wheat used for the 'Omer was of this year's produce even though of an earlier sowing.

(4) I.e., only such fruits which were in bud at the time of the offering of the Two Loaves may be brought later by an individual as first-fruits, but not those which were not in bud at that time.

(5) Only the fruit which had shown a distinct shape at the time of the offering of the Two Loaves may be brought later as first-fruits, but not those which were only in bud then.

(6) Does the budding of the leaves correspond to the taking root of corn, or is it only the later stage vis., the formation of the leaves that corresponds to it?

(7) And the question is whether the growth is permitted by the 'Omer or not.

(8) Infra 70a.

(9) Had the grain not been resown it would certainly have been permitted by the 'Omer; it had been resown, however, a short while before the 'Omer and it had not taken root at the time of the 'Omer.

(10) Sc. the actual grains of wheat that were sown.

(11) And they are regarded now as a new growth, which will not be permitted until the next year's 'Omer.

(12) Wheat sown in the soil.

(13) The general rule of overreaching is: If in any transaction an error is made which is less than a sixth of the value of the goods, the transaction must stand; if it is more than a sixth it is void; if exactly a sixth it is valid but the amount of error must be returned. V.B.M. 50b. It is, however, established (B.M. 56a) that the law of overreaching does not apply to land. The case under consideration is this: where a man undertakes to sow another's field with wheat, he having to supply the wheat, is the transaction one of land or of movables?

(14) Sc. the contractor.

(15) Where the goods are short either in measure, weight or number, one can retract even though the shortage is less than a sixth; v. B.M. 56b; Kid. 42b.
(16) And it is a transaction of movables.
(17) And as the law of overreaching does not apply to the soil it neither applies to the wheat sown.
(18) I.e., concerning the wheat that had been sown. It is established (B.M. 56a) that no oath is imposed concerning transactions of land; the question therefore is whether any claim concerning the wheat sown is regarded as one affecting land or not.
(19) Tosef. Toh. IX.
(20) Mal. I, 8.
(21) Accordingly the new growth may be offered as meal-offerings.
(22) Since the grains have passed through the digestive organs of the animal they are regarded as emaciated and dry, having lost all their sap; so that when sown they could only produce a meagre and lean crop, unsuitable for offerings.
(23) I.e.,the basket was unclean before it was swallowed, and it is suggested that now it should be regarded as clean, having divested itself of its uncleanness.
(24) The intention of a person to use an article in its present state for some purpose (even though the article normally serves another purpose and for that purpose the article is not yet complete) makes it susceptible to contract uncleanness. E.g.. a hide is normally used for the making of shoes, so that before it is made into shoes it will not contract uncleanness. If, however, a man intended to use the hide, as it is now, for a mattress or a table cover, it thereby becomes susceptible to contract uncleanness.
(25) An article that is already unclean loses its uncleanness only if its structure has changed; e.g.. if it is broken. (Kel. XXV, 9. Shab. 52b; Suk. 13b; Kid. 59a). In the case in question, since the basket is unchanged it still retains its uncleanness.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 69b

as a vessel made from cattle dung or from earth, which does not contract uncleanness, for the Master has stated, Vessels made from stone, from cattle dung or from earth do not contract uncleanness, either by Biblical or by Rabbinical law;[1] or perhaps they are not regarded as 'digested'?[2] — But surely the question can be solved from the following statement of 'Ulla which he reported in the name of R. Simeon b. Jehozadak: It once happened that wolves devoured two children beyond the Jordan and they discharged them through the excretory canal; and when the fact came before the Sages they declared the [excreted] flesh as clean![3] Flesh is different for it is tender. Then let it be solved from the next line: And they declared the [excreted] bones as unclean! — Bones are different for they are exceptionally hard.[4] R. Zera raised the question. What is the law with regard to wheat which fell from the clouds?-In what connection is the question raised? If [the question is raised as to its use] for meal-offerings, but why should it not be used? — It is raised in connection with the Two Loaves: [shall we say that] the Divine Law stated, Out of your dwellings.[5] to exclude what comes from outside the land [of Israel], but what comes from the clouds would be permitted; or perhaps Scripture restricted it exclusively [to what comes] out of your dwellings, so that what comes from the clouds would also not [be permitted]? But can it ever happen so?[6] Indeed yes, for there once came down [from the clouds] to Bar 'Adi, the Arab, [a layer of wheat] the height of a handsbreadth[7] over an area of three parasangs.

R. Simeon b. Pazzi raised the question, What is the law if an ear of corn, which had reached a third of its growth before the 'Omer, had been plucked out [before the 'Omer] and was replanted after the 'Omer when it increased its growth? Do we have regard to the stock [of the corn], and that was rendered permitted by the 'Omer; or do we have regard to the increase, and that [will be permitted] only after next year's 'Omer? — But surely the question can be solved from the following statement of R. Abbahu which he said in the name of R. Johanan: If a young shoot[8] laden with fruit was grafted on to an old tree, even if [the fruit had as a result] increased two hundredfold.[9] it is still forbidden.[10] Furthermore. R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Jonathan, If an onion was planted in a vineyard.[11] and the vineyard was later uprooted, even though [the onion had thereafter]

increased two hundredfold, it is still forbidden?[10] -It was [those very rulings][12] which caused him to raise the question. Were those Rabbis[13] certain of the ruling that we have regard to the stock, and they would apply it to all cases whether it would lead to leniency[14] or stringency;[15] or perhaps they were in doubt about it, so that they applied it only to those cases which lead to stringency but not to those which lead to leniency? — This remains undecided. Raba raised the question. What is the position with regard to tithing? In what circumstances? Where, for example,

---

(1) Shab. 58a. Cf. Kel. X, I.

(2) So that the basket can contract uncleanness.

(3) For it is regarded as digested. V. Ta'an. 22b.

(4) The question, however, still remains as regards ordinary articles that were swallowed and passed out again, whether they are to be regarded as digested or not.

(5) Lev. XXIII, 27, in connection with the Two Loaves.

(6) That wheat should fall from the clouds.

(7) The meaning and etymology of כיזבא(var. ניזבא, v. D.S.) is unknown.

(8) I.e., less than three years old, the fruit of which is 'orlah(v. Glos.) and is forbidden; cf. Lev. XIX, 23ff.

(9) And generally 'orlah is neutralized and nullified by such an increase. V. Pes. 48a.

(10) Since the increase is only an addition to the stock, no matter in what proportion it is to the stock, it will never nullify it. V. Ned. 57b. Hence it is seen that we have regard mainly to the stock.

(11) This has rendered the entire vineyard, the onion as well as the vines, forbidden as kil'ayim, 'diverse kinds in the vineyard'; cf Lev. XIX, 19; Deut. XXII, 9.

(12) Sc. the ruling in each of the quoted statements

(13) Sc.R. Abbahu and R. Samuel b. Nahmani.

(14) As in the case put by R. Simeon b. Pazzi; for if we apply the rule that we have regard to the stock the result is that the corn is permitted by this year's 'Omer.

(15) As in the cases quoted by these Rabbis, i.e., in respect of 'orlah and kil'ayim.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 70a

the ears of corn were tithed by conjectural estimate and the rest was resown and had increased in growth.[1] And should you say that [in this case] we have no regard to the stock,[2] so that the increase must be tithed, the question will remain, What about the stock itself?[3] -Said to him Abaye, Wherein does this differ from ordinary wheat and barley?[4] — He replied. In those cases where the seed decays I have no doubt at all;[5] my question only refers to the case where what was sown does not decay.[6] What is then the position with regard to this? — But surely this can be solved from the following statement of R. Isaac which he said in the name of R. Johanan: If a litra[7] of onions was tithed[8] and then replanted, the tithe must again be taken from the whole [of the growth]![9] — In this case it is the usual manner of planting.[10] but in the former case that is not the usual manner of sowing.[11] R. Hanina b. Manyomi put the following to Abaye. What is the law with regard to the growth in a plant-pot that was not perforated?[12] — But surely if it is not perforated, it is not perforated![13] Perhaps you refer to an unperforated pot which was later perforated![14] -Here there is but one sowing and it has now become joined [to the earth] and is growing up,[15] whereas in the other case there were two sowings![16]

R. Abbahu raised this question. What is the law if an ear of corn, which had been in the pile when it was smoothed off,[17] had been replanted and designated [as terumah][18] when attached [to the soil]? Do we say that since it was in the pile when it was smoothed off it then became tebel,[19] and therefore when it is later designated [as terumah, even though attached to the soil], it is consecrated [as terumah]; or perhaps since it was replanted its tebel state has passed? — The Rabbis thereupon said to Abaye, If [we say] so,[20] then we find produce that is attached to the soil consecrated as terumah, and we have learnt: We do not find produce that is attached to the soil consecrated as terumah![21] — He replied. That was taught only in connection with the liability of death[22] [at the hands of Heaven]

and the payment of the added fifth.[22] For if one plucked it[23] out and ate it, one has then eaten what was detached from soil; and if one bent down and ate it, that act runs counter to the acts of men.[24]

Wherein is this case[25] different from that which is stated in Ilfa's note-book, viz., As regards the eggs that were partly out-, side the carcass of a clean bird and partly inside,[26] the inside part[27] renders unclean whilst it is in the gullet the clothes [of him that eats it];[28] but the outside part does not render unclean whilst it is in the gullet the clothes [of him that eats it]!-What is not attached [to the soil] people sometimes eat in this [unusual] manner, but what is attached to the soil people do not eat in that manner.[29]

R. Tabyom[30] b. Kisna said in the name of Samuel, If a man sowed diverse seeds in an unperforated plant-pot, it is forbidden. Said Abaye, It is well if he were to teach us that the man suffers the Rabbinic penalty of chastisement;[31] but what does he teach us by saying 'It is forbidden'? That Rabbinically it is regarded as a sowing? Surely this we have already learnt: If a man set aside as terumah that which grew in an unperforated pot for that which grew in a perforated pot, [what has been set aside is accounted as] terumah, yet he must give the terumah afresh.[32]

MISHNAH. WHEAT, BARLEY, SPELT, OATS AND RYE ARE SUBJECT TO THE DOUGH-OFFERING; AND THEY CAN BE RECKONED TOGETHER.[33] THEY ARE FORBIDDEN [TO BE EATEN] AS NEW PRODUCE BEFORE THE 'OMER,[34] AND THEY MAY NOT BE REAPED BEFORE THE PASSOVER.[34] IF THEY HAD TAKEN ROOT BEFORE THE 'OMER, THE 'OMER RENDERS THEM PERMITTED; OTHERWISE THEY ARE FORBIDDEN UNTIL THE NEXT YEAR'S 'OMER.

GEMARA. A Tanna taught: Kusmin[35] [spelt] is a species of wheat;[36] shibboleth shu'al[37] [oats] and shipon[38] [rye] are species of barley. Kusmin

---

(1) The question therefore is: Must that increase, over and above the stock that was resown, be tithed, or is it exempt by reason of the original tithing of the stock?

(2) For otherwise it would result in a lenient ruling exempting the increase from tithing.

(3) Must the stock which was resown be tithed again or not?

(4) Which have been tithed, nevertheless when sown the produce thereof must undoubtedly be tithed again.

(5) The growth must then certainly be tithed, even though the seed had been tithed before sowing, for the original seed has perished in the earth and now there is an entirely new growth.

(6) E.g., where the tithed ears of corn had been replanted and there is now a further increase upon them.

(7) A measure of capacity; the Roman libra, a pound.

(8) Lit., 'prepared'; i.e., all the priestly dues were separated from it.

(9) I.e., both the stock and the increase. V. Ned. 57b. Similarly with the ears of corn, both the original ear and the increase must be tithed.

(10) Accordingly it must be tithed again.

(11) For the usual manner is to sow seeds and not to replant the ears of corn.

(12) It is assumed that the question is whether one may give as tithe produce grown in another unperforated pot for the produce grown in this unperforated pot. So Rashi and R. Gershom, but v. Sh. Mek. n. 3. It must be remembered that the produce grown in an unperforated plantpot is by Biblical law exempt from the tithe; cf. Demai V, 10.

(13) And both pots are strictly exempt from the tithe.

(14) And the question that he raises is whether one may give as tithe the earlier growth or the stock (i.e., which grew before the pot was perforated) for the later growth or the increase. If we say that we do not regard the stock as the main growth but that we must consider the increase too, then the latter (i.e., the later growth) must be tithed by law, so that the stock may not be given as tithe for the increase. On the other hand, if we regard the increase as the main growth then the entire growth, even the stock, must be tithed by law, and the one may therefore be given as tithe for the other. This question is, therefore, similar to that raised by Raba supra, when he enquired whether the ears of corn (i.e., the stock) when replanted had to be tithed or not. Var. lec. insert: He replied, Indeed so. Said he to him, Then it is the same

question as that of Raba?-He replied.
(15) There was here but one sowing of seeds in the pot and no more, and with the perforation of the pot the entire growth now draws sustenance from the earth, so that it is right to regard the earlier and later growth as one for the purposes of tithing.
(16) In Raba's case, the ears of corn had been sown once, then tithed, and then resown. Consequently the stock and the increase are two distinct growths, hence the necessity of putting also this question.
(17) This is the stage when corn is subject to the duty of terumah, v. Ma'as. I, 6.
(18) V. Glos.
(19) I.e., subject to terumah and tithes; v. Glos.
(20) That it is consecrated as terumah even though attached to the soil.
(21) This is an established law though it is not found in any Mishnah or Baraitha, v. Marginal Gloss.
(22) If a non-priest deliberately eats terumah he incurs the penalty of death at the hands of Heaven, cf. Lev. XXII, 9; and if he eats it inadvertently, he must compensate the priest, adding thereto a fifth part of its value, cf. ibid.14. These laws, however, apply only to terumah that is detached from the soil. What is attached may still be terumah but the above penalties do not apply.
(23) Sc. the ear corn that was designated as terumah while still attached to the soil.
(24) Lit., 'his mind is nullified by the side of every man'. It is not considered eating, and therefore does not involve any penalties. Punishment is incurred only when one eats forbidden foodstuffs in the normal way.
(25) Which does not regard the eating of corn which is still attached to the soil as an eating.
(26) E.g., the hen had died whilst in the act of laying the egg.
(27) I.e., if a person put his mouth into the carcass of the bird and from the inside ate the inner half of the egg. This unusual manner of eating is nevertheless considered eating.
(28) For the inside part is regarded as part of the carcass, and therefore whosoever eats it renders the clothes that he is wearing at the time unclean. This is the only kind of uncleanness that is stated in connection with the carcass of a clean bird; v. Sifra, Lev. XXII, 8.
(29) And if one did eat the corn whilst still attached to the soil it is not regarded as eating.
(30) MS.M. and Sh. Mek.: 'R. Tobi'.
(31) For disobeying a Rabbinical ruling; since according to the Rabbis the sowing of seeds even in an unperforated pot is accounted as a sowing.
(32) Demai V, 10; Yeb. 89a; Kid. 46b.
(33) V. Gemara.
(34) So Rashi, R. Gershom, Tos. and Sh. Mek.; v. D.S. and notes ad loc. Cur. edd. transpose 'OMER and 'PASSOVER' in this sentence.
(35) כוסמין.
(36) This was taught in connection with the dough-offering. If any dough consists of two different species of corn, each by itself not of sufficient quantity to be liable to the dough-offering, the two kinds will not combine to make the dough liable to the dough-offering. Wheat and kusmin, however, can be combined as they are both of the same kind. And so too with the others mentioned.
(37) שיבולת שועל.
(38) שיפון.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 70b

is gulba;[1] shipon is dishra;[1] shibboleth shu'al is foxtail.[2]

Only these[3] [are liable to the dough-offering]. but not rice or millet. Whence do we know it? — Said R. Simeon b. Lakish. It is deduced from the occurrence of the word 'bread' both here and in the law concerning unleavened bread; for it is written here, It shall be when ye eat of the bread of the land,[4] and it is written there,[5] The bread of affliction.[6] And whence do we know it there?[5] — Said Rash Lakish, and so it was taught in the School of R. Ishmael and also in the School of R. Eliezer b. Jacob: Scripture says, Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it; seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith, even the bread of affliction;[6] with such grain as can come to the state of leaven a

man fulfils his obligation[7] on the Passover; thus these are excluded, since they cannot come to the state of leaven but only to the state of decay.

AND THEY CAN BE RECKONED TOGETHER. A Tanna taught: Grain, flour and dough can be reckoned together. In what connection was this taught?R. Kahana said, In connection with the new produce.[8] R. Joseph said, In connection with leaven on the Passover.[9] R. Papa said, In connection with the Second Tithe, thus if one were to eat it[9] outside the wall [of Jerusalem] one would incur stripes. Raba said, In connection with food uncleanness, and it teaches us that grain and flour [in order to contract uncleanness] must be like dough: as the latter is every bit[10] a foodstuff so the former must be every bit a foodstuff.[11] And indeed it has been so taught: The grain of wheat, whether it is peeled or not, is reckoned together with other foodstuffs,[12] but the grain of barley is reckoned together with other foodstuffs[12] only when peeled but not when not peeled. But surely this is not so. For a Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael taught: It is written, Upon any sowing seed which is to be sown;[13] that is, seed such as men take out for sowing, namely wheat in its husk, barley in its husk, and lentils in their husks![14] — This is no difficulty; for the one speaks of fresh [seeds] whilst the other of dry [seeds].[15]

THEY ARE FORBIDDEN [TO BE EATEN] AS NEW PRODUCE BEFORE THE OMER.[16] Whence do we know it[17] -Said Resh Lakish, It is deduced from the occurrence of the word 'bread' both here and in the law concerning unleavened bread.[18]

AND THEY MAY NOT BE REAPED BEFORE THE PASSOVER.[16] Whence do we know it?[19] -Said R. Johanan. It is deduced from the occurrence of the word 'first' both here and in the law concerning the dough-offering.[20] What is meant by '[THEY ARE FORBIDDEN TO BE EATEN AS NEW PRODUCE] BEFORE THE 'OMER'?-R. Jonah said, Before the reaping of the 'Omer.[21] R. Jose b. Zabda said, Before the offering of the Omer.

We have learnt: THEY ARE FORBIDDEN [TO BE EATEN] AS NEW PRODUCE BEFORE THE OMER, AND THEY MAY NOT BE REAPED BEFORE THE PASSOVER. Now according to him who says 'Before the offering of the 'Omer' it is evident why the two prohibitions are not stated together and taught as one;[22] but according to him who says 'Before the reaping of the 'Omer', surely the two prohibitions should have been stated together and taught as one thus: They are forbidden [to be eaten] as new produce and they may not be reaped before the 'Omer![23] — The fact is that if this dispute was reported it must have been reported in connection with the final clause [of Our Mishnah] which states, IF THEY HAD TAKEN ROOT BEFORE THE OMER, THE 'OMER RENDERS THEM PERMITTED. What is meant by 'BEFORE THE OMER'? R. Jonah said, Before the reaping[24] of the 'Omer. R. Jose b. Zabda said, Before the offering[24] of the 'Omer. R. Eleazar said

---

(1) These are their names in Aramaic.

(2) Ears of corn with bushy spikes like a fox's tail.

(3) Sc. the kinds of grain enumerated in our Mishnah.

(4) Num. XV, 19.

(5) In connection with unleavened bread (mazzah).

(6) Deut. XVI, 3. And as only these five kinds of grain may be used for the unleavened bread, 'the bread of affliction', on the Passover, similarly only these kinds are liable to the dough-offering.

(7) By making unleavened bread therefrom.

(8) If one were to eat an olive's bulk of the new produce consisting of grain, flour and dough, one would be culpable.

(9) Cf. prev. note. mut. mut.

(10) Lit., 'in its essence'.

(11) I.e, the grain must be peeled of its inedible husk, and the flour free from bran in order to contract food uncleanness.

(12) To make up the minimum quantity of an egg's bulk in order to contract food uncleanness. The husk of wheat, as it is edible, is counted with the grain, but that of barley is not. Indeed the husk of barley would even prevent the grain within

from becoming unclean.

(13) Lev. XI, 37.

(14) V. Hul. 117b. Hence seeds in their husks are regarded as one entity for the purposes of food uncleanness.

(15) R. Ishmael speaks of fresh seeds, still moist, whose husks are edible, whereas the husks of dry seeds are inedible.

(16) V. supra p. 414, n. 5.

(17) That the prohibition of the new produce applies only to the five kinds of grain enumerated in our Mishnah.

(18) The word 'bread' occurs here with regard to the new produce (Lev. XXIII, 14: And ye shall eat neither bread nor parched corn) and also with regard to unleavened bread (Deut. XVI, 3: The bread of affliction). As the latter was to be made of these five kinds of grain only, so the prohibition of the new produce applies only to these five kinds.

(19) That the prohibition of reaping before the Passover applies only to the five kinds of grain enumerated in our Mishnah. It must be observed that this prohibition of reaping before the Passover is synonymous with the prohibition of reaping before the reaping of the 'Omer, since reaping is a prohibited act on the Festival and immediately on the night after the first day of the Festival the reaping of the 'Omer commenced.

(20) The word 'first' occurs here with regard to the reaping of the 'Omer (Lev. XXIII, 10: The first of your reaping) and also with regard to the dough-offering (Num. XV, 20: The first of your dough). As the dough-offering applied only to these five kinds of grain so the prohibition of reaping before the 'Omer applies only to these five kinds.

(21) But as soon as the 'Omer was reaped, i.e., immediately on the morning after the first day of the Festival (for the 'Omer was reaped at night at the termination of the Festival day v. supra p. 416, n. 7) it was permitted to eat the new produce, even before the offering of the Omer.

(22) For the two prohibitions are raised at different times, viz., that of reaping immediately after the reaping of the 'Omer i.e., on the morning after the first day of the Festival, and that of eating the new produce only after the offering of the 'Omer.

(23) So Rashi and some MSS. In cur. edd. 'before the Passover'; v. Tosaf. s.v. מאי. The two prohibitions are raised at the same time viz., immediately after the reaping of the 'Omer.

(24) So emended by Bir. Haz., thus in conformity with the report of the dispute stated above. Cur. edd. transpose 'reaping' and 'offering' in the respective views.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 71a

to R. Josiah his contemporary,[1] You are not to sit down[2] Until you have explained to me the following: Whence is it derived that the 'Omer renders permitted that which has only taken root?[3] -[You ask whence? Surely it is derived from the expression 'corn in the ear',[4] from which it follows that there is that which is not yet in the ear[5] [which is permitted by the 'Omer]. Perhaps [the inference is that there is] that which is not yet in the ear but which has reached a third of its growth [which is permitted by the 'Omer![6] -Rather, said Samuel. [It is derived from the expression] 'from the time you begin to put the sickle',[7] from which it follows that there is that which is not yet fit for the sickle[5] [which is permitted by the 'Omer]. But perhaps the inference is that there is that which is not yet fit for the sickle but which is at least fit for fodder [that is permitted by the 'Omer]![6] -Rather, said R. Isaac, [It is derived from the expression] 'to the standing corn.[7] from which it follows that there is that which is not yet standing corn[5] [which is permitted by the 'Omer] — But perhaps the inference is that there is that which is not yet standing corn but which is at least in the grass stage [which is permitted by the 'Omer]![6] -Rather. said Raba, [It is derived from the expression] 'which thou sowest',[8] that is from the time of sowing [it is permitted by the 'Omer]. Said R. Papa to Raba, In that case, even though it had not taken-root [it should be permitted by the 'Omer, should it not]?-He replied. You wise man,[9] it is written, In the field.[10]

MISHNAH. ONE MAY REAP [BEFORE THE 'OMER THE CORN] IN IRRIGATED FIELDS[11] IN[12] THE PLAIN,[11] BUT ONE MAY NOT STACK IT. THE MEN OF JERICHO USED TO REAP [BEFORE THE 'OMER] WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE SAGES,[13] AND USED TO STACK IT WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE SAGES, BUT THEY DID NOT FORBID THEM.[14] ONE MAY REAP THE UNRIPE CORN[15] AND FEED CATTLE THEREWITH. SAID R. JUDAH, WHEN IS THIS SO? ONLY IF ONE HAD BEGUN TO REAP IT BEFORE IT HAD REACHED A

THIRD OF ITS GROWTH. R. SIMEON SAID, ONE MAY REAP IT AND FEED [CATTLE THEREWITH] EVEN AFTER IT HAS REACHED A THIRD OF ITS GROWTH. ONE MAY REAP ON ACCOUNT OF THE SAPLINGS[16] OR [IN ORDER TO MAKE AN OPEN SPACE] FOR THE MOURNERS[17] OR THAT THE BETH HAMIDRASH BE NOT HINDERED.[18] ONE MAY NOT BIND THEM[19] IN BUNDLES BUT THEY MUST BE LEFT IN SMALL HEAPS. THE PRECEPT[20] OF THE 'OMER IS THAT IT SHALL BE BROUGHT FROM THE STANDING CORN;[21] IF THIS CANNOT BE FOUND IT MAY BE BROUGHT FROM THE SHEAVES. THE PRECEPT IS THAT IT SHALL BE BROUGHT FROM THE FRESH CORN;[22] IF THIS CANNOT BE FOUND IT MAY BE BROUGHT FROM THE DRY CORN. THE PRECEPT IS THAT IT SHALL BE REAPED BY NIGHT; IF IT WAS REAPED BY DAY IT IS VALID. MOREOVER IT[23] OVERRIDES THE SABBATH.

GEMARA. It was taught: R. Benjamin says, The verse says, When ye shall reap the harvest thereof, then shall ye bring the sheaf.[24] and following that it says, The first of your reaping unto the priest.[25] How is it to be explained? Thus, the field from which you may bring [the 'Omer] you may not reap [before the 'Omer]. but that field from which you may not bring[26] [the 'Omer] you may reap [before the 'Omer]. Perhaps I ought to say this: that kind of grain from which you may bring[27] [the 'Omer] you may not reap [before the 'Omer], but that kind from which you may not bring [the 'Omer] you may reap [before the 'Omer]! — You cannot say so on account of R. Johanan's teaching.[28]

THE MEN OF JERICHO USED TO REAP [BEFORE THE 'OMER] WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE SAGES, AND USED TO STACK IT WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE SAGES etc. Whom have you heard say that [in certain cases] they [the Sages] forbade them[29] and [in others] they did not forbid them? [Clearly it is R. Judah.[30] Is then R. Judah of the opinion that with regard to reaping [before the 'Omer] the men of Jericho acted with the approval of the Sages? But it has been taught:[31] The men of Jericho did six things: three with the approval of the Sages and three without their approval. These they did with the approval of the Sages: they grafted palms the whole day.[32] they 'rolled up' the Shema',[33] and they reaped before the 'Omer. And these they did without the approval of the Sages: they stacked the corn before the 'Omer, they permitted for use the branches of carob and sycamore trees which had been dedicated to the Temple,[34] and they made breaches in their gardens and orchards so as to allow the poor to [come in and] eat the fallen fruit on Sabbaths and Festivals in years of drought.[35] So R. Meir. Then said R. Judah to him, If they did them with the approval of the Sages then all people could do so! But they did both without the approval of the Sages, save that three they forbade them and three they did not forbid them to do. These they did not forbid them: they grafted palms the whole day. they 'rolled up' the Shema', and they reaped and stacked before the 'Omer. And these they forbade them:

---

(1) An Amora of the third century. It is intended thereby to exclude the Tanna of that name who lived in the second century.

(2) Lit., 'sit on your legs' with reference to their custom of sitting on the ground with the legs crossed under them

(3) At the time of the 'Omer. Even though the seed had not broken through the earth it is still rendered permitted by the 'Omer.

(4) Lev. II, 14. This only shall be taken for the 'Omer-offering, though what has not reached this stage is nevertheless permitted by the 'Omer.

(5) I.e., which has only taken root.

(6) But that which has only taken root is not permitted by the 'Omer.

(7) Deut. XVI, 9. This refers to the reaping of the 'Omer.

(8) Ex. XXIII, 26. Although this is stated in connection with the Two Loaves the reference must be to that which was sown before the 'Omer, for only such would be permitted for use in the offering of the Two Loaves. V. Rashi.

(9) סודני, a denominative of סוד — 'a wisdom', 'secret'. According to Rashi and R. Gershom, a compound of Aliter: 'a brewer', which was R. Papa's occupation. cf. Pes. 113a.

(10) lbid. XXIII, 16. I.e., it has taken root in the field and has begun to germinate, and is not merely lying in the soil.
(11) For the corn grown in these fields is of an inferior quality and is not fit to be used for the 'Omer, and it is established (Gemara infra) that what is not fit for the 'Omer may he reaped before the 'Omer. Moreover it is essential to reap the corn of these fields at the earliest opportunity for the standing corn cannot remain long in the field.
(12) In MS.M.: 'AND IN THE PLAIN'; so too in the parallel passage in Pes. 11a. V. Tosaf. supra 68a, s.v. קוצרים
(13) For the fields around Jericho were artificially irrigated.
(14) Lit., 'stay their hand'.
(15) שחת, corn in its earliest stage. often used as fodder.
(16) For the corn which grows among saplings, if left to remain too long in the field, would soon ruin the sapling; moreover this corn is not fit to be used for the 'Omer. Another interpretation given by Rashi is that saplings are found to be growing in a corn field and it is necessary to reap the corn immediately before the prohibition of kil'ayim (diverse kinds) sets in.
(17) Where people assembled and blessings of consolation were recited in the presence of the mourners. V. Keth., Sonc. ed., p. 41, n. 5.
(18) If there is no room for the students in the Beth Hamidrash (House of Study) and it is necessary to clear a space in the field for them. In this case the reaping is for a religious purpose, and therefore permitted.
(19) Sc. the corn that may be reaped before the 'Omer.
(20) I.e., the proper performance of the precept.
(21) So that the corn shall be reaped especially for the purpose of the 'Omer-offering (לשמה); cf. Deut. XVI, 9.
(22) Cf. Lev. II, 14: 'karmel', which signifies seeds fresh and tender. V. supra 66b.
(23) Sc. the reaping of the 'Omer. When the first day of the Festival fell on a Friday then the reaping of the 'Omer was performed on the Friday night which is the Sabbath.
(24) Lev. XXIII, 10. This implies that it is permitted to reap before the 'Omer.
(25) Ibid. This part of the verse implies that the 'Omer shall be the first reaping and nothing shall be reaped before it.
(26) E.g.. an artificially irrigated field.
(27) Sc. barley.
(28) Supra p. 416. R. Johanan established that the prohibition of reaping before the 'Omer applies to the five kinds of grain enumerated in the previous Mishnah, supra 70a.
(29) Sc. the men of Jericho.
(30) So that our Mishnah represents the view of R. Judah since it uses the expression 'BUT THEY DID NOT FORBID THEM'.
(31) Pes. 56a.
(32) Of the fourteenth of Nisan. Although in all places work was forbidden after midday on the day before the Passover, the men of Jericho did not regard grafting as work to come within this prohibition.
(33) I.e., they recited the Shema' (Deut. VI, 4-9) without making the necessary pauses. For the precise meaning of this v. Pes., Sonc. ed., p. 278-280.
(34) They maintained that only the stems of the trees had been dedicated; so that the branches which grew later on were permitted for use. They also held that no trespass-offering is due when one benefits from what grows upon that which was dedicated to the Temple. V. Pes. 56b.
(35) A man is forbidden to eat the fruit fallen from the tree on the Sabbath or on the Festival as a precautionary measure lest he climb up the tree and pluck it.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 71b

they permitted for use the branches of carob and sycamore trees which had been dedicated to the Temple. they made breaches in their gardens and orchards so as to allow the poor to [come in and] eat the fallen fruit on Sabbaths and Festivals in years of drought, and they gave pe'ah from vegetables;[1] and the Sages forbade them![2] -But according to your view, too, [this passage is difficult, for] it says 'six things' and it enumerates seven![3] You must therefore delete reaping from here.[4]

ONE MAY REAP THE UNRIPE CORN AND FEED CATTLE THEREWITH. We have learnt elsewhere:[5] These are the things which divide a field [into two] with respect to pe'ah:[6] a river, a pool,

a private[7] or a public road,[8] a public or a private path that is in use both during the summer and the rainy season, fallow land or newly broken land, and a different kind of crop. If one reaped the unripe corn [as fodder, the part so reaped] divides the field.[9] So R. Meir; but the Sages say, This part does not divide the field[10] unless it was also ploughed up. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan. R. Meir based his ruling on the principle enunciated by R. Simeon [in our Mishnah] who said, ONE MAY REAP IT AND FEED [CATTLE THEREWITH] EVEN AFTER IT HAS REACHED A THIRD OF ITS GROWTH. For he is of the opinion that any [cutting of] unripe corn[11] [for fodder] is no reaping.

Rabbah[12] was sitting and reciting this statement, when R. Aha b. Huna raised against Raba the following objection. It was taught: If locusts devoured [the crop in the middle of the field] or ants nibbled it or the wind broke it down, all agree that only if it was also ploughed up does it divide the field [in two]. but if it was not ploughed up it does not divide the field.[13] Who is meant by 'all agree'! Obviously R. Meir.[14] Now it is intelligible if you say that the Mishnah quoted[15] , refers to unripe corn which had not reached a third of its growth and the Baraitha which states 'that only if it was also ploughed up it divides the field and not if it was not ploughed up' refers to unripe corn which had already reached a third of its growth.[16] But if you say that the Mishnah quoted also refers to that which had already reached a third of its growth, then [it will be asked,] If in that case,[17] where the reaping was done by man, R. Meir holds that it is no reaping, then surely it is so in this case![18] — Say, rather, that R. Meir based his ruling on the principle enunciated by R. Judah[19] [in our Mishnah] who said, WHEN IS THIS SO? ONLY IF ONE HAD BEGUN TO REAP IT BEFORE IT HAD REACHED A THIRD OF ITS GROWTH.

But perhaps you have heard R. Judah maintaining this view only when it is cut [as fodder] for cattle, but have you heard him say so[20] with regard to that which is cut [as food] for man? For if he were to say so then we should have three Tannaim differing in this matter![21] -The fact is that when R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he said, R. Meir based his ruling on the principle enunciated by his teacher R. Akiba, namely that even though [it was cut as food] for man it is no reaping.[22] For we have learnt: If a man reaped his field in separate stages.[23] leaving [unreaped] the unripe stems, R. Akiba says. He must give pe'ah from each [portion reaped]. But the Sages say, From one for all.[24] And Rab Judah has said that R. Akiba declares him liable [to give pe'ah from each portion] only where he reaps the field in stages for roasting.[25] but not where he reaps it in stages for storing.[26] But surely this is not so! For when Rabin came [from Palestine] he stated in the name of R. Johanan that R. Akiba declares him liable [to give pe'ah from each portion] even where he reaps it in stages for storing![27] —

---

(1) I.e., they left the corner (pe'ah) of the vegetable plantation for the poor. The objection is that, since vegetables are by law not subject to pe'ah and since what is taken as pe'ah is exempt from the tithe, these vegetables would be eaten by the poor without being tithed.

(2) It will thus be seen that R. Judah reckons reaping before the 'Omer among the things done without the approval of the Sages, contra our Mishnah.

(3) Reckoning reaping and stacking as separate items.

(4) For in fact reaping met with the approval of the Sages.

(5) Pe'ah II, 1.

(6) So that pe'ah must be given from the fields on each side.

(7) That is four cubits wide.

(8) That is sixteen cubits wide.

(9) For the cutting down of unripe corn as fodder is not regarded as reaping.

(10) The cutting of the unripe corn, they say, is the beginning of the reaping of this field, the remainder to be reaped only when the corn is fully ripe; consequently the part now reaped will certainly not he regarded as a division of the field.

(11) Whether or not it has reached a third of its growth.

(12) Better 'Raba'; so in the Sulzbach ed.

(13) A Baraitha in Tosef. Pe'ah I.
(14) For R. Meir in the Mishnah quoted above differs from this view and, in that case, does not insist on the ploughing up of the part cut down. In this case, however, he accepts this view.
(15) Pe'ah II, 1.
(16) The position of R. Meir is then intelligible; where it has not reached a third of its growth (as in Mishnah quoted) the cutting thereof is no reaping and so constitutes a division in the field, and where it has reached a third of its growth (as in Baraitha quoted) the cutting thereof is a reaping, accordingly it is no division in the field, unless, of course, it was ploughed up.
(17) Pe'ah II, I.
(18) Where the corn was broken down by locusts or ants. This surely should not count as a reaping, yet the Baraitha states that all agree(!) that it is a reaping and so does not constitute a division in the field.
(19) Who clearly differentiates between the cutting of corn which has not yet reached a third of its growth, which is not considered reaping, and corn which has reached this stage, which is considered reaping. V. supra n.1.
(20) That the cutting of corn which has not reached a third of its growth is no reaping.
(21) For the first Tanna (in our Mishnah) expressly states that what is cut for cattle fodder is not considered reaping; R. Judah teaches that provided it has not reached a 'third of its growth, even though it is cut as food for man, it is not considered reaping; and R. Simeon goes so far as to say that even though it has reached a third of its growth, and even though it is cut as food for man, it is still not considered reaping; thus there are three distinct views in our Mishnah. This position. however, is untenable, for it is established (Sanh. 25a) that whenever R. Judah says 'when is this so?' he merely aims at explaining the words of the foregoing Tanna; but here, as stated, R. Judah gives an independent opinion of his own.
(22) If it had not yet reached a third of its growth.
(23) I.e., he cuts only the ripe corn leaving the unripe corn for later; the field has thus a patchy or speckled appearance (נמר. 'to give a speckled appearance').
(24) Pe'ah III, 2.
(25) I.e., when the corn has not yet reached a third of its growth and the ears can only be eaten after roasting. Accordingly R. Akiba holds that the cutting of corn which has not reached a third of its growth, even though intended as food for man, is not considered reaping.
(26) I.e., when it is reaped after it has reached a third of its growth.
(27) Whereas,R. Meir agrees that the cutting of corn after it has reached a third of its growth is considered a reaping.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 72a

He [R. Meir] agrees with him[1] in the one case[2] but disagrees with him[1] in the other.[3]

ONE MAY REAP ON ACCOUNT OF THE SAPLINGS OR [IN ORDER TO MAKE AN OPEN SPACE] FOR THE MOURNERS OR THAT THE BETH HAMIDRASH [BE NOT HINDERED]. What is the reason?-The Divine Law says. [The first of] your reaping,[4] but not the [first of the] reaping for a religious purpose.[5] ONE MAY NOT BIND THEM IN BUNDLES BUT THEY MUST BE LEFT IN SMALL HEAPS. What is the reason?-Because so far as is possible we must not work [before the 'Omer].[6] THE PRECEPT OF THE 'OMER IS THAT IT SHALL BE BROUGHT FROM THE STANDING CORN. Our Rabbis taught: It is written, And when thou bringest a meal-offering of first-fruits:[7] what does this teach us?[8] Since the precept of the 'Omer is that it shall be brought from the standing corn, whence should I know that if standing corn cannot be found it may be brought from the sheaves? The text therefore states 'thou bringest'. Another explanation is: 'Thou bringest': since the precept is that it shall be brought from the fresh corn, whence should I know that if fresh corn cannot be found it may be brought from the dry corn? The text therefore states 'thou bringest'. Another explanation is: 'Thou bringest': since the precept is that it shall be reaped by night, whence should I know that if it was reaped by day it is valid, and also that it overrides the Sabbath? The text therefore states 'thou bringest'. 'Thou bringest', whatever it is;[9] 'thou bringest'. from any place;[10] 'thou bringest', even on the Sabbath;[11] 'thou bringest', even in a state of uncleanness.[12]

IF IT WAS REAPED BY DAY IT IS VALID. But we have learnt: The whole night is valid for reaping the ‘Omer and for burning the fat and the limbs [of sacrifices on the altar]. This is the general rule: any commandment which is to be performed by day is valid during the whole of the day, and any commandment which is to be performed by night is valid during the whole of the night.[13] Now night and day are on a par, and just as that which is to be performed by day is not [valid] by night[14] so that which is to be performed by night is not [valid] by day![15] — Rabbah said, This is no difficulty, for one[16] represents Rabbi's view, the other[17] the view of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon. For it was taught:[18] If [the priest] was standing and offering up the ‘Omer meal-offering and it became unclean, if there is another [available] he should be told, ‘Bring the other in its place’.[19] But if not, he should be told, ‘Be wise and keep silent’.[20] So Rabbi. But R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon says. In either case he is told, ‘Be wise and keep silent’, for the ‘Omer that was reaped not in accordance with its prescribed rite is invalid.[21]

Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan. The ruling of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon is based upon the principle enunciated by R. Akiba, his father's teacher. For we have learnt: R. Akiba stated a general principle: Any work which can be done on the eve of the Sabbath does not override the Sabbath[22] Moreover, he [R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon] is of the same opinion as R. Ishmael who holds that the reaping of the ‘Omer is a religious duty. For we have learnt: R. Ishmael says,[23] Just as ploughing is optional.[24] so the harvest [referred to in the verse] is an optional one, excluding the harvesting of the ‘Omer, which is a religious duty.[25] Now[26] if we were to hold that if the ‘Omer was reaped not in accordance with its prescribed rite it is valid, wherefore does it override the Sabbath? Let it be reaped on the eve of the Sabbath![27] Since, however, it does override the Sabbath, one may infer that [he holds that] if it was reaped not in accordance with its prescribed rite it is invalid.[28]

But was not Rabbi a disciple of R. Simeon?[29] Surely it has been taught:[30] Rabbi said, When we were studying Torah at R. Simeon's [Academy] in Tekoa we used to carry up to him [on the Sabbath] oil and a towel from the courtyard to the roof, and from the roof to an enclosure, and from one enclosure to another enclosure, until we came to the fountain where we bathed![31] — He [Rabbi] concurs with the other teaching of R. Simeon. For it was taught:[32] R. Simeon said, Come and see how precious is a precept in its proper time! For the burning of the fat and limbs is valid the whole night, yet they did not wait until nightfall.[33]

---

(1) R. Akiba.

(2) Where it had not reached a third of its growth, R. Akiba and R. Meir agree that the cutting thereof is not considered reaping.

(3) Where it had reached a third of its growth; R. Akiba maintains that the cutting is not considered reaping, but R. Meir maintains that it is.

(4) Lev. XXIII, 10.

(5) Reaping for a religious purpose is permitted even before the ‘Omer. This is a sufficient reason for reaping in order to make a clearing for mourners or for study-both religious purposes. As to reaping on account of the saplings the reason is that the corn growing among the saplings is unfit for the ‘Omer; or it might also be, even in this case, a religious purpose, namely, avoiding the transgression of the law of kil'ayim.

(6) Wherever possible the work should not be performed in the usual manner but some change should be introduced (R. Gershom).

(7) Lev. II, 14.

(8) The expression ‘thou bringest’ is repeated in this verse, obviously for some special teaching.

(9) Even sheaves.

(10) Even from fields far away from Jerusalem, although by the time it reaches the Temple it will be somewhat dried. V. supra 64b.

(11) The reaping of the ‘Omer may be performed on a Sabbath, i.e., when the first day of the Passover fell on a Friday.

(12) If the whole or the greater part of the community was unclean.

(13) Meg. 20b.
(14) E.g.. the time for slaughtering a sacrifice is by day, and if slaughtered by night it is invalid.
(15) How then can it be maintained that the reaping of the 'Omer is valid if performed by day?
(16) Our Mishnah.
(17) The Mishnah in Meg. 20b.
(18) Yoma 7a.
(19) Even though the other is still unreaped, it should be reaped now by day and prepared for the 'Omer-offering, and not offer the first which is unclean.
(20) And not publish the fact that the one offered was unclean.
(21) And the 'Omer which is reaped by day is invalid. Hence it is preferable to offer the first which is unclean (for which mishap the High Priest's plate procures atonement v. Yoma ibid.) rather than another which is invalid at the outset.
(22) Shab. 130a.
(23) In commenting on the verse (Ex. XXXIV, 21): Six days shalt thou work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest; in plowing time and in harvest thou shalt rest.
(24) As there is no ploughing which is considered a religious duty.
(25) And therefore may be performed on the Sabbath, Sheb. I, 4.
(26) This was the argument that led R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon to the above ruling.
(27) For according to R. Akiba's principle whatever can be done on the eve of the Sabbath does not override the Sabbath.
(28) And its time is strictly limited to the night which follows the first day of the Festival; accordingly it cannot be reaped earlier on the eve of the Sabbath nor by day.
(29) He certainly was, and he must have heard from his teacher the acceptance of R. Akiba 's principle. And as Rabbi holds that the time for reaping the 'Omer is not strictly limited (for if it was not done by night it may be done by day), why does it override the Sabbath? It can surely be reaped before the Sabbath.
(30) Shab. 147b; 'Er. 91a.
(31) For R. Simeon regards all roofs, or courtyards, or enclosures as constituting one single domain, and one may carry from one into the other articles that were kept in one of them when the Sabbath began. V. 'Er. 89a.
(32) Pes. 68b.
(33) But the priests burnt the fat and the limbs of the Sabbath sacrifices on the Sabbath day, although the burning could have been postponed until nightfall. Similarly with the reaping of the 'Omer, although it could be reaped earlier on the eve of the Sabbath, the precept is most precious when performed in its real time, namely on the Sabbath.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 72b

And did not R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon know of this [teaching of his father]?[1] — [He certainly knew of it] but in that case it is different for the slaughtering has already overridden the Sabbath.[2] And Rabbi? Is it not the fact that the slaughtering there has already overridden the Sabbath?[3] — Rather [we must say that] Rabbi is of the opinion that the reaping of the 'Omer does not override the Sabbath. But does it not? But we have learnt: The Sages say, whether on the Sabbath or on a weekday it was taken out of three se'ahs![4] That is not in accordance with Rabbi's view. But we have learnt: The Sages say. Whether on the Sabbath or on a weekday it was reaped by three men into three baskets with three sickles![4] [That too is] not in accordance with Rabbi's view. But we have learnt: On the Sabbath he called out further, 'On this Sabbath?'[5] — [That too is] not In accordance with Rabbi's view.

IF IT WAS REAPED BY DAY IT IS VALID. MOREOVER IT OVERRIDES THE SABBATH. Whom have you heard say that if it was reaped by day it is valid? Clearly it is Rabbi.[6] Yet it states, MOREOVER IT OVERRIDES THE SABBATH. Presumably it refers to the reaping [of the 'Omer]. does it not?[7] — No, it refers to the offering [of the 'Omer]. And the reaping does not [override the Sabbath]? Surely it has been taught:[8] Rabbi says. And Moses declared the appointed times of the Lord.[9] For what purpose is this stated?[10] Because we have learnt only of the daily offering and the Passover-offering [that they override the Sabbath and uncleanness]. since in its anointed time' is stated in connection with them[11] — in its appointed time', even on the Sabbath, 'in its anointed

time', even in uncleanness. Whence do we know it of the other offerings of the congregation? The text therefore states These shall ye offer unto the Lord in your appointed times.[12] Whence do we know to include the 'Omer and that which is offered with it,[13] and the Two Loaves and that which is offered with them?[14] The text therefore states, 'And Moses declared the appointed times of the Lord': this verse thus fixed 'the appointed time' for all of them.[15] Now for what [service is the Sabbath overridden]? Should you say for the offering, but the Two Loaves are not offered at all![16] Obviously then it is for the grinding and the sifting of the corn[17] and similarly in the case of the 'Omer for the reaping; thus it overrides the Sabbath. No, the 'Omer [overrides the Sabbath] for the act of offering,[18] and the Two Loaves for the baking;[18] for Rabbi is of the opinion that the oven[19] [of the Sanctuary] hallows them, so that had they been baked on the previous day they would, by being kept overnight, be now invalid.

But does Rabbi hold that the oven hallows them? Surely it was taught: The lambs of Pentecost hallow the bread[20] only by their slaughtering.[21] Thus if they were slaughtered under their own name and their blood was sprinkled under their own name, the bread is hallowed; if they were slaughtered under another name and their blood was sprinkled under another name, the bread is not hallowed; if they were slaughtered under their own name but their blood was sprinkled under another name, the bread is hallowed and not hallowed.[22] This is the opinion of Rabbi. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon says, It is by no means hallowed unless [the lambs] were slaughtered under their own name and their blood was sprinkled under their own name![23] — R. Nahman b. Isaac answered, He[24] means that they are either determined or not determined.[25] CHAPTER VII

MISHNAH:[26] FROM THE FOLLOWING MEAL-OFFERINGS THE HANDFUL MUST BE TAKEN AND THE REMAINDER IS FOR THE PRIESTS: THE MEAL-OFFERING OF FINE FLOUR,[27] THAT PREPARED ON A GRIDDLE,[28] THAT PREPARED IN A PAN, THE CAKES AND THE WAFERS,[29] THE MEAL-OFFERING OF A GENTILE, THE MEAL-OFFERING OF WOMEN, THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE 'OMER, THE SINNERS MEAL-OFFERING,[30] AND THE MEAL-OFFERING OF JEALOUSY.[31] R. SIMEON SAYS, FROM THE SINNERS MEAL-OFFERING BROUGHT BY PRIESTS THE HANDFUL IS TAKEN,[32] AND THE HANDFUL IS OFFERED BY ITSELF AND SO ALSO THE REMAINDER IS OFFERED BY ITSELF.

GEMARA. R. Papa said,[33] All [the meal-offerings] enumerated in the Mishnah must consist of ten [cakes]. What does he teach us?-He wishes to exclude thereby R. Simeon's view who said, He may offer half in cakes and half in wafers; and so he teaches us that it is not so.

AND THE REMAINDER IS FOR THE PRIESTS. Whence do we know this? — Whence? [you ask,] but surely where it is expressly stated it is expressly stated, and where it is not expressly stated there is the verse, And this is the law of the meal-offering: the sons of Aaron shall offer it... and that which is left thereof shall Aaron and his sons eat![34] — With regard to those which are brought from wheat I have no doubt,[35] I only ask it with regard to those brought from barley.[36] But even with regard to those brought from barley, surely [it is obvious that] the remainder is for the priests, since the handful is taken from them?[37] According to the view of the Rabbis[38] I have no doubt,[39] I only ask it according to the view of R. Simeon who maintains that there is a meal-offering from which the handful must be taken and yet [the remainder] may not be eaten, for we have learnt: R. SIMEON SAYS, FROM THE SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING BROUGHT BY PRIESTS THE HANDFUL IS TAKEN, AND THE HANDFUL IS OFFERED BY ITSELF AND SO ALSO THE REMAINDER IS OFFERED BY ITSELF. Whence then do we know it? — Hezekiah said, From the verse, And every meal-offering, mingled with oil, or dry, shall all the sons of Aaron have.[40] And if this verse serves no purpose for meal-offerings of wheat mingled With oil[41] it should be applied to meal-offerings of barley mingled with oil,[42] and so, too, if this verse serves no purpose for dry meal-offerings of wheat[41] it should be applied to dry meal-offerings of barley.[43] But does this [verse] serve this

purpose? Surely it is required for the following which was taught: How do we know that meal-offerings may not be set off against animal-offerings?[44]

---

(1) He surely did, and in that case how could he argue from the fact that it overrides the Sabbath that the ‘Omer which was reaped not in accordance with the prescribed rite is invalid?

(2) The slaughtering of the Sabbath sacrifices has already overridden the Sabbath, and since the prohibition of Sabbath has once been overridden it is also permitted, for the sake of performing the precept at its earliest moment, to burn the fat and the limbs of the sacrifices on the Sabbath. With regard to the ‘Omer, however, the Sabbath prohibition has not been overridden, consequently it would not be proper to override the Sabbath for the reaping of the ‘Omer, but for the fact that it could not be reaped except in its proper time.

(3) How then could Rabbi infer the rule that the reaping of the ‘Omer overrides the Sabbath merely from the fact that the burning of the fat and the limbs was performed on the Sabbath?

(4) V. supra 63b.

(5) V. supra 65a.

(6) Supra 72a, where Rabbi ruled that if during the offering of the ‘Omer it became unclean, another ‘Omer may be reaped and offered.

(7) Whereas above it was concluded that according to Rabbi the reaping of the ‘Omer does not override the Sabbath.

(8) Pes. 77a.

(9) Lev. XXIII, 44.

(10) Seeing that all the Festivals are individually treated in that chapter.

(11) Cf. Num. XXVIII, 2 and IX, 2.

(12) Ibid. XXIX, 39. This verse concludes the section dealing with the additional offerings on Sabbath, New Moon and Festivals, and its purpose is to apply the expression ‘in its appointed time’ and the law derived therefrom to each of the offerings mentioned, as though it were explicitly stated with each.

(13) Viz., the lamb offered with the Omer as a burnt-offering; cf. Lev. XXIII, 12.

(14) Viz., the two lambs offered with the Two Loaves as peace-offerings; ibid. 19. Since these offerings are not mentioned in the section in Num. they would not come under the rule of ‘in its appointed time’.

(15) And it is as though ‘in its appointed time’ were expressly stated with the ‘Omer and the Two Loaves’, thereby implying that each overrides the Sabbath and uncleanness.

(16) For they are leavened, and nothing leavened may be offered on the altar; v. Lev. II, 11.

(17) Even though these acts can be performed before the Sabbath.

(18) Which act cannot be performed before the Sabbath; it therefore overrides the Sabbath.

(19) In which the Two Loaves are baked.

(20) I.e., the Two Loaves.

(21) But the baking in the oven presumably does not hallow the loaves.

(22) V. supra p. 283-4.

(23) V. supra p. 283.

(24) Rabbi.

(25) The hallowing by slaughtering referred to only means that the loaves are thereby determined for and assigned to the lambs slaughtered, so that if subsequently the lambs were lost these loaves could not be used with other lambs, and where the lambs were not slaughtered under their own name the loaves are not thereby determined for them but may be used with other lambs. The real hallowing of the loaves, however, is effected only by the baking in the oven of the Sanctuary.

(26) In the Wilna editions of this Tractate from 1886 onwards there is printed a second commentary of Rashi covering Chapters VII, VIII and IX. This commentary is undoubtedly the authentic Rashi, as is evidenced by the frequent quotations made by Tosaf. of the words of Rashi which are found only in this commentary. It is referred to hereinafter as ‘Rashi MS’. The other commentary formerly attributed to Rashi is spurious, and in all probability is to be ascribed to a pupil of R. Gershom. The similarity between this commentary and that of R. Gershom is most striking.

(27) From which the handful was taken after the flour was mixed with the oil.

(28) From this and also from the following three kinds the handful was taken after the cake was broken into pieces.

(29) Of the meal-offering baked in an oven which consisted either of ten unleavened cakes or ten unleavened wafers. V. Lev. 11,4.

(30) Brought by a poor person as a sin-offering on the commission of any one of the transgressions mentioned in Lev. V, 1-4.

(31) Brought by a woman suspected by her husband of adultery; v. Num. V,15.

(32) According to the first Tanna, however, no handful is taken out, for the whole of it is to be burnt upon the altar.

(33) For the interpretation of this passage, v. supra p 347. n. 10.

(34) Lev. VI, 7, 9.

(35) For this verse which declares that the remainder belongs to the priests deals specifically with meal-offerings of wheat.

(36) The 'Omer-offering and the meal-offering of jealousy.

(37) For if the remainder did not fall to the priest but was to be burnt upon the altar, what was the point of taking out the handful?

(38) I.e., the first Tanna of our Mishnah; v. supra p. 431, n. 7.

(39) For it is clear that whenever the handful must be taken out the remainder belongs to the priests.

(40) Lev. VII, 10.

(41) For the verse previously quoted (ibid. VI, 9) already establishes the rule that all meal-offerings of wheat, mingled with oil or dry, belong to the priests.

(42) I.e., the 'Omer-offering.

(43) I.e., the meal-offering of jealousy.

(44) I.e., instead of sharing each of the priestly portions of the offerings equally among the priests it is arranged that some priests shall receive only meal-offerings as their portion and others only portions of animal-offerings as theirs.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 73a

Because the text states, And every meal-offering that is baked in the oven...shall all the sons of Aaron have.[1] I might think that meal-offerings may not be set off against animal-offerings seeing that in a case of poverty they do not replace them,[2] but meal-offerings [I would say] may be set off against bird-offerings since in a case of poverty they do replace them;[2] therefore the text states, And all that is prepared in the pan — shall all the sons of Aaron have.[3] I might think that meal-offerings may not be set off against bird-offerings seeing that the latter are of the class of blood-offerings and the former of the class of cereal-offerings, but bird-offerings [I would say] may be set off against animal-offerings since both are of the class of blood-offerings; therefore the text states, And on the griddle...shall all the sons of Aaron have.[4] I might think that bird-offerings may not be set off against animal-offerings seeing that the preparation of the former is by hand whereas that of the latter is with a utensil,[5] but one kind of meal-offering [I would say] may be set off against another kind of meal-offering since the preparation of both is by hand; therefore the text states, And every meal-offering mingled with oil... shall all the sons of Aaron have.[6] I might think that the meal-offering prepared on a griddle may not be set off against that prepared in a pan nor that prepared in a pan against that prepared on a griddle, for what is cooked in the one[7] is soft and what is cooked in the other[8] is hard,[9] but one that is prepared on a griddle [I would say] may be set off against another that is also prepared on a griddle, and so, too, one that is prepared in a pan may be set off against another that is also prepared in a pan; therefore the text states, Or dry, shall all the sons of Aaron have.[10] I might think that sacrifices which are most holy[11] may not be set off against each other, but those which are less holy[12] may; therefore the text states, [Shall all the sons of Aaron have,] a man as well as his brother,[10] and [in proximity thereto], If he offers it for a thanksgiving:[13] just as most holy sacrifices may not be set off against each other, so also less holy sacrifices may not be set off against each other. 'A man' [signifies that] a man takes a share even though he has a physical blemish, but not a minor even though he is without blemish![14] -This teaching is derived from, the expression 'every'.[15] But has not this expression been used for the teaching of R. Jose son of R. Judah?[16] -That [teaching of R. Jose son of R. Judah] is derived from the expression, 'and every'.[17]

Rabina said, It[18] can be inferred from Levi's teaching, for Levi taught: [It is written,] Every

offering of theirs, even every meal-offering of theirs, and every sin-offering of theirs, and every guilt-offering of theirs.[19] 'Every offering of theirs' includes the log of oil of the leper.[20] For I might have thought that [it shall not be the priest's since] the Divine Law expressly stated, reserved from the fire;[21] hence we are informed [that it is not so]. 'Every meal-offering of theirs' includes the meal-offering of the 'Omer and the meal-offering of jealousy. For I might have thought that [these shall not be the priest's since] the Divine Law expressly stated, And they shall eat those things wherewith atonement was made,[22] whereas the one serves to render permitted[23] and the other to ascertain [the truth];[24] hence we are informed [that it is not so]. 'Every sin-offering of theirs' includes the sin-offering of a bird. For I might have thought that [it shall not be the priest's since] it is nebelah;[25] hence we are informed [that it is not so]. 'Every guilt-offering of theirs' includes the guilt-offering of the Nazirite and the guilt-offering of the leper. But with regard to the guilt-offering of the leper, is it not expressly stated, For as the sin-offering is the priest's so is the guilt-offering?[26] — Rather it includes the guilt-offering of the Nazirite, that it be like the guilt-offering of the leper. For I might have thought that [it shall not be the priest's since] it but serves to render permitted;[27] hence we are informed [that it is not so]. 'which they may render unto Me',[28] this is the [restitution for the] robbery committed on a proselyte.[29] ['Shall be most holy] for thee and for thy sons',[30] this teaches that it[31] is thine own and thy son's own, even to betroth a woman therewith.[32]

R. Huna said,

---

(1) Lev. VII, 9,10. All priests shall receive a portion from the meal-offerings.

(2) V. Lev. V, 7, 11. The meal-offering does not take the place of an animal-offering in ordinary cases of poverty but only in extreme poverty, whereas the meal-offering replaces the bird-offering in ordinary poverty.

(3) Ibid. VII, 9,10. This insistence that every kind of meal-offering shall be distributed among the priests signifies that under no circumstances may one's portion in one offering be set off against another's portion in another offering.

(4) Ibid. And as this is unnecessary for meal-offerings apply it to blood-offerings.

(5) Bird-offerings had their heads nipped off by hand, animal-offerings were slaughtered with a knife.

(6) Ibid. 10.

(7) Sc. the pan, מרחשת.

(8) Sc. the griddle, מחבת.

(9) v supra 63a.

(10) Lev. VII, 10.

(11) As the meal-offering and the sin-offering.

(12) As the thank-offering and the peace-offering.

(13) Ibid. 12.

(14) V. Kid. 53a. We thus see that the verse adduced by Hezekiah is here interpreted for another purpose.

(15) Whereas Hezekiah's teaching is derived from the expression 'meal-offering'.

(16) V. supra 63b.

(17) I.e., from the superfluous waw, 'and'. The Baraitha, however, derives its teachings from the expression 'every', and Hezekiah from 'meal-offering'.

(18) That the remainder of the 'Omer-offering' and of the meal-offering of jealousy (both of barley) is eaten by the priests.

(19) Num. XVIII, 9.

(20) That the remainder of the oil, after the necessary rites have been performed therewith (cf. Lev. XIV, l0f) shall be the priest's.

(21) Num. XVIII, 9. And the oil is not reserved from the fire since no part thereof is burnt on the altar fire.

(22) Ex. XXIX, 33. This verse implies that the remainder of an atoning offering only shall be eaten by priests.

(23) The 'Omer renders permitted the new produce.

(24) The meal-offering of jealousy is to ascertain the truth about the woman's guilt.

(25) V. Glos. Since the bird-offering has not been slaughtered it might be said the priests may not eat it.

(26) Lev. XIV, 13.

(27) With the offering of his guilt-offering the Nazirite is now 'fit to begin anew his period of separation which had been

interrupted by involuntary defilement. And as it is not an atoning offering it might be said that it may not be eaten by priests.

(28) Num. XVIII, 9.

(29) This too belongs to the priest. V. B.K. 110a.

(30) Num. ibid.

(31) Sc. the restitution for the robbery committed on a proselyte.

(32) On the other hand, a priest may not betroth a woman with the portions that he receives from the sacrifices. V. Kid. 52b.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 73b

The peace-offerings of gentiles are to be treated as burnt-offerings.[1] This I can prove either by simple reasoning or by a verse from Scripture. Either by simple reasoning: because a gentile in his heart [devotes the offering entirely] to Heaven.[2] Or by a verse from Scripture: Which they will offer unto the Lord for a burnt-offering:[3] whatever they[4] offer shall be a burnt-offering.

R. Hama b. Guria raised an objection: If a gentile made a freewill-offering of peace-offerings and he gave them to an Israelite,[5] the Israelite may eat them;[6] if he gave them to a priest, the priest may eat them.[6] — Raba answered, It means this: if [he gave them to an Israelite] that the Israelite shall receive atonement thereby,[7] the Israelite may eat them; if [he gave them to a priest] that the priest shall receive atonement thereby, the priest may eat them.

R. Shisbi raised an objection: FROM THE FOLLOWING MEAL-OFFERINGS THE HANDFUL MUST BE TAKEN, AND THE REMAINDER IS FOR THE PRIESTS...THE MEAL-OFFERING OF A GENTILE![8] -R. Johanan answered, This is no difficulty; for one[9] represents the view of R. Jose the Galilean, the other[10] R. Akiba's view. For it was taught: [It would have sufficed had Scripture stated] a man,[11] why does it state ‘a man, a man’?[11] To include gentiles, that they may bring either votive or freewill-offerings like an Israelite. Which they will offer unto the Lord for a burnt-offering:[11] I only know [that they may offer] burnt-offerings, but whence [that they may offer] peace-offerings? The text states, Their vows.[11] And whence thank-offerings? The text states, Their free will-offerings.[12] And whence bird-offerings and meal-offerings[13] and offerings of wine and frankincense and wood? The text states, Any of their vows,[12] and not merely ‘their vows’; so too, Any of their freewill-offerings, and not merely ‘their freewill-offerings’. Why then does this text expressly state ‘a burnt-offering’? To exclude the Nazirite-offering.[14] This is the opinion of R. Jose the Galilean. R. Akiba says, Which they will offer unto the Lord for a burnt-offering: thus [they may offer] only burnt-offerings.

But is the law that a gentile is excluded from offering a Nazirite-offering derived from this teaching? Surely it is derived from the following teaching:[15] Speak unto the children of Israel and say unto them, When either man or woman shall clearly utter a vow, the vow of a Nazirite, to consecrate himself unto the Lord:[16] hence only the children of Israel can vow the vow of a Nazirite, but gentiles cannot vow the vow of a Nazirite!-From the former teaching I should only have said that they may not offer the Nazirite-offerings, but that the Nazirite vow does apply to them; [the latter passage] therefore teaches us [that it is not so].

In accordance with whose view is the following teaching which we have learnt: R. Simeon said, The Beth din ordained seven things and this was one of them: If a gentile sent his burnt-offering from a land beyond the sea and he also sent with it the drink-offerings[17] for it, those [drink-offerings] of his[17] are to be offered; but if he did not, they are to be offered at the expense of the community.[18] Shall we say that this teaching[19] agrees with R. Jose the Galilean and not with R. Akiba?-You may even say that it agrees with R. Akiba, for [he meant to say, They may offer] burnt-offerings and everything appertaining thereto.[20]

Who is the Tanna of the following Baraitha which the Rabbis taught?[21] Home-born:[22] the home-born brings drink-offerings,[21] but a gentile may not bring drink-offerings.I might then think that his burnt-offering does not require drink-offerings [to be offered with it]; the text therefore states, After this manner.[22] Now who is [the Tanna of this Baraitha]? It is neither R. Jose the Galilean nor R. Akiba! It is not R. Jose the Galilean for he says [that the gentile may offer] even wine[23] [for a drink-offering]; neither is it R. Akiba for he says [that he may offer] only a burnt-offering but nothing else! — If you wish,I can say it is R. Jose the Galilean; and if you wish, I can say it is R. Akiba. If you wish, I can say it is R. Jose the Galilean', but you must strike out the word 'wine' from that teaching.[24] 'And if you 'wish, I can say it is R. Akiba', for [he may offer] burnt-offerings and everything appertaining thereto.

R. SIMEON SAYS, FROM THE SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING BROUGHT BY PRIESTS etc. Whence is it derived? — Our Rabbis taught: And it shall be the priest's as the meal-offering:[25] that is to say, the service thereof may be performed by [the priest] himself.[26] You say it signifies that the service thereof may be performed by [the priest] himself, but perhaps it is not so, but rather it signifies that the [remainder of the] sinner's meal-offering brought by a priest is permitted [to be eaten];[27] and as for the verse, And every meal-offering of the priest shall be wholly burnt; it shall not be eaten,[28] that refers to his[29] freewill meal-offering, but his obligatory meal-offering may indeed be eaten! The text therefore states, 'And it shall be the priest's as the meal-offering', thereby comparing his obligatory meal-offering with his freewill meal-offering; thus as his freewill meal-offering may not be eaten, so his obligatory meal-offering may not be eaten. But R. Simeon said, Is it written, 'And it shall be the priest's as his meal-offering'? It says, As the meal-offering; thereby comparing

---

(1) No part thereof shall be eaten, but they must be wholly burnt. Likewise their meal-offerings must be wholly burnt.

(2) A gentile ignorant of the distinction between the various types of sacrifices, has but one intention in his mind, namely of offering it entirely to the Lord.

(3) Lev. XXII, 18.

(4) Sc. gentiles. This verse expressly includes the offerings of gentiles, v. infra.

(5) Presumably to offer them on his (the gentile's) behalf.

(6) They are treated as peace-offerings whose flesh is consumed by the owner-in this case the Israelite or priest but not the gentile, for a gentile may not eat consecrated meat-and not as burnt-offerings, contra R. Huna.

(7) I.e., if the Israelite had undertaken to offer peace-offerings he discharges his obligation with the peace-offerings given him by the gentile; accordingly he may eat the flesh thereof.

(8) Thus it is not wholly burnt; and so it is evidently with his peace-offerings.

(9) Our Mishnah which allows a gentile to bring meal-offerings and also other offerings.

(10) R. Huna who regards all the offerings of gentiles as burnt-offerings.

(11) Lev. XXII, 18. The word 'man' is repeated in the verse. The E.VV. render: Whosoever he be.

(12) Lev. XXII, 18.

(13) So in all MSS. and also in Tos. s.v. אי. Cur. edd. omit 'meal-offerings'.

(14) Since the law of the Nazirite does not apply to a gentile (v. infra) he cannot offer the offerings prescribed for the Nazirite.

(15) Naz. 61a.

(16) Mum. VI, 2.

(17) I.e., the money for the drink-offerings.

(18) Shek. VII, 6. V. supra 51b.

(19) Which permits the offering of drink-offerings by a gentile.

(20) Sc. the drink-offerings which accompany the burnt-offering. In most MSS., in the Aruch, Rashi MS., and Yalkut there is here used a rare word , אביזרא (var. אביזרהא) 'appertunances'. Cur. edd. read: חבירתה.

(21) Zeb. 45a; Tem. 3a.

(22) Num. XV, 13. This verse refers to the drink-offerings that must accompany the sacrifices.

(23) As a separate freewill-offering.

(24) Thus the gentile may bring every offering except the drink-offering of wine.
(25) Lev. V, 13. The verse refers to the sinner's meal-offering, i.e., the obligatory meal-offering; and the conclusion of the verse, that quoted in the text, according to Rabbinic interpretation, implies that the priest's obligatory meal-offering shall be like 'the meal-offering'. The arguments which follow serve to elucidate the point of the comparison with 'the meal-offering'.
(26) If a priest sinned and is obliged to offer a meal-offering, he may perform the service of his own meal-offering. The verse accordingly means: the priest's obligatory meal-offering shall be as the meal-offering of an Israelite; just as the priest performs the service for the latter so he may perform the service for his own meal-offering.
(27) Thus this verse informs us that the priest's obligatory meal-offering is like the meal-offering of an Israelite which is eaten by the priests after the handful has been taken out.
(28) Lev. VI, 16.
(29) Sc. the priest's.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 74a

the sinner's meal-offering brought by a priest with the sinner's meal-offering brought by an Israelite; thus as from the latter the handful is taken so from the former the handful must be taken. But you might [also say], Just as the handful is taken from the sinner's meal-offering brought by an Israelite the remainder may be eaten, so when the handful is taken from the sinner's meal-offering brought by a priest the remainder may be eaten; the text therefore states, 'The priest's as the meal-offering', that is to say, as regards what concerns the priest[1] it is like the [sinner's] meal-offering [brought by an Israelite], but as regards what concerns the altar-fire it is not like that meal-offering.[2] Accordingly the handful must be offered by itself and the remainder too must be offered by itself.

But is the rule that the service thereof[3] may be performed by [the priest] himself derived from this teaching? Surely it is derived from the following teaching: Whence can we learn that a priest is entitled to come and sacrifice his offerings at any time and on any occasion he desires?[4] Because the text states, And come with all the desire of his soul... and shall minister![5] — From this latter teaching I would have said that it[6] applied only to such offerings as are not brought on account of sin, but not to such as are brought on account of sin.[7] But is this[8] derived from here? Surely we know it from the following: The verse, And the priest shall make atonement for the soul that erreth, when he sinneth through error,[9] teaches us that the priest can make atonement for himself by his own service! — From this latter teaching I would have said that it applied only to such [offerings as are brought for a sin committed] in error, but not to such [as are brought for a sin committed] wilfully; we are therefore taught [that it applies to the latter too]. (And[10] is there any instance of [an offering brought for a sin committed] wilfully? — Yes, for example, wilfully taking a false oath.)[11]

Another [Baraitha] taught: R. Simeon says, From the sinner's meal-offering brought by a priest the handful is taken, and the handful is offered by itself and so also the remainder is offered by itself. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon says, The handful is offered by itself and the remainder is scattered over the ash-heap. R. Hiyya b. Abba said that R. Johanan pondered over this: Which ash-heap is meant? If that which is on top,[12] then his view is identical with his father's;[13] and if that which is below,[14] then [it will be asked], Is there anything that is ever offered below?-Perhaps, said R. Abba, [it is different when it is intended] to go to waste. They — thereupon laughed at him, saying, Is there anything whose rite is[15] that it shall go to waste? — R. Abin's father taught as follows:[16] And every meal-offering of the priest shall be wholly burnt; it shall not be eaten:[17] l have compared it[18] [with the preceding High Priest's meal-offering] only in respect of eating[19] but in no other respect.[20] What can it mean?[21] — Abaye said, It means this:[22] 'Every meal-offering of the priest...shall not be eaten': that is his obligatory meal-offering;[23] 'shall be wholly burnt': that is his freewill meal-offering.[24] Thereupon Raba said to him, A sharp knife is dissecting the verse![25] Rather, said Raba, it means, 'Every meal-offering of the priest shall be wholly burnt': that is his freewill meal-offering; 'it shall not be eaten': that is his obligatory meal-offering.[26] Might I not say the reverse?[27] — It is more

reasonable to include his freewill meal-offering,[28] since [like the High Priest's meal-offering] it is frequent,[29] It is not brought on account of sin, and it has a sweet savour.[30] On the contrary, it is more reasonable to include his obligatory meal-offering,[31] since [like the High Priest's meal-offering] it consists of one tenth[32] and is brought as an obligation! — Those[33] are more In number.

To what purpose do the Rabbis apply the verse And every meal-offering of the priest shall be wholly burnt; it shall not be eaten?[34] They require it for the following teaching: I only know that the former[35] must be wholly burnt, and the latter[36] shall not be eaten, whence do I know to apply what is stated of the one to the other and vice versa? The text therefore stated the word 'kalil' in each case for the purposes of analogy. It says in the former passage 'kalil' and in the latter also 'kalil', as in the former it means wholly burnt, so In the latter it means wholly burnt. And as in the latter passage the eating thereof is expressly forbidden by a prohibition, so in the former the eating is forbidden by a prohibition. Rabina raised this question, What is the law if a priest ate of the sacrificial portions of an offering? As regards the prohibition concerning non-priests

---

(1) I.e., the taking out of the handful.

(2) For there is this distinction between them, the remainder of an Israelite's obligatory meal-offering is eaten, whereas the remainder of a priest's obligatory meal-offering must be burnt.

(3) Sc. of the priest's meal-offering.

(4) Even though he does not belong to that division of priests on duty at the time in the Temple.

(5) Deut. XVIII, 6, 7.

(6) The rule that the priest may sacrifice his own offerings.

(7) The former teaching, based on Lev. V, 13, is therefore necessary to state this rule even with regard to sin-offerings too.

(8) The rule that the priest may offer his own sin-offerings.

(9) Num. XV, 28.

(10) This passage in brackets is omitted in all MSS. and evidently was not in the text that was before Rashi. Sh. Mek. deletes it here.

(11) Denying the knowledge of any testimony; v. Lev. V. 1.

(12) I.e., the ash-heap which was in the middle of the altar.

(13) For by scattering it on the ash-heap it is equivalent to burning it on the altar, which is the view expressed by his father R. Simeon.

(14) I.e., the ash-heap on the ground by the side of the altar near the ascent.

(15) Lit., 'that is offered'.

(16) This teaching supplies the answer to the question raised, for according to the following exposition Scripture impliedly states that the remainder shall go to waste on the ash-heap. Some, however, regard this passage as a separate teaching and in no way connected with the preceding, so that the preceding discussion remains with the difficulty.

(17) Lev. VI, 16. This verse follows upon the law concerning the High Priest's daily meal-offering (מנחת חביתין, the meal-offering of griddle-cakes) which was wholly burnt.

(18) Sc. the sinner's meal-offering brought by the priest.

(19) That neither may be eaten.

(20) For as regards the offering there is a distinction: the High Priest's meal-offering must be burnt on the altar whereas the remainder of the sinner's meal-offering brought by a priest is to be scattered on the ash-heap.

(21) This verse expressly says that it shall be wholly burnt, how then can it be suggested that the remainder shall be scattered?

(22) The fact that the verse states 'shall be wholly burnt' and also 'shall not be eaten' suggests, in order to avoid the redundancy, that it deals with two different kinds of priestly meal-offerings.

(23) Thus the sinner's meal-offering brought by a priest shall, like the High Priest's meal-offering, not be eaten; but, unlike the High Priest's meal-offering, the handful must be taken therefrom and the remainder scattered on the ash-heap.

(24) From which, as from the High Priest's meal-offering, the handful is not taken out.

(25) According to Abaye's interpretation the verse is broken up and the words are transposed, connecting the last words with the first part of the verse. This is unnatural and arbitrary.

(26) It must be observed that in essence Abaye and Raba both say the same thing; the only difference between them is as to the correct interpretation of the opening phrase 'And every meal-offering of the priest'. If this refers to his obligatory meal-offering then it is necessary to transpose the order in the verse, as Abaye does; if to his freewill meal-offering, then the verse is interpreted as it stands, as Raba does. V. Rashba.
(27) Viz., that the obligatory meal-offering shall be wholly burnt without taking the handful therefrom, and that from the freewill meal-offering the handful shall be taken and the remainder scattered on the ash-heap. This objection is against both Abaye and Raba; v. prev. n. Cf. Tosaf. s.v. מאי; also Rashba.
(28) That it be like the High Priest's meal-offering in that the handful shall not be taken therefrom.
(29) It can be brought at any time at will, and the High Priest's meal-offering was offered daily, whereas the obligatory meal-offering was brought only on the commission of certain sins.
(30) For like the High Priest's meal-offering it was offered mingled with oil, and frankincense was also added, whereas the obligatory meal-offering was dry, without oil and frankincense. Another interpretation: the expression 'a sweet savour' is written in connection with the former but not with the latter.
(31) V. p. 441, n. 12.
(32) Whereas the freewill meal-offering may consist of any number of tenths of an ephah of fine flour, the only restriction being that there shall not be more than sixty tenths in one vessel.
(33) The points of resemblance between the freewill meal-offering and the High Priest's meal-offering.
(34) Since the Rabbis differ from R. Simeon and say that every meal-offering of a priest is to be wholly burnt without the handful being taken therefrom, to them the expression 'it shall not be eaten' is redundant in this verse.
(35) I.e., the passage dealing with the High Priest's meal-offering where it stated (Lev. VI, 15) 'It shall be wholly burnt', using the expression כליל; on the other hand, no express prohibition is stated against eating it.
(36) l.e., the verse dealing with the priest's meal-offering (ibid. 16), where it is expressly stated 'It shall not be eaten'; on the other hand, in this verse Scripture does not expressly say 'It shall be wholly burnt'; it only states 'It shall be whole', כליל

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 74b

I have no doubt at all;[1] I ask the question only as regards the precept 'It shall be wholly burnt'.[2] How is it then? — Said R. Aaron to Rabina, Come and hear: For it was taught: R. Eliezer says, The precept 'It shall be wholly burnt', wherever it applies, imports also a prohibition against eating.[3]

MISHNAH. THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE PRIESTS,[4] THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED HIGH PRIEST, AND THE MEAL-OFFERING THAT IS OFFERED WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS ARE [WHOLLY] FOR THE ALTAR AND THE PRIESTS HAVE NO SHARE IN THEM; WITH THESE THE ALTAR IS MORE PRIVILEGED THAN THE PRIESTS. THE TWO LOAVES AND THE SHEWBREAD ARE EATEN BY THE PRIESTS AND THE ALTAR HAS NO SHARE IN THEM; WITH THESE THE PRIESTS ARE MORE PRIVILEGED THAN THE ALTAR.

GEMARA. Are there no other cases?[5] But what about the burnt-offering? — There is the hide thereof which belongs to the priests. And what about the burnt-offering of a bird?-There are the crop and the feathers thereof.[6] And what about the drink-offerings? — They flow down into the pits.[7] What then does WITH THESE' [signify]?[8] [It is] to exclude Samuel's ruling. For Samuel stated:[9] If a man makes a freewill-offering of wine, he must bring it and it is poured on the altar fire; [our Mishnah] therefore teaches us that it is poured into the pits. [Our Mishnah], however, supports [the other ruling of] Samuel, for Samuel stated,[10] If a man makes a freewill-offering of oil, the handful must be taken from it [and burnt upon the altar], and the remainder is eaten by the priests.

THE TWO LOAVES AND THE SHEWBREAD. Are there no other cases?[11] But what about the sin-offering of a bird?-There is the blood thereof [which was sprinkled upon the side of the altar]. And what about the log of oil of the leper?-There are the sprinklings.[12] What does 'WITH THESE' [signify]? [It is] to exclude the view of him who says that the Two Loaves, if brought alone,[13] must

be burnt; our [Mishnah] therefore teaches us that with these the priests are always privileged.[14]

MISHNAH. ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS THAT ARE PREPARED IN A VESSEL[15] REQUIRE THREE APPLICATIONS OF OIL BEFORE THEY ARE MADE READY, VIZ., POURING, MINGLING AND PUTTING IN.[16] THE [BAKED] CAKES[17] WERE MINGLED[18] [WITH OIL]. SO RABBI. BUT THE SAGES SAY, THE FINE FLOUR [WAS MINGLED WITH OIL]. THE CAKES[19] REQUIRED MINGLING AND THE WAFERS[20] ANOINTING. HOW WERE THEY ANOINTED? IN THE FORM OF CHI.[21] AND THE RESIDUE OF THE OIL WAS CONSUMED BY THE PRIESTS.

GEMARA. What does it[22] exclude? — Said R. Papa, It excludes the meal-offering baked [in the oven].[23]

Our Rabbis taught: And if thy offering be a meal-offering prepared in the pan, it shall be made of fine flour with oil:[24] this[25] signifies that it requires the putting in of oil in the vessel [at the outset]. [The expressions] 'thy offering' [used here and] 'thy offering' [used there][26] establish an analogy:

---

(1) The priest is certainly liable on account of the prohibition (Lev. XXII, 10) There shall no non-priest eat of the holy thing, for in regard to the portions that are to be burnt upon the altar the priest is in the same category as a non-priest.

(2) Does this precept, which is stated in connection with the meal-offering, apply to all offerings which are to be burnt or not?

(3) V. Mak. 18b. Hence the priest is liable on account of this prohibition too.

(4) Whether brought as a freewill or obligatory offering.

(5) Of offerings wholly consumed by the altar and in which the priests have no share.

(6) Which are cast away and not offered; thus the offering is not wholly burnt upon the altar.

(7) These were the pits under the altar into which the wine flowed after the libation; v. Suk. 49a. The drink-offerings therefore cannot be said to be consumed by the altar.

(8) Seeing that we know of no exceptions to the rule.

(9) Zeb. 91b. Samuel distinguishes between an offering of wine and of oil, since from the latter the handful can be taken but not from the former.

(10) V. p. 443, n. 9.

(11) Of offerings which are wholly consumed by the priests and in which the altar has no share.

(12) Sc. the seven sprinklings of the oil towards the curtain. Hence it was not wholly consumed by the priests. Aliter: the application of the oil to the ear etc. of the leper.

(13) When the two lambs of Pentecost were not available, v. supra p.280.

(14) For the Two Loaves are in all circumstances eaten by the priests.

(15) I.e., those prepared in a special vessel, as the griddle and the pan, but excluding those baked in the oven. V. Gemara.

(16) The manner of its preparation was this: some oil was first put in a vessel of ministry, the flour was then put in and the two were kneaded together. Later more oil was added which was mingled with the dough. It was then baked into a cake whereupon it was broken into pieces and again more oil was poured on it, and then the handful was taken from it.

(17) Of the meal-offering prepared on a griddle or that prepared in a pan or that baked in an oven.

(18) The prescribed mingling had to be performed after the meal-offering had been baked and broken into pieces.

(19) Of the meal-offering baked in the oven.

(20) Of the meal-offering baked in the oven.

(21) In the form of a cross like the Greek letter . V. Tosaf. infra 75a, s.v. כמין, where various other suggestions are made.

(22) Sc. the expression 'THAT ARE PREPARED IN A VESSEL'.

(23) This meal-offering had only two applications of oil, putting in and mingling, but not the third of pouring oil on it after it was baked.

(24) Lev. II, 7.

(25) Sc. the expression סלת בשמן; lit., 'fine flour on the oil'.

(26) Ibid.5, with reference to the meal-offering prepared on a griddle.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 75a

just as here there must be the putting in of oil in the vessel [at the outset], so there there must also be the putting in of oil in the vessel [at the outset]. And just as there there must be mingling and pouring, so here there must also be mingling and pouring.[1]

THE [BAKED] CAKES WERE MINGLED [WITH OIL]. SO RABBI. BUT THE SAGES SAY, THE FINE FLOUR [WAS MINGLED WITH OIL]. Our Rabbis taught: [The expression] 'fine flour mingled with oil' signifies that the fine flour was mingled [with oil]. But Rabbi says, The cakes were mingled, as it is said, Cakes mingled with oil.[2] They said to him, Is it not written in connection with the loaves of the thank-offering, Cakes [mingled with oil]?[3] Nevertheless it was not possible[4] to mingle the cakes [with oil] but only the flour![5] How was it[6] made ready? He put in oil into the vessel at the outset, put in [the flour], added oil to it and mingled them together; he then kneaded it, baked it, broke it in pieces, poured oil on it, and then took the handful from it. Rabbi says, The cakes were mingled, as it is said, 'Cakes mingled with oil'. How was it made ready? He put in oil into the vessel at the outset, put in [the flour], kneaded it, baked it, broke it in pieces, added oil to it and mingled them together, again poured oil on it, and then took the handful from It.

This was indeed a sound argument that the Sages put to Rabbi.[7] What is the argument?Said R. Samuel son of R. Isaac, Since there was only one quarter log of oil, how could it be distributed among so many cakes?[8]

THE CAKES REQUIRED MINGLING [WITH OIL] AND THE WAFERS ANOINTING. Our Rabbis taught: It is written, 'Cakes mingled [with oil]',[9] but not wafers mingled with oil. For [without the Biblical direction] I might have argued by an a fortiori argument thus: if cakes which do not require anointing require mingling, wafers which require anointing should surely require mingling! The text therefore states, 'Cakes mingled [with oil]', but not wafers mingled with oil. [It is written,] 'Wafers anointed [with oil]',[9] but not cakes anointed with oil. For [without the Biblical direction] I might have argued by an a fortiori argument thus: if wafers which do not require mingling require anointing, cakes which require mingling should surely require anointing! The text therefore states 'Wafers anointed [with oil]', but not cakes anointed with oil. How is this implied? — Raba explained, Because [Scripture] should not have omitted to state at least once the expression 'cakes anointed with oil and wafers mingled with oil'.[10]

HOW WERE THEY ANOINTED? IN THE FORM OF CHI. What is the meaning of 'IN THE FORM OF CHI'?-Said R. Kahana, In the form of the Greek letter chi.[11]

Our Rabbis taught: If the meal-offering [baked in the oven] is composed half of cakes and half of wafers,[12] one must bring for it one log of oil and divide it, one half for the cakes and the other half for the wafers. The cakes are to be mingled [with oil] and the wafers anointed. One must anoint the wafer over the whole of its surface; and the residue of the oil is to be put into the cakes. R. Simeon son of Judah says in the name of R. Simeon, One must anoint it in the form of [the letter] chi; and the residue of the oil is consumed by the priests.

Another Baraitha taught: If wafers are brought as an offering by themselves, one must bring for them one log of oil and anoint them, repeating this again and again until all the oil in the log has been used up. R. Simeon son of Judah says in the name of R. Simeon, One must anoint them in the form of [the letter] chi, and the residue of the oil is consumed by the priests.

MISHNAH. ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS THAT ARE PREPARED IN A VESSEL[13] REQUIRE TO

BE BROKEN IN PIECES.

GEMARA. What does it exclude?-Said R. Papa, It excludes the Two Loaves and the Shewbread.[14]

Our Rabbis taught: Thou shalt break it in pieces . . . it is a meal-offering:[15] this includes all meal-offerings that they require to be broken in pieces. I might then say that it includes also the Two Loaves and the Shewbread; the text therefore states, 'It'. And pour oil thereon, it is a meal-offering:[15] this includes all meal-offerings that they require oil to be poured on them. I might then say that it includes also the meal-offering baked in the oven; the text therefore states, 'Oil thereon'. Perhaps I must thus exclude the cakes but not the wafers; the text therefore states, 'It is'. How is this implied? Perhaps I should rather exclude the meal-offering of the priests!

---

(1) With regard to the meal-offering prepared on a griddle Scripture mentions two applications of oil, the mingling and the pouring at the end; and with regard to that prepared in a pan Scripture only mentions the putting in of oil at the outset. On the strength of the analogy it is established that what is stated of the one applies to the other, thus both kinds require three applications of oil.

(2) Ibid. 4.

(3) Ibid. VII, 12.

(4) V. infra.

(5) Thus in spite of the express Biblical direction it was the flour that was mingled with oil and not the cakes.

(6) Sc. the meal-offering that was prepared in a pan or on a griddle.

(7) The text adopted is that of MS.M., R. Gershom, Tosaf. and Sh. Mek.; and the interpretation follows that suggested by Tosaf. sv. שפיר. V, Rashi. Cur. edd. read: What was the purport of the words 'nevertheless it was not possible etc.' which the Sages said to Rabbi?

(8) V. infra 89a. A half log of oil was prescribed for the thank-offering, half of this quantity being used for the ten soaked cakes, and the other half (i.e., a quarter log) for the ten cakes and the ten wafers. It would therefore be impossible to mingle ten baked cakes with less than a quarter log of oil, for baked cakes are porous and all the oil would soon be absorbed in a few cakes. Obviously then the mingling could only have been performed before the cakes were baked, i.e., mingling the oil with the flour. And so it was, according to the Sages, with all meal-offerings.

(9) Lev. II, 4.

(10) The fact that Scripture invariably speaks of cakes mingled with oil and wafers anointed with oil indicates that the manner of applying the oil is exclusive in each case.

(11) V. supra p. 445, n. 2.

(12) According to R. Simeon the meal-offering baked in the oven may consist of either ten cakes or ten wafers or five cakes and five wafers. V. supra p. 372.

(13) I.e., from which the handful is taken (Tif. Yisroel).

(14) These were not broken in pieces.

(15) Lev. 11,6.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 75b

— Rabbah explained, Which meal-offering is it that needs two expressions to exclude it?[1] You must say it is the meal-offering baked [in the oven].[2]

MISHNAH. THE MEAL-OFFERING[3] OF AN ISRAELITE WAS FOLDED INTO TWO AND THE TWO WERE FOLDED INTO FOUR,[4] AND IT WAS SEVERED[5] [AT EACH BEND]; THE MEAL-OFFERING OF PRIESTS WAS FOLDED INTO TWO AND THE TWO WERE FOLDED INTO FOUR, BUT IT WAS NOT SEVERED;[6] THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED HIGH PRIEST WAS NOT FOLDED. R. SIMEON SAYS, NEITHER THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE PRIESTS[7] NOR THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED HIGH PRIEST WAS BROKEN IN PIECES, SINCE THE HANDFUL WAS NOT TAKEN FROM THEM, AND

WHENEVER THE HANDFUL IS NOT TAKEN [FROM THE OFFERING] IT IS NOT TO BE BROKEN IN PIECES. THEY MUST ALL BE BROKEN INTO PIECES THE SIZE OF AN OLIVE.[8] GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: [It is written,] Thou shalt break.[9] From this expression I would say [that it must be broken] in two, the text therefore states, In pieces.[9] [From the expression] 'in pieces' I would say that it should be broken into crumbs, the text therefore states, 'It':[9] it[10] must be broken in pieces but not the pieces into further pieces. How then must it be done? The meal-offering of an Israelite was folded into two and the two into four, and it was severed [at each bend]; the meal-offering of priests and of the anointed High Priest were folded etc. But have we not learnt: [THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED HIGH PRIEST] WAS NOT FOLDED?-Rabbah said, It means it was not folded into four but it was folded into two.

R. SIMEON SAYS, NEITHER THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE PRIESTS NOR THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE ANOINTED HIGH PRIEST WAS BROKEN IN PIECES. R. Joseph said, Over habiza[11] which contains pieces of bread the size of an olive the benediction is '... who bringest forth bread from the earth'. If it does not contain pieces of bread the size of an olive the benediction is '...who createst various kinds of food'. R. Joseph said, Whence do I know this? From the following teaching: If he[12] was standing and offering meal-offerings [in the Temple] in Jerusalem, he says, 'Blessed art thou... who hast kept us in life and hast preserved us and enabled us to reach this season'. If he[13] took them to eat he says the benediction ... — who bringest forth bread from the earth'.[14] And we have learnt: THEY MUST ALL BE BROKEN INTO PIECES THE SIZE OF AN OLIVE.[15] Abaye said to him, Then according to the Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael who said, 'He must crumble [the meal-offerings] until they have been reduced to the fineness of the flour of which they had been made', it would not be necessary to say the benediction 'who bringest forth' —[16] And should you say that it is so, but it has been taught:[17] If a man gathered together crumbs from all of them[18] the size of an olive and ate them [on the Passover], if they were leavened he has thereby incurred the penalty of kareth,[19] but if unleavened he fulfils therewith his obligation on Passover![20] -We are dealing here[21] with the case where he pressed [the crumbs] into a compact mass.[22] In that case, consider the comment on the above teaching: 'Provided he ate them[23] in the time it takes to eat half a loaf'.[24] Now if he pressed them into a compact mass it should have stated 'he ate it'! — Rather we are dealing here with the case where the crumbs come from a large loaf.[25] What is the decision then?[26] R. Shesheth said, Even though the pieces of bread [in the habiza] are not the size of an olive, [one must say the benediction 'who bringest forth']. Raba said, This is so provided they still have the semblance of bread.[27]

---

(1) Viz., 'it' and 'thereon'.

(2) For it consists of two kinds, cakes and wafers; accordingly two expressions are required to exclude this meal-offering.

(3) I.e., each cake.

(4) Thus fulfilling the precept of breaking in pieces.

(5) So that the handful could be taken therefrom.

(6) Since the handful was not taken from it but it was wholly burnt.

(7) Sc. his freewill-offering, for according to R. Simeon from the priest's obligatory meal-offering the handful was taken.

(8) Reading פותתן. In the MSS., and also further in the Gemara and in Rashi, the reading is פתיתין, 'All the pieces must be about the size of an olive'. The exact implication of this statement is doubtful and many interpretations have been suggested: (i) After the pieces have been folded and broken into four, they must be broken into eight, and then again into sixteen and so on until each piece is reduced to the size of an olive. This statement accordingly continues the view of the first Tanna in this Mishnah (R. Gershom and Rashi). (ii) This statement is the expression of R. Simeon's view, that the pieces must be broken many times until each is reduced to an olive's size, this in opposition to the first Tanna who maintained that the cake was broken into four pieces only (Rashi in MS.). (iii) Each cake must first be broken into pieces each about the size of an olive, and then the pieces must be folded into two and then into four (Maim. in Com. on Mishnah, and Bartinoro).

(9) Lev. II, 6.

(10) Sc. each one of the two pieces.
(11) חביצא, a dish of flour, honey and oil beaten in a pulp (Jast.).
(12) Sc. a priest who is offering his first meal-offering of the year. Another interpretation: An Israelite who is offering a meal-offering for the first time in his life.
(13) Sc. the priest.
(14) The benediction prescribed for bread.
(15) Hence over food containing pieces of bread the size of an olive one must say the benediction .. . — who bringest forth bread from the earth'.
(16) Since there are no pieces the size of an olive.
(17) V. Ber. 37b.
(18) Sc. from the five species of grain, v. supra p. 414 (Tosaf.).
(19) V. Glos.
(20) Thus crumbs when collected unto an olive's bulk are regarded as bread, consequently one must say over them the benediction 'who bringest forth'.
(21) In the 'Baraitha quoted from Ber.
(22) Making one piece the size of an olive.
(23) Sc. the crumbs.
(24) I.e., a Piece of bread equivalent in size to four eggs (according to Maim: three). The eating of the crumbs must not be spread out over a longer space of time.
(25) Since the whole loaf has not been reduced to crumbs but only a portion of it, the loose crumbs, even though each is less than an olive's bulk, are considered as of some worth, and when they make up an olive's bulk one must say over them the benediction 'who bringest forth'. Where, however, the entire cake is reduced to crumbs, as in the case of the meal-offering according to the view of the Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael, one would not have to say over them the benediction 'who bringest forth'.
(26) Regarding the saying of the benediction for bread over pieces less than the size of an olive.
(27) I.e., the pieces of bread have not been soaked too long in the mixture so as to be reduced to a pulp.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 76a

MISHNAH. ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS REQUIRE TO BE RUBBED[1] THREE HUNDRED TIMES AND BEATEN[2] FIVE HUNDRED TIMES. THE RUBBING AND THE BEATING APPLY TO THE GRAINS OF WHEAT. R. JOSE SAYS, TO THE DOUGH.[3] ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS CONSIST[4] OF TEN CAKES EACH, EXCEPTING THE SHEWBREAD AND THE GRIDDLE-CAKES OF THE HIGH PRIEST, WHICH CONSIST OF TWELVE CAKES EACH. SO R. JUDAH. BUT R. MEIR SAYS, THEY ALL CONSIST OF TWELVE CAKES EACH, EXCEPTING THE CAKES OF THE THANK-OFFERING AND OF THE NAZIRITE-OFFERING, WHICH CONSIST OF TEN CAKES EACH.

GEMARA. A Tanna taught: He must rub once and beat twice, then rub twice and beat thrice.[5] R. Jeremiah enquired, Is the [moving of the hand] to and fro counted as one [rubbing] or as two [rubbings]? — This is undecided.

THE RUBBING AND THE BEATING APPLY TO THE GRAINS OF WHEAT. R. JOSE SAYS, TO THE DOUGH. The question was asked: Does [R. Jose] mean to the dough and not to the grains of wheat; or does he mean to the dough too?-Come and hear, for it was taught: The rubbing and the beating apply to the grains of wheat. R. Jose says, The rubbing and the beating apply to the dough.[6]

ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS CONSIST OF TEN CAKES EACH, [EXCEPTING THE SHEWBREAD AND THE GRIDDLE-CAKES OF THE HIGH PRIEST], WHICH CONSIST OF TWELVE CAKES EACH.With regard to the Shewbread this is expressly stated.[7] With regard to the griddle-cakes of the High Priest this is inferred by the occurrence of the word 'statute' both here and in connection with the Shewbread.[8] But whence do we know that all other meal-offerings must

consist of ten cakes each? — By inference from the cakes of the thank-offering: as these consist of ten cakes,[9] so [all meal-offerings] must consist of ten cakes. Perhaps the inference should be drawn from the Shewbread: as this consists of twelve cakes, so [all meal-offerings] must consist of twelve cakes! — It is more reasonable to draw the inference from the cakes of the thank-offering since they[10] [like the cakes of the thank-offering] are the offerings of an individual, are freewill-offerings, require oil, are rendered invalid if left overnight, and may not be offered on the Sabbath or in uncleanness.[11] On the contrary, it is more reasonable to draw the inference from the Shewbread for they [like the Shewbread] are most holy, require frankincense, consist entirely of unleavened cakes, and are brought on their own account![12] -Those[13] are more in number.

But if we hold the view that what is derived by a gezerah shawah[14] may be set up as a basis for further inference,[15] should we not then draw the inference from the griddle-cakes of the High Priest; just as these consist of twelve cakes[16] so [all meal-offerings] must consist of twelve cakes? — It is more reasonable to draw the inference from the cakes of the thank-offering for they[17] [like the cakes of the thank-offering] are the offerings of ordinary persons, are freewill-offerings, are not offered by halves, are subject to the law of piggul, and may not be offered on the Sabbath or in uncleanness.[18] On the contrary, it is more reasonable to draw the inference from the griddle-cakes of the High Priest for they [like the griddle-cakes of the High Priest] consist of one tenth, are hallowed by a vessel, are most holy, require frankincense, consist entirely of unleavened cakes, are brought on their own account, require bringing near, and are offered [in part] on the altar fire;[19] moreover these[20] are more in number! — It is preferable to infer an offering of ordinary persons from an offering of ordinary persons.[21]

R.MEIR SAYS,THEY ALL CONSIST OF TWELVE CAKES EACH. If he holds the view that what is derived by a gezerah shawah may be set up as a basis for further inference, then he infers [other meal-offerings][22] from the griddle-cakes of the High Priest, for these[23] are more in number. And if he holds the view that what is derived by a gezerah shawah may not be set up as a basis for further inference, then he infers [other meal-offerings] from the Shewbread, for he prefers to infer the [most] holy from the [most] holy. EXCEPTING THE CAKES OF THE THANK-OFFERING AND OF THE NAZIRITE-OFFERING, WHICH CONSIST OF TEN CAKES EACH. With regard to the cakes of the thank-offering this is expressly stated;[24] and with regard to the cakes of the Nazirite-offering [this is so] because the Master has said, 'His peace-offerings'[25] includes the peace-offerings of the Nazirite.[26]

R. Tobi b. Kisna said in the name of Samuel, If for the cakes of the thank-offering one baked only four cakes [instead of forty],[27] it is sufficient. But are not forty necessary? — That is only as a meritorius act. But terumah has to be taken therefrom?[28] And should you say that a piece is taken from each cake as terumah, but the Divine Law expressly says 'One',[29] [meaning] that he may not take what is broken![30] - [The terumah] was taken therefrom during the kneading.[31]

An objection was raised: All meal-offerings which were made into too many or too few cakes are valid, excepting the Shewbread, the griddle-cakes of the High Priest, the cakes of the thank-offering and of the Nazirite-offering! — He

---

(1) The grains of wheat must be rubbed with the hand in order that the husk be the more easily removed.

(2) Beating down with the fist (others: with the foot) on the grains.

(3) I.e., in the preparation of the dough it was necessary to rub it three hundred times and beat it five hundred times.

(4) l.e., shall be made up and baked into ten cakes.

(5) This process must be repeated one hundred times, thus there will have been three hundred rubbings and five hundred beatings.

(6) And not to the wheat. A variant reading in R. Jose is: The rubbing applies to the grains of wheat and the beating to the dough. So Bah. V. Maim. Com. on Mishnah.

(7) That there must be twelve cakes; v. Lev. XXIV,5.
(8) V. ibid. 9 and VI, 15.
(9) V. infra beginning of chap. VIII, p. 458.
(10) Sc. all other meal-offerings.
(11) Whereas the Shewbread is an obligatory offering of the community and therefore it overrides the laws of the Sabbath and of uncleanness, does not require oil, and is left on the table in the Temple the whole week.
(12) Whereas the cakes of the thank-offering belong to the less holy offerings and are not brought as an offering by themselves but as accompanying the animal-offering. They do not have any frankincense, and some of the cakes are leavened.
(13) The points of resemblance between the other meal-offerings and the cakes of the thank-offering.
(14) V. Glos.
(15) Heb. Binyan Ab ('creation of a class'), an inference by analogy from a case explicitly stated in the Bible for all similar cases not specified in detail.
(16) This was arrived at by the gezerah shawah on the strength of the common expression 'statute' used of the Shewbread and of the griddle-cakes of the High Priest.
(17) Sc. all other meal-offerings.
(18) Whereas the griddle-cakes are the offering of the High Priest, brought as an obligation, and therefore override the Sabbath and uncleanness; they are offered half in the morning and half in the evening, and are not subject to the law of piggul (v. Glos.).
(19) Whereas the cakes of the thank-offering consist of many tenths of flour, they are hallowed only by the slaughtering of the animal sacrifice on whose account these cakes are brought, they do not require frankincense, a proportion of them is leavened, they do not require to be brought near to the altar, and no part thereof is offered upon the altar fire.
(20) Sc. the points of resemblance between the other meal-offerings and the griddle-cakes of the High Priest.
(21) I.e., other meal-offerings from the cakes of the thank-offering, rather than from the High Priest's meal-offering.
(22) That they shall consist of twelve cakes.
(23) V. supra n. 5.
(24) That these must consist of ten cakes of each kind; v. infra 77b.
(25) Lev. VII, 13, stated with reference to the thank-offering.
(26) Therefore like the thank-offering the cakes of the Nazirite-offering must consist of ten cakes; v. infra 78a.
(27) He baked only one cake of each of the four kinds prescribed (unleavened cakes, wafers, soaked cakes, and leavened cakes) instead of ten of each kind.
(28) From each set of ten cakes one cake was to be given to the priest as terumah.
(29) Lev. VII, 14.
(30) V. infra 77b.
(31) During the kneading of each kind a portion was taken as terumah and baked into a whole cake.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 76b

is in agreement with the view of the following Tanna,[1] for it was taught: All meal-offerings which were made into too many or too few cakes are valid, excepting the Shewbread and the griddle-cakes of the High Priest. Others say, Excepting also the cakes of the thank-offering and of the Nazirite-offering.

R. Huna said, If for the meal-offering baked in the oven one baked only one cake,[2] it is sufficient. Why? Because the word 'unleavened' is written defectively [in Scripture].[3] R. Papa demurred, is this so only because 'unleavened' is written defectively, but had 'unleavened' not been written defectively it would not be so? Behold with regard to the cakes of the thank-offering the word 'unleavened'[4] is not written defectively, nevertheless R. Tobi b. Kisna said in the name of Samuel that if for the cakes of the thank- offering one baked only four cakes [instead of forty] it was sufficient! — That statement [of R. Tobi b. Kisna] is at variance with this.

MISHNAH. THE 'OMER CONSISTED OF ONE TENTH [OF AN EPHAH OF FLOUR]

TAKEN FROM THREE SE'AHS;[5] THE TWO LOAVES CONSISTED OF TWO TENTHS TAKEN FROM THREE SE'AHS; AND THE SHEWBREAD CONSISTED OF TWENTY-FOUR TENTHS TAKEN FROM TWENTY-FOUR SE'AHS.

GEMARA. [THE 'OMER etc.] Why so?-Since it was of the new produce and of barley,[6] a tenth of the finest flour could only be obtained out of three se'ahs.

THE TWO LOAVES CONSISTED OF TWO TENTHS TAKEN FROM THREE SE'AHS. Since it was of wheat, even though it was of the new produce, two tenths of the finest flour could be obtained out of three se'ahs.

THE SHEWBREAD CONSISTED OF TWENTY-FOUR TENTHS TAKEN FROM TWENTY-FOUR SE'AHS. Why so? — Since it was of wheat and of the old produce, one tenth of the finest flour could be obtained out of one se'ah.

Our Rabbis taught: In all meal-offerings if the number of tenths was increased or diminished,[7] it is invalid; if the number of se'ahs[8] was increased or diminished, it is valid.[9] MISHNAH. THE 'OMER[10] WAS SIFTED THROUGH THIRTEEN SIEVES, THE TWO LOAVES THROUGH TWELVE, AND THE SHEWBREAD THROUGH ELEVEN. R. SIMEON SAYS, THERE WAS NO PRESCRIBED NUMBER FOR THEM,[11] BUT THEY BROUGHT FINE FLOUR AND SIFTED IT AS MUCH AS WAS NECESSARY, AS IT IS SAID, AND THOU SHALT TAKE FINE FLOUR AND BAKE IT:[12] [IT MAY NOT BE BAKED] UNTIL IT IS SIFTED AS MUCH AS IS NECESSARY.[13]

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: [It was sifted] through a fine sieve and then a coarse one, and again through a fine sieve and then a coarse one.[14] R. Simeon son of Eleazar says, There were thirteen sieves in the Temple, one on top of the other;[15] the uppermost retained the bran and the nethermost retained the fine flour.

R. SIMEON SAYS, THERE WAS NO PRESCRIBED NUMBER FOR THEM. Our Rabbis taught: Fine flour and bake it:[12] this teaches that fine flour was to be taken.[16] And how do we know that even grains of wheat may be brought?[17] The text therefore states and thou shalt take', in any manner. I might think that this is so even in regard to all other meal-offerings;[18] therefore the text states, 'It'. This is so here, having regard to sparing [expense]. What is meant by having regard to sparing'? — Said R. Eleazar, The Torah wished to spare Israel unnecessary expense.[19] Where is this indicated? For it is written, And thou shalt give the congregation and their cattle drink.[20] CHAPTER VIII

MISHNAH. THE THANK-OFFERING REQUIRED FIVE SE'AHS [OF FLOUR], JERUSALEM MEASURE, WHICH ARE SIX SE'AHS WILDERNESS MEASURE;[21] THIS BEING EQUIVALENT TO TWO EPHAHS (FOR AN EPHAH IS THREE SE'AHS) OR TO TWENTY TENTHS [OF AN EPHAH], TEN FOR THE LEAVENED CAKES AND TEN FOR THE UNLEAVENED.[22]

---

(1) Samuel, in whose name R. Tobi b. Kisna reported the statement, accepts the view of the first Tanna in the following Baraitha.

(2) Instead of ten cakes.

(3) Lev. II, 4. The word **מצת**, being written defectively, i.e., without the waw, is interpreted as though it were in the singular.

(4) Lev. VII, 12. The word **מצות** is written plene and is obviously in the plural.

(5) In order to obtain one tenth of an ephah of the finest flour one whole ephah (three se'ahs equal one ephah) of barley was reaped, which was ground, sifted and resifted until reduced to a tenth. V. supra 63b.

(6) For there is more offal and bran in fresh corn than in dry, and so too there is more refuse in barley than in wheat.
(7) I.e., the prescribed number of tenths for the meal-offering which accompanied the animal offerings (three tenths for a bullock etc.) was increased or reduced (so Rashi MS. and Tosaf.). Another explanation is: the tenth measure was filled to overflowing, or it was not quite full.
(8) Out of which the 'Omer, or the Two Loaves, or the Shewbread was taken.
(9) For Scripture only prescribes the quantity of flour to be offered but not the quantity of grain out of which the measure of flour was to be obtained.
(10) I.e., the flour for the 'Omer-offering.
(11) Adopting the reading לא היה להן קצבה, R. Simeon clearly refers to all that has been stated previously in this and in the preceding Mishnah; accordingly it was not essential to sift the flour in a prescribed number of sieves, or to take it out of a prescribed number of se'ahs, so long as fine flour was obtained (Bartinoro). In the separate editions of the Mishnah the reading is לא היה לה קצבה ; accordingly R. Simeon refers only to the number of siftings prescribed for the Shewbread (Rashi MS.).
(12) Lev. XXIV, 5.
(13) But it is immaterial through how many sieves the flour had passed.
(14) A coarse sieve (i.e., which has a netting of large meshes), when sifting the ground grain, lets through the flour and retains the bran, whilst a fine sieve retains the flour and lets through the fine dust only. Here the grain was sifted thirteen times, the first time in a fine sieve and the second time in a coarse one. The third time it was sifted again in the same fine sieve as before and the fourth time in the same coarse sieve as before; thus only two sieves were in use (R. Gershom and Rashi). According to Rashi MS. and Tosaf., thirteen sieves were used of various sizes, the last being the finest of all. On this interpretation the statement of R. Simeon son of R. Eleazar which follows merely elucidates the view of the first Tanna.
(15) The sieve below being of finer texture and of smaller meshes than the one above it.
(16) I.e., finely sifted flour was to be bought in the market for the purpose.
(17) And ground and sifted in the Temple.
(18) That they may buy wheat and grind it and sift it in the Temple. In this way much expense would be saved.
(19) V. Sifra on Lev. XIV, 36. As the Shewbread was a regular weekly offering it was permitted to buy wheat and have it prepared in the Temple so as to save expense.
(20) Num. XX, 8. The miracle of providing water for the Israelites in the wilderness was performed also out of consideration for the saving of the cattle. This last passage, 'Where is this indicated... is omitted in all MSS.
(21) The measures which were used by the Israelites in the wilderness were later on, after the settlement in the Land of Israel, enlarged, so that the measure which was originally equal to six se'ahs was later regarded as being equal to five. In other words, each se'ah was increased by one fifth, which in Rabbinic parlance is called 'a sixth from the outside'.
(22) Forty cakes were required for the thank-offering, ten leavened and thirty unleavened. The latter consisted of three kinds, ten cakes of each kind.

'TEN FOR THE LEAVENED CAKES', ONE TENTH FOR EACH CAKE; 'AND TEN FOR THE UNLEAVENED. OF UNLEAVENED CAKES THERE WERE THREE KINDS: CAKES, WAFERS, AND SOAKED CAKES,[1] THUS THERE WERE THREE AND A THIRD TENTHS OF FLOUR FOR EACH KIND, THREE CAKES TO EVERY TENTH. BY JERUSALEM MEASURE THEY WERE THIRTY KABS,[2] FIFTEEN FOR THE LEAVENED CAKES AND FIFTEEN FOR THE UNLEAVENED. 'FIFTEEN FOR THE LEAVENED CAKES', ONE KAB AND A HALF FOR EACH CAKE; 'AND FIFTEEN FOR THE UNLEAVENED'. OF THE UNLEAVENED CAKES THERE WERE THREE KINDS: CAKES, WAFERS, AND SOAKED CAKES, THUS THERE WERE FIVE KABS FOR EACH KIND, TWO CAKES TO EVERY KAB.

GEMARA. THE THANK-OFFERING REQUIRED FIVE SE'AHS [OF FLOUR]. JERUSALEM MEASURE etc. Whence do we know this?[3] — R. Hisda said, From the verse, The ephah and the bath shall be of one measure;[4] as the bath is three se'ahs so the ephah is three se'ahs. But whence do we know this of the bath? Shall we say, because it is written, That the bath may contain the tenth part of a homer?[5] Then the same is said of the ephah too, And the ephah the tenth part of a homer![6] But [you will say that the latter verse proves nothing as] we do not know how much the homer is, then the same applies to the former verse, since we do not know how much the homer is! — Rather it is derived from the following verse: And the set portion of oil, of the bath of oil, shall be the tenth part of a bath out of the cor, which is ten baths, even a homer; for ten baths are a homer.[7]

Samuel said,[8] They may not increase the measures[9] by more than a sixth, neither the coins by more than a sixth, and the profits [on necessary foods] must not exceed a sixth.[10] What is the reason [for his first statement]? If it be said that the market prices will rise [above due proportions on that account].[11] then [for the same reason] it should not [be permitted to increase] even by a sixth! And if it be said that it is so on the score of overreaching, so that the transaction be not annulled,[12] but surely Raba said, On account of any fraud in measure, weight or number, even though it is less than the standard of overreaching, one can retract.[13] And if it be said [that the reason why no more than a sixth may be added to weights is] that the dealer may not incur any loss,[14] [it will be retorted]. Is [then the whole purpose of the law that] he be guarded against loss? Is he not entitled to make any profit? 'Buy and sell [at no profit] merely to be called a merchant!' — Rather, said R. Hisda, Samuel found a Scriptural text and expounded it: And the shekel shall be twenty gerahs; twenty shekels, five and twenty shekels, ten and five shekels shall be your maneh.[15] Was then the maneh two hundred and forty denars?[16] But three things are to be inferred from this: it is to be inferred that the Temple maneh was doubled;[17] it is to be inferred that they may increase the measures[18] but that they may not increase them by more than a sixth; and it is to be inferred that the sixth is added 'from the outside'.[19] Rabina said, This[20] may be proved from our Mishnah which states: THE THANK-OFFERING REQUIRED FIVE SE'AHS [OF FLOUR], JERUSALEM MEASURE, WHICH ARE SIX SE'AHS WILDERNESS MEASURE.[21] This obviously proves it.

---

(1) Cf. Lev. VII, 12.

(2) I.e., the five se'ahs were equivalent to thirty kabs, for six kabs equal one se'ah.

(3) That an ephah is three se'ahs.

(4) Ezek. XLV, 11.

(5) Ibid. The homer is thirty se'ahs.

(6) Ibid. Hence there is no need to infer the ephah from the bath.

(7) Ibid. 14. The cor was known to be thirty se'ahs, thus this verse informs us that the bath was a tenth part of the cor, i.e., three se'ahs; and the ephah and the bath were of one measure (ibid. 11).

(8) V. B.B. 90a.

(9) Even though all the townspeople have agreed to the change.

(10) Lit., 'he who profits must not profit more than a sixth'.

(11) For merchants, learning of the increase in the weights and measures of this town, will immediately raise the prices of commodities, and taking advantage of this will raise them higher than what is warranted by the change in the measures.
(12) It is established that in any transaction if an error is made which is more than a sixth of the value of the goods the transaction is void; if it is exactly a sixth, the transaction stands but the amount of error must be returned; if less than a sixth the transaction is valid and there is no redress. V. B.M. 50b. Now if weights and measures may be increased by more than a sixth, then traders who were ignorant of the increase and who sell their goods in the present measures at the former prices would be defrauded by more than a sixth, with the effect that all their dealings would be declared void. In order to obviate this the increase in weights and measures was limited to a sixth.
(13) V. supra 69a and B.B. 90a. Since in such cases one can retract even when the error was less than one sixth, nothing is gained by limiting the increase to a sixth.
(14) A dealer is allowed to make a profit of one sixth on a transaction. By limiting the increase to a sixth a dealer who sells his goods ignorant of the increase will at most lose his profit but will not suffer any loss.
(15) Ezek. XLV, 12.
(16) The maneh according to Ezekiel was 20 + 25 + 15 shekels = 60 shekels = 240 denars (one shekel = 4 denars), whereas elsewhere throughout the Talmud it is established that the maneh was 25 shekels = 100 denars.
(17) I.e., consisting of 200 denars.
(18) And also the value of coins.
(19) So as to add a sixth 'from the outside' the original was divided into five parts, and another part of equal value, making a sixth one, was added to it. Thus the maneh consisted of 240 denars.
(20) That the sixth was added 'from the outside'.
(21) It is evident that the Jerusalem se'ah was made to equal one se'ah and a fifth of the wilderness se'ah, thus there was an increase of one fifth, which in Rabbinic parlance is 'one sixth from the outside'.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 77b

MISHNAH. FROM EACH KIND [THE PRIEST] TOOK ONE TENTH PART AS TERUMAH,[1] AS IT IS SAID, AND OF IT HE SHALL PRESENT ONE OUT OF EACH OFFERING AS TERUMAH UNTO THE LORD.[2] 'ONE': [MEANS] THAT HE MAY NOT TAKE WHAT IS BROKEN. 'OUT OF EACH OFFERING'-THAT EACH KIND OF OFFERING SHALL BE EQUAL,[3] [AND] THAT HE MUST NOT TAKE [THE TERUMAH] FROM THE ONE KIND OF OFFERING INSTEAD OF FROM ANOTHER.[4] IT SHALL BE THE PRIEST'S THAT SPRINKLETH THE BLOOD OF THE PEACE-OFFERINGS;[2] BUT THE REST WAS CONSUMED BY THE OWNER.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: 'And of it he shall present': — of all of them joined together.[5] One: — that he may not take what is broken. Out of each offering: — that each kind of offering shall be equal. [and] that he must not take [the terumah] from the one kind of offering instead of from another. 'As terumah unto the Lord': but I know not how much it [must be]. I can, however, infer it by the following argument: it is written here 'terumah', and it is written there in connection with the terumah of the tithe 'terumah';[6] as there it is one part in ten, so here it is one part in ten. Or perhaps argue this way: it is written here 'terumah', and it is written there in connection with the first-fruits 'terumah';[7] as there there is no fixed measure, so here there is no fixed measure. Let us then see to which of the two is this case most similar. We may infer the terumah which is not followed by any other offering from that terumah which is not followed by any other offering,[8] but let not the firstfruits enter the argument since they are followed by other offerings.[9] Or perhaps argue this way: we may infer the terumah which must be eaten in a holy place from that terumah which must also be eaten in a holy place,[10] but let not the terumah of the tithe enter into the argument seeing that it may be eaten in any place. The text therefore stated here, Of it... as terumah unto the Lord,[11] and also there in connection with the terumah of the tithe, Of it as the terumah of the Lord,[12] for the purpose of gezerah shawah.[13]

We have thus learnt that the terumah must be one part in ten, but I know not of what measure shall the [leavened] cakes be. I can, however, infer it by the following argument: it is written here bread',[14] and it is also written in connection with the Two Loaves 'bread';[15] as there there was one tenth [of an ephah] for each loaf, so here there must be one tenth for each cake. Or perhaps argue thus: it is written here 'bread', and also there in connection with the Shewbread it is written 'bread';[16] as there there were two tenths for each loaf, so here there must be two tenths for each cake. Let us then see to which of the two is this case most similar. We may infer a meal-offering which is leavened and offered with an animal-offering[17] from another meal-offering which is leavened and is offered with an animal-offering,[18] but let not the Shewbread enter into the argument seeing that it is neither leavened nor offered with an animal-offering. perhaps argue this way: we may infer a meal-offering[19] which may be offered either of the produce of the Land [of Israel] or of that grown outside it, from the new or the old produce, from that meal-offering[20] which also may be offered either of the produce of the Land or of that grown outside it, from the new or the old produce; but let not the Two

offering of the produce and it was followed by the 'Great Terumah' and the various tithes. Loaves enter into the argument seeing that it must be offered of the new produce and of that grown in the Land. The text therefore stated, Ye shall bring out of your dwellings two wave-loaves.[21] Now the text need not have stated 'Ye shall bring';[22] why did it state 'Ye shall bring'? [To teach that] every other offering that you make of a similar kind[23] shall be like this; as in this case there was one tenth [for each loaf]. so [in the other case] there must be one tenth [for each cake]. Should we not [rather say]. as in this case there were two tenths in all, so here there shall be two tenths in all?[24] The text therefore stated, They shall be.[25]

We have now learnt that ten [tenths] are required for the leavened [cakes], but whence do we know that ten [tenths] are required for the unleavened [cakes]? The text therefore stated, With cakes of leavened bread;[26] thus one must bring unleavened [cakes] in the same measure as the leavened [cakes] — It is thus established that there were twenty tenths for the cakes of the thank-offering, ten for the leavened [cakes] and ten for the unleavened. I might think that the ten [tenths] for the unleavened [cakes] were all of one kind [of cake]; the text therefore stated, If he offer it for a thanksgiving, then he shall offer with the sacrifice of thanksgiving unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil, and cakes mingled with oil of fine flour soaked.[27] Thus there were three and a third tenths for each kind, three cakes to every tenth; and thus there were forty cakes for the thank-offering. Four [cakes] were taken and given to the priest, and the rest was consumed by the owner.

The Master said, 'And of it he shall present, of all of them joined together'. Consider then the verse, And all the fat thereof shall he take off from it;[28] how can one apply here the ruling 'of all joined together'?[29] — [One must accept] the ruling of R. Hisda in the name of Abimi. For R. Hisda said in the name of Abimi, The flesh may not be cut up before the sacrificial portions have been taken off.[30]

The Master said, 'It is written here "terumah", and it is written there in connection with the terumah of the tithe "terumah".' Perhaps we should infer it from the terumah at Midian![31] — We may infer the terumah that is binding for all times from that terumah which is also binding for all times, and let not the terumah at Midian enter into the argument since it was not binding for all times. Perhaps we should infer it from the terumah stated in connection with the dough-offering![32] — A Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael taught: We may infer that matter in connection with which there is written, Of it... as terumah unto the Lord,[33] from that matter in connection with which there is also written, Of it as the terumah of the Lord;[34] hence the terumah of the dough-offering is excluded since there is not stated in connection therewith 'Of it as terumah unto the Lord'.

Raba raised this question: By [eating] the terumah of the cakes of the thank-offering does one incur the penalty of death [at the hands of heaven] or the liability of the added fifth or not?[35] Since it has been compared with the terumah of the tithe, then in this respect too it is like the terumah of the tithe; or perhaps the Divine Law has excluded [this terumah] by the expressions 'therein'[36] and 'the fifth part thereof'.[36] Does it render [other cakes into which it may fall] subject to the law of terumah[37] or not? — These questions remain undecided.

The Master said, The text therefore stated, 'They shall be'. How is this[38] intimated in the text?

---

(1) תרומה , here meaning a select portion, or gift.

(2) Lev. VII, 14.

(3) There must be an equal number of cakes, namely ten, of each kind.

(4) The priest shall not take two cakes from one kind and none from another.

(5) When the offering is about to be taken all the cakes must be together in one vessel.

(6) Num. XVIII, 26. The Levites were to offer a tenth part of the tithe which they had received from the people to the priest.

(7) Cf. Deut. XII, 17: 'And the terumah of thy hand', which expression, according to Rabbinic interpretation, refers to the first-fruits. There was no prescribed measure for the first-fruits, v. Pe'ah I, 1.

(8) The terumah from the cakes of the thank-offering and the terumah of the tithe given by the Levites were both final offerings.

(9) The offering of the first-fruits was the first

(10) The terumah of the cakes of the thank-offering and the offering of first-fruits must be eaten within the walls of Jerusalem.

(11) Lev. VII, 14.

(12) Num. XVIII, 26.

(13) V. GIos. As the offering from the tithe was one tenth so the terumah of the cakes must be one tenth.

(14) Lev. VII, 13.

(15) Ibid, XXIII, 17.

(16) Ibid. XXIV, 7.

(17) The cakes of the thank-offering are offered accompanying the animal-sacrifice and a part thereof is leavened.

(18) The Two Loaves are leavened and are offered with the two lambs on the Feast of Weeks.

(19) The cakes of the thank-offering.

(20) The Shewbread.

(21) Lev. XXIII, 17.

(22) For in the preceding verse (16) Scripture has already stated, Ye shall present a new meal-offering.

(23) I.e., when leavened cakes are offered; this includes the thank-offering.

(24) I.e., two tenths for the ten leavened cakes.

(25) Ibid. XXIII, 17. V. infra as to the derivation of the law from this expression.

(26) Ibid. VII, 13. In addition to, and in the same measure as, the unleavened cakes mentioned in the preceding verse (12) there must be leavened cakes.

(27) Ibid. 12.

(28) Ibid. IV, 19.

(29) For it is assumed that the flesh of the animal is already cut up before the fat is taken off. V., however, Tosaf. s.v. מאי

(30) Thus when the fat is taken off the animal is 'joined together'.

(31) That portion of the spoil which was given to Eleazar the priest after the battle with the Midianites is described as 'terumah', and consisted of a five hundredth part. Cf. Num. XXXI, 28, 29.

(32) Cf. Num. XV, 19. The portion to be given as dough-offering is, according to the Rabbis, one twenty-fourth.

(33) Lev. VII, 14, with reference to the cakes of the thank-offering.

(34) Num. XVIII, 26, with reference to the terumah of the tithe.

(35) If a non-priest deliberately ate terumah of produce (either the great terumah or the terumah of the tithe) he would incur the penalty of death at the hands of Heaven, and if inadvertently he would be liable to make restitution and add a

fifth to the repayment. The question raised is whether these rules apply to the cakes given to the priest as terumah from the thank-offering or not.

(36) Lev. XXII, 9 and 14 respectively. These expressions are used specifically

(37) And the entire mixture is forbidden to non-priests like the terumah of produce.

(38) That ten tenths are required for leavened cakes of the thank-offering.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 78a

— R. Isaac b. Abdimi said, Because it is written, They shall be.[1] Perhaps it means ten kapizas![2] — Raba answered, The verse speaks of tenths.

'We have now learnt that ten [tenths] are required for the leavened [cakes], but whence do we know that ten [tenths] are required for the unleavened [cakes]? The text therefore stated, With cakes of leavened bread; thus one must bring unleavened [cakes] in the same measure as the leavened [cakes]'. But may that which has itself been inferred by a hekkesh[3] become the basis for another inference to be made from it again by a hekkesh?[4] -[The original rule was derived] from itself and [from] something else,[5] and [any rule derived] from itself and [from] something

of the terumah of produce, and the suffix in each case excludes every other terumah. else is not regarded as a hekkesh.[6] This is well according to him who does not regard this as a hekkesh, but what can be said according to him who regards this as a hekkesh?[7] — The expression 'ye shall bring' is an amplifying text.[8]

MISHNAH. THE CONSECRATION [MEAL-OFFERING][9] CONSISTED OF [UNLEAVENED CAKES] LIKE THE UNLEAVENED CAKES OF THE THANK-OFFERING. NAMELY CAKES, WAFERS, AND SOAKED CAKES. THE NAZIRITE MEAL-OFFERING[10] CONSISTED OF TWO THIRDS OF THE UNLEAVENED CAKES OF THE THANK-OFFERING. NAMELY CAKES AND WAFERS. BUT NOT SOAKED CAKES; THUS THERE WERE TEN KABS[11] BY JERUSALEM MEASURE. WHICH ARE SIX TENTHS AND SOMETHING OVER.[12]

GEMARA. Whence is it derived?[13] — Said R. Hisda in the name of R. Hama b. Guria, It is written, And out of the basket of unleavened bread that was before the Lord, he took one unleavened cake, and one oil-cake, and one wafer.[14] Now 'cake' means cake, and 'wafer' means wafer; but what is meant by 'oil-cake'? Surely it means a cake soaked in oil. R. Awia demurred, perhaps it means a cake of oil![15] — Rather it is derived from the exposition of R. Nahman b. R. Hisda in the name of R. Tabla. [It is written,] This is the offering of Aaron and of his sons, which they shall offer unto the Lord in the day when he is anointed.[16] What do we learn in regard to 'his sons' from the offering 'when he is anointed'? It is that the offering at the initiation [of the ordinary priest] shall be like the offering at the anointing [of the High priest]; as at the anointing [of the High priest] there was an offering of soaked cakes,[17] so at the initiation [of the ordinary priest] there was an offering of soaked cakes.[18]

R. Hisda said, When the High Priest is inaugurated into the service he requires two tenths of an ephah for offerings, one on account of his anointing[19] and the other on account of his initiation.[19] Mar son of R. Ashi[20] said, He requires three [tenths]. But they do not in fact differ, for the former refers to the case where he had already been serving in the Temple as an ordinary priest, and the latter to the case where he had not served in the Temple as an ordinary priest.[21]

THE NAZIRITE MEAL-OFFERING CONSISTED OF TWO THIRDS OF THE UNLEAVENED CAKES OF THE THANK-OFFERING. Our Rabbis taught: 'His peace-offerings'[22] includes the peace-offering of the Nazirite, that it requires ten kabs [of flour], Jerusalem measure, and one quarter log of oil.[23] I might think that [it includes the Nazirite-offering] in regard to all that is mentioned in

the passage,[24] the text therefore stated, Unleavened.[25] How is this implied? — R. Papa answered, [It[26] includes for the Nazirite-offering] only those kinds which are specified by the term 'unleavened', thus excluding the soaked cakes which are not specified by the term 'unleavened'.[27] A Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael taught: 'A basket of unleavened bread'[28] is a general statement, 'cakes' and 'wafers' are particular instances; we thus have a general statement followed by the enumeration of particular instances, in which case the scope of the general statement is limited to the particulars specified; thus only cakes and wafers, but nothing else.

---

(1) Heb. תהיינה , written plene, with two 'yods'. The 'yod' has the numerical value of ten, thus intimating in this verse ten tenths; and as this measure cannot possibly refer to the Two Loaves, for it is expressly stated in this verse that the Two Loaves consist of two tenths, it can only refer to the leavened cakes of the thank-offering, which were contemplated by the superfluous expression at the beginning of the verse 'ye shall bring', v. supra p. 463. V. Tosaf. s.v. אמר for a variant text and a further interpretation.

(2) A measure of capacity equal to half a kab.

(3) The rule that the ten leavened cakes of the thank-offering shall consist of ten tenths, a tenth for every cake, was established by a comparison (hekkesh, היקש v. Glos.) with the Two Loaves, intimated in the verse by the expression 'ye shall bring'.

(4) Whereby it is sought to infer from the leavened cakes, by reason of the hekkesh implicit in vv. 12 and 13; that the unleavened cakes shall also consist of ten tenths. The rule is well established that in matters appertaining to sacrifice one may not draw an inference by a hekkesh from that which has itself been inferred by a hekkesh. V. Zeb. 49b.

(5) The original inference that the leavened cakes of the thank-offering shall consist of ten tenths, a tenth for every cake, was not entirely drawn from the case of the Two Loaves, inasmuch as the number of cakes, namely ten, is deemed to be expressly stated in connection with the leavened cakes of the thank-offering by virtue of the expression 'they shall be' (v. supra n. 3). Accordingly the leavened cakes supplied the rule that there must be ten cakes (i.e., derived 'from itself') and the Two Loaves supplied the rule that there must be a tenth for each cake (i.e., derived 'from something else'); the result obtained is therefore not regarded as one obtained entirely by a hekkesh.

(6) Consequently from such a hekkesh other matters can be inferred.

(7) V. Zeb. 57a and Yoma 57a.

(8) This expression stated in connection with the Two Loaves is, as has been said supra p. 463, superfluous there, and has been interpreted as applying to the leavened cakes of the thank-offering; and as in this verse the measure of a tenth per cake is clearly intimated, it is established without a hekkesh that there must be ten tenths for the leavened cakes. Accordingly a further inference, namely in respect of the unleavened cakes, may be drawn from this.

(9) Offered at the consecration of Aaron and his sons in the priesthood, v. Lev. VIII, 26.

(10) Cf. Num. VI, 15.

(11) Which is two thirds of the fifteen kabs required for the unleavened cakes of the thank-offering.

(12) The kab was equivalent to two thirds of a tenth, accordingly ten kabs equalled six and two thirds tenths.

(13) That the consecration meal-offering consisted also of cakes soaked in oil.

(14) Lev. VIII, 26.

(15) I.e., a cake of congealed oil. The meaning and etymology of this word אנתא are both doubtful.

(16) Lev. VI, 13. This verse clearly points to some connection between the offering of 'his sons', i.e., the meal-offering brought by ordinary priests at their initiation into service, and that of Aaron 'when he is anointed' and which was offered daily by the High Priest.

(17) This is expressly stated, ibid. 14.

(18) And the consecration offering is identical with the initiation offering of the priests.

(19) As High Priest.

(20) In MS.M., Tosaf., and Sh. Mek.: Mar. b. Hiyya.

(21) In this case three offerings were necessary: one by reason of his initiation into the priestly service, the second by reason of his initiation into service as the High Priest, and the third by reason of his anointing as High Priest.

(22) Lev. VII, 15, stated in connection with the thank-offering.

(23) Since the Nazirite-offering consisted of two kinds of unleavened cakes only, it required the same quantity of flour used for these two kinds in the thank-offering, namely ten kabs, and the same quantity of oil used for these two kinds, namely one quarter log.

(24) That the Nazirite-offering should have also cakes soaked in oil.
(25) Num. VI, 15, in connection with the Nazirite-offering. This term implies the exclusion of soaked cakes.
(26) The expression 'his peace-offerings'.
(27) This term describes the cakes and the wafers prescribed for the thank-offering, Lev. VII, 12; accordingly the unleavened cakes spoken of in the Nazirite-offering signify these same cakes.
(28) Num. VI, 15.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 78b

MISHNAH. IF A MAN SLAUGHTERED THE THANK-OFFERING WITHIN [THE TEMPLE COURT] AND THE BREAD THEREOF WAS OUTSIDE THE WALL [AT THE TIME]. THE BREAD IS NOT HALLOWED. IF HE SLAUGHTERED IT BEFORE [THE LOAVES] HAD BECOME CRUSTED IN THE OVEN, OR EVEN IF ALL EXCEPT ONE HAD BECOME CRUSTED, THE BREAD IS NOT HALLOWED.

GEMARA. What does 'OUTSIDE THE WALL' mean? — R. Johanan says, Outside the wall of Beth Page;[1] but Resh Lakish says, Outside the wall of the Temple court. 'Resh Lakish says. Outside the wall of the Temple court',for we must interpret 'al in the sense of 'near to'.[2] 'R. Johanan says, Outside the wall of Beth page', but [if it was] outside the wall of the Temple court it would be hallowed, for we need not interpret 'al in the sense of 'near to'.

But have they not differed in this matter once already? For we have learnt:[3] If a man slaughters the Passover-offering with leaven In his possession, he transgresses a negative command.[4] R. Judah says. Also [if he so slaughters] the daily offering.[5] Whereupon Resh Lakish said, He is never culpable unless the leaven belongs to him who slaughters or to him who sprinkles the blood or to any one of the members of the company,[6] and it is also with him in the Temple court;[7] but R. Johanan said, Even if it is not with him in the Temple court! — Both disputes are necessary. For if it were stated only there [in connection with the Passover-offering, I would say that] only there does R. Johanan [hold him culpable even though the leaven was not with him], for wherever it happens to be it is a prohibited matter,[8] but as regards the hallowing of the bread I would say that he concurs with Resh Lakish, that if it is within the Temple court it is hallowed, but if outside it is not hallowed. And if it were stated only here I would say that only here does Resh Lakish [insist that the bread in order to be hallowed must be within the Temple court], but there I would say that he concurs with R. Johanan [that he is culpable even though the leaven is not with him]. Hence both disputes are necessary.

There has been taught [a Baraitha] in accord with R. Johanan's view. If a man slaughtered the thank-offering within [the Temple court] and the bread thereof was outside the wall of Beth Page [at the time], the bread is not hallowed.

IF HE SLAUGHTERED IT BEFORE [THE LOAVES] HAD BECOME CRUSTED IN THE OVEN [...THE BREAD IS NOT HALLOWED]. Whence is this derived? — From the following which our Rabbis taught: With cakes of leavened bread he shall present:[9] this teaches that the bread is hallowed only if [the loaves] had become crusted in the oven[10] [before the slaughtering of the sacrifice]. 'He shall present his offering with the slaughtering':[11] this teaches that the bread is hallowed only by the slaughtering of the sacrifice.' The slaughtering of the thank-offering':[11] this teaches that if he slaughtered [the thank-offering] under the name of another offering, the bread is not hallowed.

Our Rabbis taught:[12] One fulfils one's obligation [on the Passover] with unleavened bread partially baked, and with unleavened bread prepared in a stewing pot. What is meant by 'unleavened bread partially baked'? — Rab Judah explained in the name of Samuel, It is [any unleavened bread

which] when broken has no threads dragging from it.

Raba said, And the same rule applies to the loaves of the thank-offering.[13] Surely this is obvious, for here the expression 'bread' is used and there too the expression 'bread' is used![14] — You might think that since the Divine Law stated, One,[15] intimating that he may not take what is broken, such[16] is regarded as broken;[17] he therefore teaches us [that it is not so].

It was stated:[18] If the thank-offering was slaughtered accompanied by eighty loaves,[19] Hezekiah ruled, Forty out of the eighty are hallowed;[20] and R. Johanan ruled, Not even forty out of the eighty are hallowed.[21] Said R. Zera, All agree that if he declared, 'Let forty out of the eighty be hallowed', they are hallowed; like- wise If he declared, 'The forty shall not be hallowed unless all the eighty are hallowed', they are not hallowed; they differ only where no specific statement was made: one Master[22] is of the opinion that his intention[23] was to ensure the prescribed number,[24] while the other Master[25] holds the view that his intention was to provide a large offering.[26]

Abaye said,[27] They differ as to whether vessels of ministry hallow in the absence of the [owner's] intention;[28] one Master is of the opinion that vessels of ministry hallow even in the absence of the [owner's] intention,[29] while the other Master holds the view that vessels of ministry do not hallow in the absence of the [owner's] intention.[30]

R.Papa said, All agree that vessels of ministry hallow in the absence of the [owner's] intention, but they differ only as to the knife; one Master[31] is of the opinion that the knife hallows just as any vessel of ministry, while the other Master[32] holds the view that it does not hallow like any other vessel of ministry, since it has no receptacle.

Others quote [R. Papa] in this form: R. Papa said, All agree that vessels of ministry only hallow with the [owner's] intention, but they differ as to the knife; one Master[31] holds that the knife is more efficacious than any other vessel of ministry, seeing that it hallows even though it has no receptacle;[33] whilst the other Master[32] holds that the knife is no more efficacious than any other vessel of ministry.

MISHNAH. IF HE SLAUGHTERED THE THANK-OFFERING [INTENDING TO EAT THEREOF] OUTSIDE ITS PROPER TIME[34] OR OUTSIDE ITS PROPER PLACE,[35] THE BREAD IS [NEVERTHELESS] HALLOWED.[36] IF HE SLAUGHTERED IT AND IT WAS FOUND TO BE TREFAH, THE BREAD IS NOT HALLOWED.[37] IF HE SLAUGHTERED IT AND IT WAS FOUND TO HAVE A BLEMISH, R. ELIEZER SAYS, THE BREAD IS [NEVERTHELESS] HALLOWED. BUT THE SAGES SAY, IT IS NOT HALLOWED. IF HE SLAUGHTERED IT UNDER ANOTHER NAME, AND SO, TOO, IF THE RAM OF THE CONSECRATION-OFFERING OR THE TWO LAMBS OFFERED AT PENTECOST WERE SLAUGHTERED UNDER ANOTHER NAME, THE BREAD IS NOT HALLOWED.

GEMARA. In accordance with whose view is the ruling in our Mishnah?-It is in accordance with the view of R. Meir; for it was taught: This is the general rule: If the disqualifying defect befell [the thank-offering] before the slaughtering, the bread is not hallowed; (if after the slaughtering, the bread is hallowed).[38] Thus if he slaughtered it [intending to eat thereof] outside its proper time or outside its proper place, the bread is hallowed; if he slaughtered it and it was found to be trefah, the bread is not hallowed.

---

(1) A fortified suburb of Jerusalem (Jast.). It formed the boundary of the city, hence 'outside the walls of Beth Page' is identical with outside Jerusalem. V. Neubauer, Geog. 147-149. Maim. in his Com. on this Mishnah gives the interesting reading בית בגי, explaining it as the place close to the Temple mount where the meal-offerings were prepared and baked. He thus connects this word with בג , Dan. I, 5, meaning food.

(2) The expression עַל ‘al in the verse, With (‘al) cakes of leavened bread he shall present his offering (Lev. VII, 13) implies that the cakes must be near the sacrifices, i.e., with it in the Temple court.
(3) Pes. 63b.
(4) The prohibition is: Thou shalt not slaughter the blood of My sacrifice’ with (‘al) leavened bread (Ex. XXIII, 18 and XXXIV, 25).
(5) I.e., he slaughters the evening daily offering of the fourteenth of Nisan whilst having leaven in his possession. This is also prohibited, according to R. Judah, as being implied in the expression ‘My sacrifice’. V. Prec. n.
(6) Registered for this sacrifice.
(7) Resh Lakish holding that the term ‘al in the verse quoted (v. n. 3) must be taken in the sense of ‘near to’.
(8) Once the time for the removal of leaven has gone by.
(9) Lev. VII, 13. The additional words ‘his offering with the slaughtering’ are deleted by Sh. Mek. as anticipating the next interpretation; they are omitted by Rashi.
(10) For only then are the loaves regarded as לֶחֶם ‘bread’.
(11) Ibid.
(12) Pes. 37a.
(13) I.e., the loaves must already be baked as much as this in order to be hallowed by the slaughtering of the thank-offering.
(14) Cf. Lev. VII, 13 and Deut. XVI, 3. And surely what is regarded as bread for the Passover is regarded as bread for the thank-offering.
(15) Lev. VII, 14: And he shall present one out of each offering. V. supra p. 461.
(16) I.e., what is partially baked.
(17) Since it would fall to pieces when handled, and therefore is not regarded as sufficiently baked for the purposes of the thank-offering.
(18) Supra. 48a, ‘Er. 50a, Kid. 51a.
(19) Instead of the prescribed forty.
(20) All the eighty loaves, however, must be eaten in conditions of sanctity since is it not known which are the forty hallowed loaves.
(21) And the offerer has not thereby fulfilled his obligation.
(22) Hezekiah.
(23) In bringing eighty loaves.
(24) If for some reason it should happen that as many as forty loaves become unfit or are lost, the remaining loaves should replace them. At no time, however, was it ever intended that more than forty loaves should be offered with the thank-offering.
(25) R. Johanan.
(26) But this is not permissible, hence none of the loaves are hallowed.
(27) The text is somewhat uncertain and the reading adopted is that of Rashi and Sh. Mek. and of many MSS. Cur edd. add at the beginning of Abaye's words: ‘All agree that his intention was to provide a large offering’. Var. lec. to ensure the prescribed number’.
(28) The knife used for slaughtering the thank-offering is the vessel of ministry that hallows the loaves; but in this case as there are more than the prescribed number of loaves and there is no specific statement by the owner as to his intention, the question is whether the knife automatically hallows forty out of the eighty loaves or not.
(29) Hence forty loaves are hallowed; so Hezekiah.
(30) This is the view of R. Johanan. If it is assumed for the argument. as it is indeed stated in some texts (v. supra n. 9), that all hold that the owner's intention was to provide a large offering, then the expression שלא מדעת should be rendered ‘against the owner's intention’ and not ‘in the absence of the owner's intention.
(31) Hezekiah.
(32) R. Johanan.
(33) Accordingly it will also hallow even in the absence of the owner's intention.
(34) In this case the offering is piggul (‘rejected’, ‘abhorred’), and whosoever eats thereof incurs the penalty of kareth (v. Glos.).
(35) In this case the offering is invalid, and whosoever eats thereof incurs stripes but not the penalty of kareth.
(36) In accordance with the principle that if the offering first became invalid in the Temple at the time of the slaughtering

the bread is hallowed. V. Gemara, and Zeb. 84a.

(37) For this defect obviously befell it before the slaughtering, in fact, before it was brought in the Temple.

(38) This is omitted in all the MSS., and is not found in Tosef. Men. VIII, whence this Baraitha is taken. The statement is in fact misleading for what it really means to imply is that if the disqualifying defect did not befall it before the slaughtering the bread is hallowed.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 79a

If he slaughtered it and it was found to have a blemish, R. Eliezer says, The bread is hallowed; but R. Joshua says, It is not hallowed. So R. Meir. R. Judah said, R. Eliezer and R. Joshua do not dispute the ruling[1] that [if at the slaughtering there was an intention of eating thereof] outside its proper time the bread is hallowed,[2] or that if it was found to have a blemish the bread is not hallowed.[3] They differ only where [there was an intention of eating thereof] outside its proper place; in this case R. Eliezer says, The bread is hallowed; and R. Joshua says, It is not hallowed. R. Eliezer argued, Since [the intention to eat of the offering] outside the proper time is a disqualifying defect, and [the intention to eat thereof] outside the proper place is also a disqualifying defect: as in the former case the bread is nevertheless hallowed, so in the latter case. too, the bread is hallowed. R. Joshua argued, Since [the intention to eat of the offering] outside its proper place is a disqualifying defect, and a blemish in the animal is also a disqualifying defect: as in the latter case the bread is not hallowed, so in the former, too, it is not hallowed. R. Eliezer replied. I likened it to [the case where there was an intention to eat thereof] outside its proper time, but you likened it to the case of a blemish in the animal. Let us then see to which [of the two] is it more similar. If it is more similar to [the case where there was an intention to eat thereof] outside its proper time then we must infer it from this, and if it is more similar to the case of the blemish in the animal then we must infer it from this. And so R. Eliezer began to argue as follows: We may infer that which is a defect by reason of the intention from that which is also a defect by reason of the intention, but we may not infer that which is a defect by reason of the intention from that which is a defect by reason of a physical blemish. Thereupon R. Joshua began to argue as follows: We may infer a defect which does not involve the penalty of kareth from a defect which also does not involve the penalty of kareth,[4] and let not [the intention to eat of the offering] outside its proper time enter into the argument since it is a defect which involves the penalty of kareth. Moreover, we should infer it from [the slaughtering of the offering] under another name,[5] for this is a defect by reason of the intention and also does not involve the penalty of kareth. At this R. Eliezer was silent.[6]

Why is it, according to R. Meir's view, that where [the thank-offering] was slaughtered and was found to be trefah [the bread is not hallowed, for] the defect is regarded as having befallen it before the slaughtering, and that where it was slaughtered and was found to have a blemish [the bread is, according to the ruling of R. Eliezer, hallowed. for] the defect is not regarded as having befallen it before the slaughtering? — [It refers only to such blemishes as] a film over the eye.[7] and it agrees with R. Akiba who said that [in such cases] if they were brought up [on the altar] they must not be taken down. And the other?[8] — He will reply, It is only when [the blemish] affects the validity of [the animal] itself [as a sacrifice] that R. Akiba says that if they were brought up they must not be taken down, but he does not say so where it affects the hallowing of the bread.

It was stated: If a sin-offering was slaughtered [with the intention of performing a service or of eating thereof] outside its proper time and it was brought up [on the altar], it must not be taken down. If [it was slaughtered with the intention of performing a service or of eating thereof] outside its proper place and it was taken up, Rabbah[9] said, It must be taken down; but Raba[9] said, It must not be taken down. Rabbah evidently agrees with R. Joshua[10] and Raba with R. Eliezer;[11] but Raba retracted in favour of Rabbah's view seeing that R. Eliezer retracted in favour of R. Joshua's view. There are some, however, who say that although R. Eliezer retracted in favour of R. Joshua's view Raba did not retract in favour of Rabbah's view; for there [R. Joshua] convinced [R. Eliezer] by his

argument: We should infer it from [the slaughtering of the offering] under another name; here, however, if we derive it from [the slaughtering of the offering] under another name, [we obtain the ruling that] if it was brought up it must not be taken down.[12]

IF HE SLAUGHTERED IT UNDER ANOTHER NAME, etc, R. Papa said, Our Tanna omits the ram of the Nazirite-offering which is frequent and deals with the ram of the Consecration-offering![13] And our Tanna? — He deals with the very first offering.[14]

MISHNAH. IF THE DRINK-OFFERINGS[15] HAD ALREADY BEEN HALLOWED IN A VESSEL WHEN THE ANIMAL-OFFERING WAS FOUND TO BE INVALID, IF THERE IS ANOTHER ANIMAL-OFFERING,[16] THEY MAY BE OFFERED WITH IT; BUT IF NOT, THEY ARE LEFT TO BECOME INVALID BY REMAINING OVERNIGHT.[17]

GEMARA. Ze'iri said, The drink-offerings are hallowed[18] only by the slaughtering of the animal-offering. Why is this? Because the verse says, Animal-offerings and drink-offerings.[19]

We have learnt: IF THE DRINK-OFFERINGS HAD ALREADY BEEN HALLOWED IN A VESSEL WHEN THE ANIMAL-OFFERING WAS FOUND TO BE INVALID, IF THERE IS ANOTHER ANIMAL-OFFERING, THEY MAY BE OFFERED WITH IT; BUT IF NOT, THEY ARE LEFT TO BECOME INVALID BY REMAINING OVERNIGHT, Now presumably it became invalid in the act of slaughtering?[20] — No, it became invalid in the act of sprinkling.[21] With whom [would this agree]?[22] [Shall I say only] with Rabbi, who ruled that where there are two acts[23] which [jointly] render the offering permissible, one can promote [to sanctity] even without the other? — You may even say that it agrees with R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon,[24] for we are dealing here with the case where the blood had been received in a bowl and was spilt.

---

(1) Cur. edd. insert here: ‘that if he slaughtered it and it was found to be trefah the bread is not hallowed’. It is not found in the MSS. or in Tosefta Men. VIII. It is deleted here by Sh. Mek.

(2) For this is a case of piggul, and with piggul it is essential that the remaining services be regarded as validly performed, otherwise the penalty of piggul would not be incurred. Accordingly the bread is undoubtedly hallowed by the slaughtering.

(3) For the disqualifying defect must have befallen it before it came into the Temple.

(4) The offering of an animal with a physical blemish does not involve the penalty of kareth.

(5) In which case it is expressly stated in our Mishnah that the bread is not hallowed.

(6) I.e., he recognized in this last statement a convincing argument, and eventually acquiesced in R. Joshua's view that where there was an intention expressed at the slaughtering of the offering of eating thereof outside its proper place the bread is not hallowed.

(7) Or, ‘a cataract’. As this is but a minor defect, since it is not noticeable nor is it regarded as a defect in birds, it is accepted by the altar; consequently it is regarded as having befallen the offering in the Temple and the bread is therefore hallowed.

(8) So MS.M., Rashi MS. and Sh. Mek. The question is against R. Judah in his report of R. Eliezer's view, that where the animal is found after the slaughtering to have a blemish the bread is not hallowed. Why should not the bread be hallowed seeing that we are speaking of a minor blemish? In some texts the reading is ‘And R. Judah?’ and in others ‘and R. Joshua?’.

(9) So MS.M., Rashi MS. and Sh. Mek. Cur. edd. transpose ‘Rabbah’ and ‘Raba’ in the entire passage.

(10) Who in a similar case in connection with the thank-offering ruled that the bread was not hallowed, for he compared the slaughtering of an offering at which there was the intention of eating thereof outside its proper place with the offering of a blemished animal, and in the latter case even if it was brought up it must be taken down.

(11) Who considered the slaughtering at which there was the intention of eating thereof outside its proper place on the same footing as where there was the intention of eating thereof outside its proper time, and in the latter case all agree that if brought up it must not be taken down.

(12) For it is admitted by all that if a sin-offering was offered under another name and it was brought up upon the altar it

must not be taken down again. V. Zeb. 84a.

(13) Which was only offered at the consecration of the Tabernacle in the wilderness. This is most strange on the part of the Tanna.

(14) The consecration-offering was the first offering that was accompanied by a bread-offering. The law, however, applies also to the ram of the Nazirite-offering. Aliter: the Tanna only mentions offerings of the community but not individual offerings.

(15) These include the wine as well as the meal-offerings which accompanied certain animal-offerings; v. Num. XV, 4ff.

(16) Which was slaughtered on this day too, but which had not been provided with the drink-offerings.

(17) Since they have been hallowed in a vessel of ministry. A variant reading is: ואם לנו יפסלו בלינה, 'if they remained overnight, they are, by being kept overnight. rendered invalid'.

(18) And therefore become invalid if kept overnight or if taken outside the Sanctuary (Rashi MS.). Tosaf and Rashi (in cur. edd.) explain 'hallowed' to mean that they may not now be used for another offering.

(19) Lev. XXIII, 37. The drink-offerings are thus dependent upon and are hallowed by the animal-offering.

(20) Nevertheless the drink-offerings are hallowed, for the Mishnah states that in the absence of another animal-offering they must be kept overnight to be rendered invalid. Now since in this case the slaughtering of the animal-offering was invalid it obviously could not have hallowed the drink-offerings, but they must have been hallowed before the slaughtering, thus contrary to Ze'iri.

(21) And the drink-offerings were hallowed by the slaughtering.

(22) Viz., the view expressed that the slaughtering alone hallows the drink-offerings.

(23) Here the slaughtering and the sprinkling.

(24) Who maintains that both acts are essential for the hallowing of the drink-offerings;

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 79b

and R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon holds the same view as his father, who maintained that what was ready for sprinkling is regarded as sprinkled.[1]

The Master stated: 'IF THERE IS ANOTHER ANIMAL-OFFERING, THEY MAY BE OFFERED WITH IT'. But has not R. Hisda ruled that oil which had been set apart for one meal-offering is invalid for another meal-offering? — R. Jannai answered, The Beth din make a mental stipulation about [the drink-offerings][2] that if they are required, they are required [and utilized for that offering]; but if not, they shall be utilized for another offering. If so, this should apply to oil too! — Oil is part of the meal-offering.[3] Should they not stipulate that they shall be non-holy?[4] — [No,] for it is to be feared that people will say that one may take out what has already been in a vessel of ministry for secular use.[5] But even now it is to be feared, is it not, that people might think that drink-offerings set apart for one offering may be used for another offering?[5] — Behold Mattitiah b. Judah taught [that the ruling of our Mishnah applies only] where the other animal-offering[6] had been slaughtered at the same time.[7] Then what would be the law where the other animal-offering had not been slaughtered at the same time? They [the drink-offerings] would be left to become invalid by remaining overnight, would they not? Then instead of teaching the final clause, BUT IF NOT, THEY ARE LEFT TO BECOME INVALID BY REMAINING OVERNIGHT, [the Tanna] could have drawn a distinction in that [first clause] thus: That is so[8] only where the other animal-offering had been slaughtered at the same time, but not where the other animal-offering had not been slaughtered at the same time! — That is just what [the Tanna] meant to say, That is so only where the other animal-offering had been slaughtered at the same time, but where the other animal-offering had not been slaughtered at the same time, [the drink-offerings] are invalid for they are regarded as though they had remained overnight.

But does R. Simeon[9] hold that the mental stipulation of the Beth din is effective? Behold R. Idi b. Abin stated in the name of R. Amram who cited R. Isaac who cited R. Johanan, The daily offerings which are not required for the community[10] are, according to R. Simeon, not redeemed unblemished;[11] but according to the Sages they are redeemed unblemished![12] — In that case it is

different for there is the remedy of putting them to pasture.[13]

MISHNAH. THE YOUNG OF A THANK-OFFERING;[14] ITS SUBSTITUTE,[15] AND THE ANIMAL WHICH WAS SET APART IN THE PLACE OF THE THANK-OFFERING WHICH WAS SET APART AND WAS LOST,[16] DO NOT REQUIRE THE BREAD-OFFERING; FOR IT IS WRITTEN, AND HE SHALL OFFER WITH THE SACRIFICE OF THANK-OFFERING;[17] THE THANK-OFFERING REQUIRES THE BREAD-OFFERING, BUT ITS YOUNG, WHAT IS BROUGHT IN ITS PLACE, AND ITS SUBSTITUTE, DO NOT REQUIRE THE BREAD-OFFERING.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: Why was It necessary for Scripture to say, He offers [it] for a thank-offering?[18] Whence is it derived that if a man had set apart a beast for a thank-offering and it was lost and he set apart another in its place, and then the first was found so that now both beasts are standing before him — whence [it is asked] is it derived that he may offer whichever of them he pleases and with it the bread-offering? Because the text states, He offers... for a thank-offering.[19] I might think that the other animal also requires the bread-offering; therefore the text says, He offers it,[19] implying one only[20] but not two. Thus the text has qualified it after including it.[21] Whence do I know that the young [of the thank-offering]. what was brought in its place, and its substitute, are also included that they too must be offered [as thank-offerings]? Because the text states, If... for a thank-offering.[22] I might think that they also require the bread- offerings; the text therefore says, Then he shall offer with the thank-offering; the thank-offering alone requires the bread-offering, but its young, what was brought in its place,[23] and its substitute, do not require the bread-offering.

R. Hanina sent the following ruling in the name of R. Johanan, This is so[24] only [if it is offered] after the atonement;[25] but if before the atonement, it also needs the bread-offering.[26] Now R. Amram pondered over this. To what [does the above ruling refer]? Shall I say to the case of the animal that was brought in the place of an obligatory thank-offering?[27] But we have already learnt it regarding the case [where it was offered] before the atonement, and also regarding the case [where it was offered] after the atonement![28]

---

(1) Accordingly the moment that the blood had been received in a bowl in readiness for the sprinkling the drink-offerings become hallowed.

(2) This relates, of course, only to communal offerings. By ‘Beth din’ is meant here the Temple authorities, the priests.

(3) For the oil is mingled with the flour and becomes one with the meal-offering; hence, even before mingling, the oil is so closely related to the meal-offering that if the latter is for some reason invalid the oil cannot be used for any other offering.

(4) I.e., in the event of the drink-offerings not being utilized for the animal-offering they shall be permitted for secular use. Wherefore does our Mishnah state: BUT IF NOT, THEY ARE LEFT TO BECOME INVALID?

(5) For people will not be aware of the mental reservation of the Beth din.

(6) For which these drink-offerings are to be used.

(7) In this case people would assume that the drink-offerings had originally been intended for the other animal-offering.

(8) That the drink-offerings may be used for another animal-offering.

(9) For it had been said supra that our Mishnah was in agreement with R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon who adopted his father's view.

(10) There were always six lambs which had been examined and found free from blemish in readiness for the daily offerings, for although only two were required daily six were made ready in case of an emergency. Consequently on the last day of every year, i.e., on the twenty-ninth day of Adar, there were always four lambs left which were not required for the community. They could not be used as offerings, for from the first of Nisan lambs from the new stock only would be used. V. supra 49b.

(11) But they must be allowed to pasture until they become blemished when they may be redeemed. The fact that R. Simeon must resort to this measure indicates clearly that he holds that the mental stipulation of the Beth din with regard to the lambs, namely those that are not required shall be non-holy, is of no effect.

(12) For the mental stipulation of the Beth din is effective. V. Shebu. 11b.
(13) Until they become blemished when they can be redeemed. Only in such a case does R. Simeon hold that the mental stipulation of the Beth din is of no effect, but not in the case where there is no other remedy, as with the drink-offerings.
(14) A man consecrated a pregnant beast as a thank-offering and it later brought forth its young. The young must be offered as the same sacrifice as the mother-beast; v. Tem. III, 2.
(15) In which case both the consecrated beast and the substitute are holy. cf. Lev. XXVII, 10; and the latter must be offered as the same sacrifice as the former; v. Tem. l.c.
(16) And which was eventually found. It is immaterial which beast was offered, the other must also be offered as a thank- offering.
(17) Lev. VII, 12.
(18) Ibid. The expression 'he offers it' is entirely superfluous in the construction of this verse.
(19) Lev. VII, 12.
(20) I.e., only one of these two thank-offerings, either the original animal or what was brought in its place, requires the bread-offering.
(21) What was brought in place of the thank-offering is here included that it too must be offered as a thank-offering. but it is qualified in that it does not require a bread-offering.
(22) Ibid. The expression עַל , translated 'for', really signifies 'with', 'in addition to'. I.e., others are also offered as thank-offerings in addition to the original animal.
(23) This item is redundant here, since it has already been established by virtue of the expression 'he shall offer it' that what was brought in the place of the thank-offering is exempt from the bread-offering.
(24) That the bread-offering is not required.
(25) I.e., the young or the substitute or what was brought in the place of the thank-offering is being offered now as a thank-offering after the original animal had been sacrificed and atonement effected thereby.
(26) So that if both animals are present, whichever is offered, whether the original thank-offering or its young or its substitute, needs the bread-offering.
(27) E.g.. if one vowed a thank-offering by using the expression 'I take upon myself to offer a thank-offering'. In this case if the animal set apart for the offering was lost another must be brought in its place.
(28) In the foregoing Baraitha it is expressly taught that if the original thank-offering has not been sacrificed but both it and the substitute are present, whichever is offered requires the bread-offering; and if the one had already been sacrificed the other, it has also been taught, is exempt from the bread-offering. And this Baraitha deals with an obligatory thank-offering, for were it only a freewill thank-offering it would not be necessary to replace it if it were lost.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 80a

Shall I then say [it refers] to the case of what was brought in the place of a freewill thank-offering? But surely whether [it is offered] before the atonement[1] or after the atonement it certainly requires the bread-offering, for it is an additional thank-offering![2] Shall I then say [it refers] to the case of the young of a freewill thank-offering? But surely whether [it is offered] before the atonement or after the atonement it certainly does not require the bread-offering, for it is the surplus of the thank-offering?[3] — I must say [it refers] to the case of the young of an obligatory thank-offering; thus if [the young is offered] before the atonement it requires the bread-offering, but if after the atonement it does not require the bread-offering. What does he teach us? — That R. Johanan is of the opinion that a man may obtain atonement with the increase of consecrated things.[4]

Abaye also pondered over it in like manner.[5]

It has also been [expressly] stated: R. Isaac b. Joseph said in the name of R. Johanan, The animal that was brought in the place of a freewill thank-offering, whether [it is offered] before or after the atonement, requires the bread-offering, for it is an additional thank-offering. The young of a freewill thank-offering, whether [it is offered] before or after the atonement, does not require the bread-offering, for it is only the surplus of the thank-offering. The young of an obligatory thank-offering and what was brought in the place of an obligatory thank-offering.[6] if offered before

the atonement, require the bread-offering; but if after the atonement, do not require the bread-offering.

Samuel said, Whatever in the case of a sin-offering must be left to die[7] in the case of a thank-offering does not require the bread-offering.[8] and whatever in the case of a sin-offering must be left to pasture[9] in the case of a thank-offering requires the bread- offering.

R. Amram raised the following objection: [It was taught]:[10] Why was it necessary for the text to say. 'He offers [it] for a thank-offering'? Whence is it derived that if a man set apart a beast for a thank-offering and it was lost and he set apart another in its place, and then the first was found so that now both beasts stand before him — whence [it is asked] is it derived that he may offer whichever of them he pleases and with it the bread-offering? Because the text states, 'He offers . . . for a thank-offering'. I might think that the other animal also requires the bread-offering; therefore the text states, 'He offers it', implying one only but not two. Now a sin-offering in such a case would certainly be left to pasture;[11] for we have learnt: If a man set apart an animal as his sin-offering and it was lost, and he set apart another in its stead, and then the first was found so that now both stand [before us]. one must be used for his atonement while the other must be left to die. So Rabbi. But the Sages say. No sin-offering may be left to die save only that which is found after its owner had obtained atonement [by another offering].[12] It follows, however, that [if it is found] before its owner had [otherwise] obtained atonement it must be left to pasture! — Samuel agrees with Rabbi who maintains that the animal which was lost at the time that a second was set apart must be left to die.[13] Then in what circumstances does it ever arise that the animal, according to Rabbi, must be left to pasture?[14] -In the case stated by R. Oshaia. For R. Oshaia said, If a man set apart two sin-offerings as security.[15] he obtains atonement by whichever animal he pleases [to offer], while the second must be left to pasture.[16] But surely a thank-offering in such a case would not require the bread-offering![17] — Rather Samuel agrees with R. Simeon who maintains that the five sin-offerings must be left to die.[18] But R. Simeon holds that under no circumstances [is a sin-offering] to be left to pasture![19] — Samuel too stated one rule [only]: Whatever in the case of a sin-offering must be left to die in the case of a thank-offering does not require the bread-offering. Then what does he teach us?[20] — [His purpose is] to reject R. Johanan's view; for [R. Johanan] ruled that a man may obtain atonement from the increase of consecrated things;[21] and [Samuel] teaches us that it is not so.

Rabbah[22] said, [Where a man said,] 'This [animal] shall be a thank-offering and these its loaves'. if the loaves were lost he may bring other loaves [for this thank-offering]; but if the thank-offering was lost he may not bring another thank-offering [for these loaves]. What is the reason? — The loaves are appurtenant to the thank-offering but the thank-offering is not appurtenant to the loaves.

Raba said, If a man set apart money [to purchase an animal] for a thank-offering

---

(1) Sc. before the sacrifice of the original thank-offering.

(2) Lit., 'he is offering many thank-offerings'. Since the original is a freewill thank-offering there is no obligation to replace it if lost, accordingly what is brought in replacement is in fact another thank-offering, and as such certainly requires the bread-offering.

(3) Any accretion to the original thank-offering is accounted as surplus and, like the surplus of money that was assigned for the purchase of a thank-offering, does not require the bread-offering.

(4) And as the young may be used for the atonement it is deemed to be a thank-offering just as the mother-beast and therefore requires the bread-offering.

(5) And arrived at the same conclusion as R. Amram.

(6) So MSM. and other MSS., and Sh. Mek. The words 'and what was brought in the place of an obligatory thank-offering' are omitted in cur. edd., evidently wrongfully since the verb 'require' is governed by a plural subject.

(7) This is the ruling in the following five cases: (i) The young of a sin-offering; (ii) the substitute of a sin-offering; (iii) a sin-offering whose owner died; (iv) a sin-offering which was lost and its owner had obtained atonement with another;

and (v) a sin-offering more than a year old. The animal in these cases was locked up and starved to death.
(8) Thus the young of the thank-offering (or any of the other cases enumerated in the prec. n., with the exception of (v), for a thank-offering may be more than a year old) is offered as a thank-offering but does not require the bread-offering.
(9) Until it becomes blemished and is then redeemed. For the circumstance v. Gemara.
(10) V. supra p. 479 and notes.
(11) According to the view of the Sages infra. Nevertheless it is stated that in the case of a thank-offering no bread-offering is required, thus in conflict with the second part of Samuel's rule.
(12) Tem. 22b, Pes. 97a.
(13) Even though it was found again before the second animal was offered it must none the less be left to die, for it had been rejected as a sin-offering. Likewise a thank-offering in such circumstances would not require the bread-offering, thus in accordance with Samuel's rule.
(14) For Samuel ruled that whatever in the case of a sin-offering must be left to pasture etc.
(15) In case one is lost the other should be available for use.
(16) This is admitted by Rabbi, for only where the animal had been rejected as a sin-offering. on being lost, does Rabbi rule that it must be left to die, but not where both animals were from the outset available for the offering.
(17) For one merely stands to replace the other, and we have learnt that what was brought in the place of a thank-offering does not require the bread-offering. Accordingly Samuel's rule does not hold good.
(18) V. supra p. 482, n. 2. The fourth case would, according to R. Simeon, include the case where two sin-offerings were brought as security, so that the animal which had not been used must be left to die. A thank-offering in such a case would certainly not require the bread-offering, thus in conformity with Samuel's rule.
(19) How then can Samuel say, 'Whatever in the case of a sin-offering must be left to pasture'?
(20) For all the cases implied in Samuel's rule have been expressly taught that they do not require the bread-offering.
(21) Hence, according to R. Johanan, the young of a thank-offering, if offered before atonement has been made by the mother-beast, would require the bread-offering.
(22) So Rashi and Sh. Mek., and so also in the parallel passage in Pes. 13b. In cur. edd. 'R. Abba'. According to Sh. Mek. the two statements which follow are also by Rabbah.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 80b

and some was left over, he may bring with it the loaves. If [he set money apart] for the loaves of a thank-offering and some was left over, he may not bring with it the thank-offering. What is the reason? Shall I say it is R. Kahana's teaching? For R. Kahana said, Whence is it known that the' loaves of the thank-offering are referred to as 'the thank-offering'? From the verse, And he shall offer with the thank-offering unleavened cakes.[1] If so, the reverse should also be true, should it not?[2] -[No,] the loaves are referred to as 'the thank-offering' but the thank-offering is never referred to as 'the loaves'.

Raba also said, If a man set apart [an animal for] his thank- offering and it was lost, and he set apart another in its stead and that too was lost, and he then set apart a third in its stead, and then the first [animals] were found so that now all three animals stand before us. — if he obtained atonement by the first animal, the second does not require the bread-offering[3] but the third does;[4] if he obtained atonement by the third, the second does not require the bread-offering but the first does;[5] if by the second, the other two do not require the bread-offering.[6] Abaye said, Even though he obtained atonement by any one of them the other two do not require the bread-offering. because each was replaced by the other.[7]

R. Zera said, And so it is, too, with regard to the sin-offering. Thus if a man set apart [an animal for] his sin-offering and it was lost, and he set apart a second animal in its stead and that too was lost, and then he set apart a third in its stead, and then the first [animals] were found so that now all three animals stand before us, — if he obtained atonement by the first animal, the second must be left to die[8] and the third must be left to pasture;[9] if he obtained atonement by the third animal, the second must be left to die and the first must be left to pasture; if he obtained atonement by the

second animal, the other two animals must be left to die. Abaye said, Even though he obtained atonement by any one of them the other two animals must be left to die, because each was replaced by the other.

What is the point of saying 'And so it is too'? [Is it not obvious?] — You might think that it applies only there [in the case of the thank-offering] for one might say that he is offering additional thank-offerings,[10] but not here [in the case of the sin-offering] for one cannot say that he is offering additional sin-offerings;[11] we are therefore taught [that so it is too with the sin-offering].

R. Hiyya taught: If a thank-offering was confused with its substitute and one of them died, there is no remedy for the other.[12] For what is he [the owner] to do? Should he offer the bread-offering with it? perhaps it is the substitute.[13] Should he not offer the bread-offering with it? Perhaps it is the original thank-offering. But if he had said, 'Behold I take upon myself [to offer a thank-offering]'. he cannot do otherwise than bring it .[14] then let him bring another animal and the bread-offering [of a thank-offering] with it and declare, 'If the surviving [animal] is the substitute, then let this be a thank-offering and this its bread-offering; and if the surviving [animal] is the [original] thank-offering, then let this be the bread-offering for it and this [animal] be as security'![15] — It must be that he had said, 'Let this be [a thank-offering]'.[16]

(Mnemonic: The arguers, Martha, 'Ulla, Shisha, Ashi, Damharia. — Hul[lin], SH[elamim], Surplus, Substitute, Outside, Hezekiah, Set apart a sin-offering. Security.)[17] The arguers[18] before Rabbi raised this question. Let him bring the bread-offering and declare, 'If the surviving [animal] is the [original] thank-offering, let this be its bread-offering; but if not, let this be unconsecrated [bread]'! — He replied, May one bring unconsecrated food into the Sanctuary?[19]

Then let him bring another animal and the bread-offering and declare, 'If the surviving [animal] is the substitute, let this [animal] be a thank-offering and this its bread-offering; and if the surviving [animal] is the [original] thank-offering, let this be the bread-offering for it and this [animal] be a peace-offering!' — He replied. [This is no remedy] for then the time allowed for the eating of peace-offerings would be curtailed.[20]

Levi[21] suggested this to Rabbi, Let him bring another animal and the bread-offering and declare, 'If the surviving [animal] is the substitute, let this [animal] be a thank-offering and this its bread-offering; and if the surviving [animal] is the [original] thank-offering. then let this be the bread-offering for it and this [animal] be the surplus of the thank-offering!'[22] — He replied. It seems to me that this man has no brains in his skull.

---

(1) Lev. VII, 12.

(2) That the surplus of money assigned for the loaves should be used for the thank-offering.

(3) For the second animal which was brought to replace the first (which eventually was offered as a thank-offering) is regarded as the surplus of the thank-offering and therefore does not require the bread-offering.

(4) The third was brought to replace the second, but as the second was not offered the third cannot be regarded as the surplus of the thank-offering, but rather as an additional thank-offering which requires the bread-offering.

(5) The third animal (which was offered) replaced the second, hence the latter is now the surplus of the thank-offering; the first animal, however, was not at any time replaced directly by the third.

(6) For both the first and the third are directly connected with the second, and are now the surplus of that which was actually offered.

(7) So that even the third, which only indirectly replaced the first, is also exempt from the bread-offering.

(8) For the owner of this sin-offering has obtained atonement by another animal, accordingly this animal which is the surplus of the sin-offering must be left to die.

(9) For it is not directly connected with the first animal.

(10) Since a man may offer as many thank-offerings as he pleases and at any time.

(11) A sin-offering cannot be brought at any time as a freewill-offering; accordingly even in the first case where the atonement was made by the first animal the third animal should also be left to die.
(12) I.e., it must be left to die.
(13) And the bread-offering was not to be brought with the substitute. V. Mishnah, supra p 479.
(14) Lit., 'there is no way of not bringing it'. By using this expression there is a personal obligation upon this man to bring the promised offering.
(15) And where an animal is brought together with the thank-offering as security against its loss it does not require the bread-offering.
(16) The use of this expression does not involve a personal obligation; hence it cannot be said that another animal is brought as security.
(17) It will be observed that from here until the next Mishnah eight suggestions are put forward which are introduced by different scholars. The mnemonic therefore consists of two parts; first the names of the various scholars and secondly a list of the subjects of the arguments. The text, however, is in a bad state; v. Sh. Mek. and Rabbinowicz D.S. a. l. n. 6. 'The arguers' (that is, Levi, v. next n.) put the first three questions 'Damharia' is not the name of a person but of the place where R. Dimi lived (v. p. 490. n. 2). חלש is an abbreviation of חולין and שלמים , meaning unconsecrated animals and peace-offerings respectively.
(18) Sc. Levi. When taking part in discussions in the College Levi was known by this appellation; v. San. 17b. When he discussed a matter privately with Rabbi he was simply spoken of as Levi (Rashi MS.).
(19) Certainly not. Hence the remedy suggested is unsatisfactory.
(20) As this additional animal is in a state of doubt whether it is a thank-offering or a peace-offering. its flesh would only be eaten the same day until midnight like a thank-offering. and what is left over would be burnt; yet if it were a peace-offering it would not have to be burnt then, since it may be eaten during two days and one night.
(21) V. supra p. 486, n. 8; v. however Tosaf s.v. אמר.
(22) Which is offered without the bread-offering.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 81a

May one at the very outset set apart [an animal] to be the surplus [of an offering]?[1]

R. Isaac b. Samuel b. Martha was sitting in the presence of R. Nahman, and while sitting there he said, Let him bring another animal and the bread-offering and declare, 'If the surviving [animal] is the substitute, let this animal be a thank-offering and this its bread-offering; and if the surviving [animal] is the [original] thank-offering. let this be the bread-offering for it and this [animal] be the substitute [of the thank-offering]'! — He replied. Tell me, Sir; forty stripes on his shoulders, and [yet you] permit him [to do so]![2]

R. 'Ulla was once ill, and Abaye and the other Rabbis came to visit him. While sitting there they said, If [the law] is in accordance with R. Johanan who ruled that [the bread] is hallowed even though it was outside the wall of the Sanctuary.[3] then let him bring the bread-offering and put it down outside the wall of the Sanctuary and let him declare, 'If the surviving [animal] is the [original] thank-offering, then here is its bread-offering; and if not, let it be treated as unconsecrated [bread]'! — [This is no remedy] for there are four cakes which must be waved,[4] and what should one do? Should he [the priest] wave them outside [the Sanctuary]? But it is written Before the Lord.[5] Should he wave them inside? He is then bringing unconsecrated food into the Sanctuary. It is thus impossible to do so.

R. Shisha son of R. Idi demurred saying, If [the law] is in accordance with Hezekiah who ruled that forty out of the eighty cakes are hallowed,[6] let him bring another animal and with it eighty cakes and let him declare, 'If the surviving [animal] is the [original] thank-offering. let this [animal] also be a thank-offering and here are eighty cakes for both [thank-offerings]; and if the surviving [animal] is the substitute, then let this [animal] be a thank-offering and this the bread-offering for it, and let forty out of the eighty cakes be hallowed!'[7] — [This is no remedy] for there would then be a

curtailment of the eating of the forty cakes.[8]

R. Ashi said to R. Kahana, If [the law] is in accordance with R. Johanan who ruled[9] that where a man set apart a pregnant beast as a sin-offering and it then gave birth, his atonement may be made, if he so desires, with the mother-beast itself or, if he prefers. with her young, let him bring here a pregnant beast and wait until it gives birth and let him also bring eighty cakes and declare, 'If the surviving [animal] is the substitute, let it [the mother-beast] and its young be thank-offerings, and here are the eighty cakes for both of them; and if the surviving [animal] is the [original] thank-offering, let it [the mother-beast] also be a thank-offering, and here are eighty cakes for both, and this [the young] shall be the surplus of the thank-offering'![10] — He replied, Who can tell us [for certain] that the reason for R. Johanan's ruling[11] is that he is of the opinion that if a man were to reserve it [the young] it is accounted a reservation?[12] Perhaps [he holds] it is not accounted a reservation,[13] and this is the reason for R. Johanan's ruling, namely that he is of the opinion that a man may obtain atonement with the increase of consecrated things.[14]

Rabina once happened to be in Damharia[15] and R. Dimi son of R. Huna of Damharia suggested the following to Rabina, Let him bring [another] animal and say. 'Behold I take upon myself [to offer a thank-offering]' ,[16] and let him also bring a [third] animal and with it eighty cakes and declare, 'If the surviving [animal] is the substitute, let these two animals be thank-offerings and here are eighty cakes for both; and if the surviving [animal] is the thank-offering, then let that animal in respect of which I said, "I take upon myself [to offer a thank-offering]" also be a thank-offering, and here are the eighty cakes for those two [thank-offerings], and let the third animal be as security!' — He replied. The Torah says, Better it is that thou shouldst not vow, than that thou shouldst vow and not pay,[17] and you say that he should proceed to vow in the first instance?

MISHNAH. IF A MAN SAID. 'BEHOLD I TAKE UPON MYSELF [TO BRING] A THANK-OFFERING', HE MUST BRING BOTH IT AND ITS BREAD FROM WHAT IS UNCONSECRATED.[18]

---

(1) Surely not.

(2) To designate an animal as a substitute for a consecrated one is a transgression of Lev. XXVII, 10 and involves the penalty of stripes. Surely then it would not be suggested as a remedy in our case to make this substitution in the first instance!

(3) At the time of the slaughtering of the thank-offering. V. supra 78b.

(4) This was the priest's portion from the bread-offering, one cake from each sort, which had to be waved together with the breast and thigh of the thank-offering.

(5) Lev. VII, 30. Although this is stated of the peace-offering it applies also to the thank-offering.

(6) Where a man brought eighty cakes with his thank- offering, Hezekiah maintained that forty of them are hallowed, the other forty being regarded as having been brought as security only. V. supra 78b.

(7) The cakes should be left outside the Sanctuary and only eight be brought within; so R. Gershom and Rashi. According to Rashi MS. the whole of the eighty cakes are to be brought into the Sanctuary, and there can be no objection to this on the ground that unconsecrated food is being brought into the Sanctuary for the additional forty cakes are deemed a security for the others and are of service to the hallowed cakes.

(8) According to another reading: of the four cakes. It is obviously necessary to give the priest eight cakes for there may be here two thank-offerings; but the priest, thinking that he is not entitled to more than four of them, for there may be here only one thank-offering, would only eat four and leave four; the owners, on the other hand, would not eat the remaining four cakes, and they would therefore be destroyed unnecessarily. Another interpretation: Clearly eight cakes are given to the priests, but it is possible that only four of them are holy; now if it happens that the priests are unable to consume all the eight cakes that same day. it may be that the remaining cakes, which have to be burnt, are the hallowed cakes, so that by giving the priests non-hallowed cakes to eat it may result in bringing hallowed cakes to destruction.

(9) Yeb. 78a, Tem. 25a.

(10) For which no bread-offering is required. The objection, stated supra, 'May one at the outset set apart an animal to be

the surplus of an offering?' cannot be raised here, for at the time that the animal was set apart the surplus. i.e., the young, was not yet brought into the world.

(11) That the atonement may be effected either by the mother-beast or by the young.

(12) The young of an animal that was consecrated pregnant can be reserved and appointed by the owner for any purpose or offering, for it is not considered as one entity with the mother-beast; consequently in the case of the sin-offering either animal may be offered for the atonement; likewise in a thank-offering, each animal when offered requires the bread-offering.

(13) Accordingly the young may not be used for any offering but it is one with the mother-beast, and when the latter is offered as a thank-offering the young becomes the surplus thereof and does not require the bread-offering.

(14) R. Johanan only ruled that either animal may be used for atonement, but after atonement has been effected with one animal, be it the mother-beast or the young. the other animal is regarded as the surplus thereof, and as such does not require the bread-offering when offered as a thank-offering.

(15) A town in the neighbourhood of Sura.

(16) By using this expression he assumes a personal obligation to bring the offering and must replace it by another if it died or was lost; thus it is usual in such a case to bring another animal with it as security.

(17) Eccl. V, 4. From this verse it is established that the best course is not to vow at all (cf. Hul. 2a). and indeed it is reprehensible to do so (cf. infra 109b). for a vow, i.e., when the expression 'I take upon myself' is used, may become most difficult of fulfilment, and so bring about sin.

(18) For everything that is obligatory must be brought from what is unconsecrated; v. infra 82a.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 81b

[IF HE SAID.] 'THE THANK-OFFERING FROM WHAT IS UNCONSECRATED AND ITS BREAD FROM [SECOND] TITHE [MONEY]'. HE MUST BRING BOTH IT AND ITS BREAD FROM WHAT IS UNCONSECRATED.[1] [IF HE SAID,] 'THE THANK-OFFERING FROM SECOND TITHE AND ITS BREAD FROM WHAT IS UNCONSECRATED', HE SHALL BRING IT SO. [IF HE SAID,] 'BOTH THE THANK-OFFERING AND ITS BREAD FROM SECOND TITHE', HE SHALL BRING IT SO; BUT HE MAY NOT BRING IT FROM SECOND TITHE WHEAT BUT ONLY FROM SECOND TITHE MONEY.[2]

GEMARA. R. Huna said, If a man said, 'Behold I take upon myself [to bring] the bread of a thank-offering', he must bring a thank-offering and its bread. For what reason? Since this man knows full well that bread alone cannot be offered he obviously meant a thank-offering together with its bread, and when he said, 'The bread of a thank-offering' he merely stated the final words [of the vow].[3]

We have learnt: [IF HE SAID,] 'THE THANK-OFFERING FROM SECOND TITHE AND ITS BREAD FROM WHAT IS UNCONSECRATED', HE SHALL BRING IT SO. Now why is this so? Surely since he said, 'Its bread from what is unconsecrated', he ought to bring both it [the thank-offering] and its bread from what is unconsecrated![4] — There it is quite different, for since he had already said, 'The thank-offering from Second Tithe', [when he next said, 'Bread from what is unconsecrated'] it is to be taken as though he had said, 'Behold I take upon myself to bring the bread for So-and-so's thank-offering'.[5] If that is so, then in the first clause too which reads, [IF HE SAID,] 'THE THANK-OFFERING FROM WHAT IS UNCONSECRATED AND ITS BREAD FROM SECOND TITHE MONEY, HE MUST BRING BOTH IT AND ITS BREAD FROM WHAT IS UNCONSECRATED, it should also be taken as though he had said, 'Behold I take upon myself to bring the thank-offering[6] for So-and-so's bread'.[7] — How can you compare [the two]? Bread might very well be brought for another's thank-offering; but is a thank-offering ever brought for another's bread?[8]

Come and hear: If a man said, 'Behold I take upon myself to offer a thank-offering without the bread', or 'an animal-offering without the drink-offerings', they compel him to bring the

thank-offering with the bread or the animal-offering with the drink-offerings. Now this is so only where he said, ‘a thank-offering’, but where he did not say ‘a thank-offering’,[9] he would not ‘[have to bring anything at all!][10] — [No.] it is just the same even though he did not say ‘a thank-offering’,[11] but since the Tanna wished to state the case of an animal-offering without the drink-offerings, when he could not have stated [the reverse, viz..] drink-offerings without an animal-offering,[12] he also stated the case of the thank-offering.[13]

Why is it so?[14] Surely this is a vow that carries with it its annulment![15] — The authority for this [view of our Mishnah], said Hezekiah, is Beth Shammai who maintain that one must always regard the first words [of a man's statement as binding].[16] For we have learnt:[17] If a man said, ‘I will be a Nazirite [and abstain] from dried figs and pressed figs’,[18] Beth Shammai say. He becomes a Nazirite;[19] but Beth Hillel say, He does not become a Nazirite.[20] R. Johanan said, You may even say that this is in accordance with Beth Hillel, [only we must suppose that the man] said, ‘Had I but known that one cannot vow in this manner[21] I should not have vowed in this manner but in that’.[22] What [then means], ‘They compel him’?[23] -That is if he wishes to change his mind now.

Come and hear: If a man said, ‘I take upon myself to bring a thank-offering without bread’, or ‘an animal-offering without the drink-offerings’, and when they said to him, ‘You must bring a thank-offering with the bread’ or ‘an animal-offering with the drink-offerings’. he replied, ‘Had I but known this I would not have vowed at all’, they compel him none the less and say to him, ‘Observe and hear’.[24] Now this is well according to Hezekiah,[25] but it surely presents a difficulty to R. Johanan![26] — R. Johanan will reply, That [Baraitha] undoubtedly represents Beth Shammai's view.

What is meant by ‘Observe and hear’?-Abaye said, ‘Observe’: bring the thank-offering, ‘and hear:’ bring its bread-offering. Raba said. ‘Observe’: bring the thank-offering with its bread-offering. ‘and hear’: be not in the habit of doing so.

[IF HE SAID.] ‘BOTH THE THANK-OFFERING AND ITS BREAD FROM SECOND TITHE’. HE SHALL BRING IT SO. ‘HE SHALL BRING IT SO!’ Is he then bound to bring it so?[27] — R. Nahman and R. Hisda explained, If he wishes he brings it [as he vowed]. and if not he need not bring it [as he vowed].[28]

BUT HE MAY NOT BRING IT FROM SECOND TITHE WHEAT BUT ONLY FROM SECOND TITHE MONEY. R. Nahman and R. Hisda both said, They taught this only of Second Tithe wheat,[29] but he may bring it from wheat bought with Second Tithe money.[30]

R. Jeremiah was sitting before R. Zera and recited as follows: They taught this only of Second Tithe wheat, but he may bring it from wheat bought with Second Tithe money. [R. Zera] said to him, Master, you say so; but I say that even from wheat bought with Second Tithe money he may not bring it.[31] And I will state my reason and I will state your reason. I will state your reason: Whence do you know this[32] of the thank-offering? From peace-offerings.[33]

---

(1) For the bread is subsidiary to the thank-offering, and since he vowed to bring the thank-offering from what is unconsecrated that included the bread too, and his subsequent words are of no consequence.

(2) I.e., money which had been used for redeeming Second Tithe produce.

(3) But his intention was to offer a thank-offering too.

(4) For when he said ‘Bread from what is unconsecrated’, let it be taken as the final words of an unexpressed intention, so that he must bring both the thank-offering and the bread from what is unconsecrated. His opening words ‘the thank-offering from Second Tithe’ would be of no consequence. V., however, Tosaf s.v. **אמאי** .

(5) Lit. ‘to exempt So-and-so's thank-offering (from the bread-offering).’ This vow is binding, and he must bring the bread from what is unconsecrated, whether that other's thank-offering was of Second Tithe or of what was unconsecrated. So too in the case of our Mishnah, this man meant to offer bread from what was unconsecrated to exempt

his own thank-offering brought from Second Tithe from this obligation.
(6) Viz., the animal.
(7) Accordingly in our Mishnah he should be permitted to bring the thank-offering from what is unconsecrated and the bread from Second Tithe, as he had actually vowed.
(8) Of course not, for the bread is subsidiary to the thank-offering.
(9) But offered to bring the bread alone.
(10) Thus in conflict with R. Huna.
(11) I.e., by offering the bread of a thank-offering he is compelled to bring a thank-offering too.
(12) Since one may certainly offer drink-offerings without an animal-offering, cf. infra 107a.
(13) But even where he did not say 'a thank-offering' but only the bread-offering he is compelled to bring a thank-offering also, in accord with R. Huna.
(14) That where a man vowed to bring a thank-offering without the bread he must nevertheless bring the bread as well.
(15) Lit., 'a vow and with it its opening'. This man's intention apparently was to bring the thank-offering alone, but realizing immediately that his promise of a thank-offering would also entail the bread-offering he immediately decided to annul his vow by adding the words 'without bread'.
(16) Where a statement is made consisting of two parts, one inconsistent with the other, we recognize the first expression only and the other is to be disregarded. Here, therefore, as soon as the man said 'I take upon myself to bring a thank-offering', that constituted a binding vow, and his subsequent words 'without the bread' cannot nullify the effect of his opening words.
(17) Nazir 9a.
(18) This is nonsense for a Nazirite must abstain only from wine and grapes but not from figs.
(19) In the ordinary sense and must abstain from wine and grapes. Beth Shammai maintain that he is bound by his first expression 'I will be a Nazirite' and his subsequent words are disregarded.
(20) For this is a vow which carries with it its annulment. He purposely added the words 'from dried figs. etc,' in order to annul his vow of becoming a Nazirite.
(21) I.e., a thank-offering without the bread.
(22) A thank-offering with bread.
(23) Seeing that he has expressly indicated his intention that he meant to bring a thank-offering with bread.
(24) Deut. XII, 28.
(25) For like the previous Baraitha this Baraitha also adopts the view of Beth Shammai.
(26) This Baraitha surely cannot be reconciled with Beth Hillel's view; for since his vow is clearly annulled by his subsequent statement why should he be compelled to offer it?
(27) Lit., 'is there no way of not bringing it (as he vowed)'. Surely if be brings what is unconsecrated it is all the better!
(28) But may bring it from what is unconsecrated.
(29) Sc. the original Second Tithe produce.
(30) Even though the wheat bad been bought in Jerusalem with Second Tithe money for ordinary purposes and not for the bread of a thank-offering.
(31) Except where the wheat was bought with Second Tithe money for the express purpose of the thank-offering, in which case our Mishnah clearly teaches that he may bring it from that.
(32) That it may be brought from Second Tithe money.
(33) Since we find the thank-offering referred to as peace-offerings. cf. Lev. VII, 13.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 82a

And in respect of peace-offerings [this is derived] from the expression 'there' stated [in connection with peace-offerings][1] and also in connection with the Second Tithe.[2] Then it follows, as peace-offerings are not brought from actual Second Tithe produce.[3] so the [bread of the] thank-offering may not be brought from actual Second Tithe produce; and wheat bought with Second Tithe money is not actual Second Tithe produce.[4] And I will state my reason: Whence do I know this of the thank-offering? From peace-offerings. And in respect of peace-offerings [this is derived] from the expression 'there' stated [in connection with peace-offerings] and also in connection with the Second Tithe. Then it follows, as peace-offerings are not of the same kind as Second Tithe, so the

[bread of the] thank-offering may not be from that which is the same kind as Second Tithe;[5] thus excluding wheat bought from Second Tithe money[6] which is the same kind as Second Tithe.

R. Ammi said, If a man designated[7] Second Tithe money for a peace-offering, the peace-offering has not appropriated it.[8] Why? Because the sanctity of the peace-offering is not so potent that it can be imposed upon the sanctity of Second Tithe.

An objection was raised: If a man bought[9] a wild animal for a peace-offering or cattle for use as ordinary food,[10] the hide does not become unhallowed.[11] Does not this prove that the peaceoffering has appropriated it?[12] — Surely it has been stated in connection with this that Rab said, The peace-offering has not appropriated it; and what is meant by 'the hide does not become unhallowed'? It means this:-[The wild animal] does not come within the category [of peace-offerings] for its hide to become unhallowed.[13] And why is it so? — Rabbah answered. It is as if he bought[14] an ox for ploughing.[15]

It was stated: If a man designated Second Tithe money for a peace-offering, R. Johanan said, [The peace-offering] has appropriated it; R. Eleazar said, It has not appropriated it. According to R. Judah[16] who maintains that the [Second] Tithe is secular property they both agree that the peace-offering has appropriated it;[17] they differ only according to R. Meir[16] who maintains that the [Second] Tithe is sacred property. He who said that it has not appropriated it is in accord with R. Meir;[18] but he who said that it has appropriated it is of the opinion that since Second Tithe is usually offered[19] as peace-offerings, if a man designates [Second Tithe money for a peace-offering] the designation is binding.

An objection was raised: If a man designated Second Tithe money for a peace-offering, when he redeems it[20] he must add two fifths, one in respect of things consecrated and one in respect of Second Tithe![21] — Do you think that this teaching is the opinion of all? It is only the opinion of R. Judah.[22]

MISHNAH. WHENCE [IS IT DERIVED]THAT IF A MAN SAYS,'I TAKE UPON MYSELF [TO OFFER] A THANK-OFFERING', HE MAY BRING IT ONLY FROM WHAT IS UNCONSECRATED? BECAUSE IT IS WRITTEN, AND THOU SHALT SACRIFICE THE PASSOVER-OFFERING UNTO THE LORD THY GOD OF THE FLOCK AND THE HERD.[23] BUT IS NOT THE PASSOVER-OFFERING BROUGHT ONLY FROM THE LAMBS AND FROM THE GOATS? WHY THEN IS IT WRITTEN, OF THE FLOCK AND THE HERD? IT IS TO COMPARE WHATSOEVER IS BROUGHT FROM THE FLOCK AND THE HERD[24] WITH THE PASSOVER-OFFERING: AS THE PASSOVER-OFFERING IS OBLIGATORY AND OFFERED ONLY FROM WHAT IS UNCONSECRATED,[25] SO EVERYTHING THAT IS OBLIGATORY[26] MAY BE OFFERED ONLY FROM WHAT IS UNCONSECRATED. THEREFORE IF A MAN SAYS, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF [TO OFFER] A THANK-OFFERING', OR 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF [TO OFFER] A PEACE-OFFERING', SINCE THESE ARE OBLIGATORY THEY MAY BE OFFERED ONLY FROM WHAT IS UNCONSECRATED. THE DRINK-OFFERINGS IN EVERY CASE[27] MAY BE OFFERED ONLY FROM WHAT IS UNCONSECRATED.[28] GEMARA. And whence do we know it[29] for the Passover-offering itself? — It was taught:[30] R. Eliezer said: A Passover-offering was ordained to be brought in Egypt and a Passover-offering was ordained for later generations; as the Passover-offering that was ordained in Egypt could be brought only from what was unconsecrated,[31] so the Passover-offering that was ordained for later generations may be brought only from what is unconsecrated. Said to him R. Akiba, Is it right to infer the possible from the impossible?[32] The other replied, Although it was impossible [otherwise]. it is nevertheless a striking argument and we may make an inference from it. Then R. Akiba put forward the following argument [in refutation]: This[29] was so of the Passover-offering ordained in Egypt since it did not require the sprinkling of

blood and the offering of the sacrificial portions upon the altar;[33]

---

(1) Deut. XXVII, 7. And thou shalt sacrifice peace-offerings and shalt eat there.

(2) Deut. XIV, 26: And thou shalt eat there. Thus by analogy it is established that peace-offerings may be brought from Second Tithe.

(3) For Second Tithe is taken from corn only, and so cannot actually be used for peace-offerings. What is meant is. of course, that the money obtained from redeeming Second Tithe produce may be used for buying animals for peace-offerings.

(4) Since the original Second Tithe wheat had already been redeemed with money.

(5) So that any Second Tithe wheat, even that which was bought with Second Tithe money, may not be used for the thank-offering. But he may buy with Second Tithe money wheat expressly for the thank-offering. V. p. 494. n. 5.

(6) For Second Tithe purposes but not for the thank-offering.

(7) Lit., 'attached'.

(8) But he may use the money for another purpose.

(9) With Second Tithe money in Jerusalem.

(10) Neither purchase is proper, for wild animals may not be offered as peace-offerings, and cattle bought with Second Tithe money should be offered as peace-offerings only and not be slaughtered for a secular meal.

(11) It is assumed that this means that the hide of the wild beast must be sold and with the money a peace-offering must be offered. Similarly the hide of the cattle must be sold and the money received must be treated as Second Tithe money.

(12) I.e., the sanctity of the peace-offering rests upon the hide so that it must be sold and the money received must be spent on peace-offerings.

(13) In the usual way when cattle is bought with Second Tithe money and is offered as a peace-offering the hide becomes absolutely unhallowed and has neither the sanctity of the peace-offering nor the sanctity of Second Tithe. And likewise, if the sanctity of peace-offerings could apply to wild animals the hide thereof would also become absolutely unhallowed. Since, however, this is not the case, for the wild animal does not come within the category of peace-offerings, the hide does not become unhallowed, but it must be sold and the money received must be treated as Second Tithe money (Rashi MS. and Tosaf.).

(14) With Second Tithe money in Jerusalem.

(15) In which case the ox must be sold and the money received treated in the sanctity of Second Tithe.

(16) V. Kid. 24a, 52b.

(17) For the sanctity of the peace-offering immediately rests upon the secular property.

(18) For he holds that the sanctity of the peace-offering cannot rest upon sacred property.

(19) So MSS. reading קרב. Cur. edd. read קרי , 'is referred to'.

(20) When a man redeems things consecrated or Second Tithe produce or Second Tithe money for other coinage he must add to the redemption money one fifth part of its value. For the former v.Lev.XXVII, 13, 15 and for the latter v. ibid. 31.

(21) It is thus quite evident that the sanctity of the peace-offering rests upon the Second Tithe money that was merely designated for a peace-offering, contrary therefore to R. Eleazar.

(22) Who regards the Second Tithe as secular property and therefore the sanctity of the peace-offering can rest upon it.

(23) Deut. XVI, 2.

(24) Sc. peace-offerings and thank-offerings.

(25) V. Gemara.

(26) I.e., in every case where the expression 'I take upon myself' was used, for this imposes a personal obligation for the fulfilment of the vow.

(27) Whether the expression 'I take upon myself' was used or not, and whether it was expressly stated that the drink-offerings be brought from Second Tithe or not.

(28) For the drink-offerings are wholly offered up, and whatsoever is wholly offered up may not be brought from Second Tithe (Tosaf).

(29) That it is to be brought only from what is unconsecrated.

(30) Yeb. 46a.

(31) For at that time the law of the Second Tithe had not been promulgated, and even later when this law was given it was not to come into force until the Israelites entered the Holy Land.

(32) The Passover-offering in Egypt could not possibly have been brought from Second Tithe (v. prec. n.) whereas that

of future generations could.

(33) Since there was no altar in existence at that time.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 82b

will you say the same of the Passover-offering of later generations which requires the sprinkling of the blood and the offering of the sacrificial portions upon the altar?[1] The other replied. Behold it is written, And thou shalt keep this service in this month,[2] [signifying] that all the services of this month should be like this.[3]

[Now let us consider the view of] R. Akiba. If he holds that it is not proper to infer the possible from the impossible, then let him stand by that argument [in refutation];[4] and if he retracted it, and the only reason why he did not derive the law from the Passover-offering in Egypt was that refutation [which he raised], but surely [that can be countered by] the Passover-offering brought in the wilderness which proves [the reverse]![5] — He [R. Akiba] was arguing with R. Eliezer from his own standpoint. As for me, I hold that it is not proper to infer the possible from the impossible; but even from your point of view, that one may infer the possible from the impossible, there is surely this refutation: This was so of the Passover-offering in Egypt since it did not require the sprinkling of blood and the offering of the sacrificial parts upon the altar; will you say the same of the Passover-offering of later generations which requires the sprinkling of blood and the offering of the sacrificial portions upon the altar? To this, however, R. Eliezer replied. It is written, 'And thou shalt keep'.

But should not R. Eliezer have replied that the Passover-offering brought in the wilderness proves the reverse?[6] — He [R. Eliezer] was arguing with R. Akiba from his own standpoint. As for me, I hold that it is quite proper to infer the possible from the impossible; and as for that refutation of yours, it can be countered by the Passover-offering brought in the wilderness which proves the reverse; but even from your point of view, that it is not proper to infer the possible from the impossible, [I reply that there is written.] 'And thou shalt keep'.

But even now let him raise this objection.[7] — R. Shesheth answered, This proves that no objections can be entertained against a hekkesh.[8] In the School garden[9] it was asked, May that which has itself been inferred by a hekkesh become the basis for another inference to be made from it again by a hekkesh?[10] — It is derived from the class, for all the Passover-offerings from one class.[11]

And whence does R. Akiba derive the law that the Passover- offering may be brought only from what is unconsecrated? — He derives it from the following teaching of Samuel in the name of R. Eliezer:[12] It is written, This is the law of the burnt-offering, of the meal-offering, and of the sin-offering, and of the guilt-offering, and of the consecration-offering, and of the sacrifice of peace-offerings.[13] 'Burnt-offering': as the burnt-offering requires a vessel, so all the other offerings require a vessel. (What [vessel] is it that is meant? Shall I say a basin?[14] But with regard to the peace-offerings of the congregation it is also written, And put it in basins![15] — Rather it means a knife.[16] And how do we know this of the burnt-offering itself? Because it is written, And Abraham stretched forth his hand, and took the knife to slay his son.[17] And there it was a burnt-offering, as it is written, And offered him up for a burnt-offering in the stead of his son.)[18] 'Meal- offering': as the meal-offering may be eaten only by the males of the priesthood, so all the other offerings may be eaten only by the males of the priesthood. (What [other offerings] are meant? It cannot be the sin-offering and the guilt-offering.

---

(1) Like peace-offerings; and as peace-offerings may be brought from Second Tithe, so it should also be with the Passover-offering.

(2) Ex. XIII, 5.

(3) I.e., the Passover-offering of future generations offered in this month shall be like this one in that it be brought only from what is unconsecrated.

(4) Why then did he put forward another argument in refutation?

(5) For it required the sprinkling of blood and offering of the sacrificial portions upon the altar — for an altar had already been set up — nevertheless it was brought only from what was unconsecrated since as yet the law of Second Tithe had not come into force.

(6) Why did he find it necessary to adduce this verse 'And thou shalt keep'?

(7) Even against the inference drawn from the verse 'And thou shalt keep' R. Akiba can put forward the objection that it is not right to infer the possible from the impossible.

(8) V. Glos. The inference drawn from this verse is by hekkesh or analogy.

(9) The garden where scholars of the academy used to congregate for general discussions, v. Kaplan, The Redaction of the Talmud, pp. 240ff. V. however Tosaf. s.v. ובתרביצא . Cf. the expression ' תרביצאי in Rashi Yoma 62b, s.v. ומוספין , and Zeb. 104a, s.v. והעור .

(10) For it is desired in our Mishnah to conclude by a hekkesh from the Passoverofferings of later generations that all obligatory offerings shall be brought only from what is unconsecrated; but this law with regard to Passover-offerings of later generations is itself inferred by a hekkesh from the Passover-offering in Egypt, and it is an established rule that in matters appertaining to sacrifice one may not draw an inference by a hekkesh from that which has itself been inferred by a hekkesh. V. Zeb. 49b.

(11) The Tanna of our Mishnah derives the law that the thank-offering must be brought only from what is unconsecrated by hekkesh from Passover-offerings in general, which include also the Passover-offering in Egypt.

(12) Zeb. 97b.

(13) Lev. VII, 37.

(14) For receiving the blood therein. This is expressly stated in connection with the burnt-offering, as it is written (Ex. XXIV, 5,6): And he sent the young men of the children of Israel who offered burnt-offerings . . . And Moses took half the blood and put it in basins.

(15) Ibid. 6. And in verse 5 it is written, And sacrificed peace-offerings.

(16) I.e., the instrument used for the slaughtering shall be something detached from the ground and not a flint or a reed that is attached to the ground (Rashi Zeb. 98a). Aliter: one must use a knife for the slaughtering and not kill the beast by tearing its organs with the hands as is the case with a bird-offering whose head is nipped by the priest with his finger.

(17) Gen. XXII, 10. The expression 'and took' implies something movable and not fixed.

(18) Ibid. 13.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 83a

for this[1] is expressly stated of them.[2] Neither can it be the peace-offerings of the congregation,[3] for this[1] is already deduced from the amplification of the following verse: In a most holy place shalt thou eat thereof; every male may eat thereof:[4] this teaches us that the peace-offerings of the congregation may be eaten only by the males of the priesthood! — Tannaim [hold different views] about it; some derive it[5] from this [passage] and some from that.)[6] 'Sin-offering': as the sin-offering renders holy [like itself] whatever has absorbed from it,[7] so all the other offerings render holy [like themselves] whatever has absorbed from them. 'Guilt-offering': as with the guilt-offering neither the foetus-sac nor the afterbirth is holy.[8] so with all other offerings neither the foetus-sac nor the afterbirth is holy. (He is of the opinion that the young of consecrated animals are themselves holy only when they come into being;[9] and also that it is quite proper to infer the possible from the impossible.)[10] 'Consecration-offering': as in the case of the consecration-offering the remainder was burnt[11] but the living animal that was left over was not burnt,[12] so in the case of all other offerings the remainder is to be burnt but the living animal that might be left over[13] is not to be burnt. 'Peace-offerings': as peace-offerings can make others[14] piggul and can also become piggul themselves,[15] so all the other offerings can make others piggul and can also become piggul themselves. In a Baraitha it was taught in the name of R. Akiba as follows: This is the law etc. 'Meal-offering': as the meal-offering renders holy [like itself] whatever has absorbed from it,[16] so all the other offerings render holy [like themselves] whatever has absorbed from them. (And this was

necessary to be stated of the sin-offering as well as of the meal-offering. For had the Divine Law stated it only of the meal-offering [I would have said that this was so only of the meal-offering], because on account of its softness it could be absorbed, but I would not have said so of the sin-offering. And had the Divine Law only stated it of the sin-offering [I would have said that this was so only of the sin-offering], because on account of its fatness it could easily penetrate into the other matter, but I would not have said so of the meal-offering. Therefore both were necessary to be stated.) 'Sin-offering': as the sin-offering must be brought only from what is unconsecrated, and [must be sacrificed] by day, and [all the services in connection therewith must be performed] with the [priest's] right hand, so all the other offerings must be brought only from what is unconsecrated, and [must be sacrificed] by day, and [all the services in connection therewith must be performed] with the [priest's] right hand.[17] (And whence do we know this[18] of the sin-offering itself? — R. Hisda answered, Because it is written, And Aaron shall offer the bullock of the sin-offering which is his;[19] that is to say, it must come from his own means and not from the means of the community nor from the Second Tithe. Is not [the rule that offerings must be sacrificed] by day derived from [the verse], In the day that he commanded?[20] — It was indeed stated [above] to no purpose. Is not [the rule that all the services in connection therewith shall be performed with] the right hand derived from the following dictum of Rabbah b. Bar Hannah? For Rabbah b. Bar Hannah said in the name of Resh Lakish, Wherever the word 'finger' or 'priest' is used it signifies that the right hand only [shall be used]![21] — This too was stated [above] to no purpose.) 'Guilt-offering': as the bones of the guilt-offering are permitted for use,[22] so the bones of all other offerings are permitted for use.[23]

For what purpose does R. Akiba use the verse, And thou shalt sacrifice the Passover-offering?[24]

---

(1) That only male priests may eat of the offering.

(2) Cf. Lev. VI, 22; VII, 6.

(3) Sc. the two lambs offered on the Feast of Weeks, cf. Lev. XXIII, 19.

(4) Num. XVIII, 10. The verse continues, It shall be holy unto thee; and the expression 'holy' includes the two lambs which are also described by the expression 'holy'. cf. Lev. XXIII, 20.

(5) That the peace-offerings of the congregation. sc. the two lambs, may be eaten only by the male priests.

(6) From the expression 'meal-offering'.

(7) This is based on Lev. VI, 20: Whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall be holy. Thus if the flesh of a peace-offering absorbed aught of the sin-offering, the former must be treated in the same sanctity as the sin-offering; if the sin-offering was invalid the flesh of the peace-offering becomes invalid too; and if the sin-offering was fit the other is to be eaten under the same stringency as the sin-offering, i.e., within a holy place and during one day.

(8) For these cannot be found in the guilt-offering as it is a male animal.

(9) But whatever is found in the womb of a consecrated animal is not holy.

(10) I.e., to infer other offerings of female animals from the guilt-offering which must be a male animal.

(11) Cf. Ex. XXIX, 34.

(12) For no other animal was in fact set apart as a substitute for the consecration-offering.

(13) Where e.g., two animals were set apart for one offering as a measure of security, and one was left over, the latter was not burnt but was to be treated as the surplus of the offering; and so too with the young of an animal which had been consecrated pregnant.

(14) E.g.. the drink-offerings that are brought with the peace-offering or the bread with the thank-offering. V. supra 15a and b.

(15) The law of piggul (v. Glos.) is stated in Scripture only in connection with the peace-offerings, but by analogy it is extended to apply to all offerings.

(16) For also of the meal-offering as of the sin-offering it is written (Lev. VI, 11). Whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy.

(17) Thus we see R. Akiba deriving from 'sin-offering' the law that other offerings, including the Passover, cannot be brought except from what is unconsecrated.

(18) That it must be brought only of what is unconsecrated.

(19) Lev. XVI, 6.

(20) Ibid. VII, 38.

(21) V. supra 10a, and Hul. 22a.

(22) For profane purposes. Provided the bones are without marrow, v. Pes. 83a.

(23) The other items in this verse (ibid. 37) are interpreted by R. Akiba in the same way as R. Eliezer.

(24) Deut. XVI, 2. This verse is expounded in our Mishnah to teach that the thank-offering shall be brought only from what is unconsecrated; according to R. Akiba, however, this exposition is unnecessary, since he derives from the sin-offering the general rule that all obligatory offerings must be brought only from what is unconsecrated.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 83b

— He requires it for the following teaching of R. Nahman. For R. Nahman said in the name of Rabbah b. Abbuha,[1] Whence do we know that the surplus of the Passover-offering[2] is brought as a peace-offering? Because it is said, And thou shalt sacrifice the Passover-offering unto the Lord thy God of the flock and the herd.[3] But is not the Passover-offering brought only from the lambs and the goats? It means that the surplus of the Passover-offering is to be [utilized] for something which comes from the flock and from the herd.[4]

But is it[5] derived from this verse? Surely it is derived from the following teaching of Samuel's father: It is written, And if his offering for a sacrifice of peace-offerings [unto the Lord] be of the flock:[6] and Samuel's father said, This teaches that what comes [only] from the flock[7] shall be offered as peace-offerings! And again,is it derived from this [latter] verse? Surely it is derived from the following: It was taught:[8] Lamb;[9] this includes the fat tail of the Passover-offering.[10] When it says, If [he bring] a lamb,[9] it is to include the Passover-offering that has passed the age of one year[11] and the peace-offerings which are brought by virtue of the Passover-offering[12] for all the regulations of peace-offerings, viz., that they require the laying on of hands, the drink-offerings, and the waving of the breast and the thigh. Again, when it says, And if [his offering be] a goat.[13] this interrupts the subject [and thereby] teaches that in the case of a goat [the burning of] the fat tail [upon the altar] is not required![14] — There are three Scriptural texts;[15] one is required for [the Passover-offering] which has passed the age of one year and whose time [for offering][16] has also passed, another for that which has not passed the age of one year but whose time [for offering] has passed. and a third for that which has not passed the age of one year and whose time [for offering] has not passed.[17] And all [three texts] are necessary; for had [Scripture] taught us it only of that [Passover-offering] which had passed the age of one year and whose time [for offering] had also passed, I would have said that it was so[18] only in that case seeing that it was absolutely rejected [from being offered as a Passover-offering], but I would not have said so of that [Passover-offering] whose time [for offering] had passed but which had not passed the age of one year, since it is fit for the Second Passover.[19] And had [Scripture] taught us it only of that [Passover-offering] whose time [for offering] had passed but which had not passed the age of one year, I would have said that it was so[18] only in that case seeing that it was rejected [from being offered] for the first Passover, but I would not have said so of that [Passover-offering] whose time [for offering] had not passed and which had not passed the age of one year, since it is even fit for the first Passover. Hence [all texts] are necessary. CHAPTER IX

MISHNAH. ALL THE OFFERINGS[20] OF THE CONGREGATION OR OF THE INDIVIDUAL MAY BE OFFERED FROM [PRODUCE GROWN] IN THE LAND [OF ISRAEL] OR OUTSIDE THE LAND, FROM THE NEW [PRODUCE] OR FROM THE OLD, EXCEPTING THE ‘OMER-OFFERING AND THE TWO LOAVES, WHICH MUST BE OFFERED ONLY FROM THE NEW PRODUCE AND FROM [PRODUCE GROWN] IN THE LAND. ALL [OFFERINGS] MUST BE OFFERED FROM THE CHOICEST PRODUCE. AND WHICH IS THE CHOICEST? MICHMAS[21] AND ZANOHA[21] RANK FIRST FOR THE QUALITY OF THEIR FINE FLOUR; SECOND TO THEM IS HAFARAIM[21] IN THE VALLEY. THE [PRODUCE OF THE] WHOLE LAND[22] WAS VALID, BUT THEY USED TO BRING IT FROM THESE PLACES.

GEMARA. Our Mishnah is not in accordance with the following Tanna. For it was taught: If the 'Omer-offering was offered from the old produce it is valid, and so, too, if the Two Loaves were offered from the old produce they are valid, save that the precept has not been duly performed; the 'Omer-offering-for it is written, Thou shalt bring for the meal-offering of thy first-fruits.[23] that is, even from the store-room;[24] and the Two Loaves-for it is written, Out of your dwellings,[25] but not from [the produce grown] outside the Land; 'Out of your dwellings', even from the store-room. But has not a deduction already been drawn [from that expression]?[26] The verse reads, Ye shall bring.[27] even from the store-room. But is not this [latter expression] required to teach that every other offering that you make of a similar kind shall be like this![28] — If for this only the verse should have read, 'Thou shalt bring'; why does it say, Ye shall bring? You can therefore draw two deductions therefrom. But is it not written, The first?[29] — That is only a recommendation.[30] But does it not say. New?[31] — That is required for [the following Baraitha] which was taught: R. Nathan and R. Akiba[32] said, If the Two Loaves were brought from the old produce they are none the less valid. How then am I to interpret the expression 'new'? To signify that they shall be the first[33] of all meal offerings.[34]

Now they[35] differ only concerning the new produce.[36]

---

(1) Pes. 70b; Zeb. 9a.

(2) E.g.. if a certain sum of money was put aside for the Passover-offering but it was not all expended. Or, if the animal set apart for the Passover-offering was lost and another was offered in its stead and later the original animal was found.

(3) Deut. XVI, 2.

(4) Sc. peace-offerings.

(5) That the surplus of the Passover-offering is offered as peace-offerings.

(6) Lev. III, 6. The expression 'sacrifice of peace-offerings' is obviously superfluous in this verse as the whole passage is dealing with the peace-offering.

(7) Sc. the Passover-offering.

(8) Pes. 96b, Zeb. 9a.

(9) Lev. III, 7. This word is superfluous for since the preceding verse speaks of an offering 'of the flock' and the subsequent passage of 'a goat', this passage must obviously be dealing with lambs.

(10) That it must be burnt together with the other sacrificial portions upon the altar. With all other offerings of sheep the fat tail is expressly stated to be burnt, hence it was necessary to include the Passover-offering.

(11) And so is unfit for its purpose, cf. Ex. XII, 5.

(12) I.e., חגיגת ארבעה עשר the peace-offerings brought on the fourteenth day of Nisan as supplementary to the Passover-offering. These supplied the full meal for those members registered for the one Passover-offering, at the end of which the Passover-lamb was distributed, about an olive's bulk being given to each person. So Rashi MS. According to Rashi and Tos. the peace-offerings in the text are the surplus of the Passover-offering; v. Tosaf.s.v. ושלמים .

(13) Lev.III, 12.

(14) The 'and if' at the head of the passage is a disjunctive term, indicating that the provisions that apply to a lamb do not apply to a goat, unless expressly stated; and the fat tail is mentioned in connection with the former (v. 9) but not with the latter.

(15) The above three verses, viz., Deut. XVI, 2, Lev. III, 6, and ibid. 7, each informing us that the surplus of the Passover-offering must be offered as a peace-offering.

(16) Sc. the fourteenth day of Nisan.

(17) I.e., the lamb was set apart for a Passover-offering but was slaughtered before the Passover.

(18) That it is offered as a peace-offering.

(19) Observed on the fourteenth day of the second month (Iyar) by those who were prevented from keeping the first Passover either by reason of uncleanness or absence on a journey; v. Num. IX, 10ff.

(20) Sc. meal-offerings.

(21) So according to many MSS.; in cur. edd. these names are corrupt. All three are Biblical place-names; for Michmas (var: Machnis, Machmis) v. Ezra II, 27; for Zanoha (var: Zatha, Zinuha) v. Jos. XV, 34, 56; for Hafaraim (var. lec: 'Afraim (cf. Ephrain in II Chron. XIII, 19). 'Aforaim, Kufraim) v. Jos. XIX, 19.

(22) Lit., ‘all the lands’; i.e., the various districts in the Land of Israel.
(23) Lev. II, 14.
(24) Lit., ‘the upper-room’, ‘the attic’. I.e., produce from the previous year that has been stored up.
(25) Ibid. XXIII, 17.
(26) The expression ‘out of your dwellings’ is in the first place interpreted to exclude the produce grown outside Palestine, how then can it be interpreted a second time to include the old produce?
(27) Lev. XXIII, 17.
(28) V. supra p. 463.
(29) Both with regard to the ‘Omer-offering and the Two Loaves, Lev. II, 12 and XXIII, 10, respectively. The first clearly implies the new produce.
(30) Nevertheless if old produce was used it is valid.
(31) Ibid. XXIII, 16.
(32) According to Sh. Mek.: ‘R. Jacob’.
(33) Lit., ‘the newest’.
(34) I.e., no meal-offering of the new corn shall be offered before the offering of the Two Loaves, even though the latter are offered of the old produce.
(35) Sc. the Tanna of our Mishnah and the Tanna of the Baraitha quoted.
(36) I.e., whether only the new produce must be used or even the old is valid.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 84a

but as to the Land they do not differ at all, [for they both hold] that the ‘Omer-offering and the Two Loaves must be offered from the [produce of the] Land [of Israel] and not from [that grown] outside the Land. This view is clearly not in accord with that of the following Tanna. For it was taught: R. Jose son of R. Judah says, The ‘Omer-offering may be offered from [what is grown] outside the Land. How then am I to interpret the expression ‘when ye are come into the land’?[1] To signify that they were not bound to offer the ‘Omer-offering before they entered the Land. Furthermore, he is of the opinion that the [prohibition of the] new corn[2] outside the Land [of Israel] is Biblical; that the expression ‘your dwellings’[3] implies wherever you may be dwelling;[4] and that the expression ‘when ye are come into the land’ implies [that the prohibition comes into force only] at the time when you come [into the Land].[4] Now since [the prohibition of the new corn outside the Land of Israel] is Biblical, we may surely offer [the ‘Omer-offering therefrom].

We have learnt elsewhere:[5] Those who kept guard over the aftergrowths in the Sabbatical year[6] received their pay out of the terumath ha-lishkah.[7] Rami b. Hama pointed out the following contradiction to R. Hisda: We have learnt: ‘Those who kept guard over the aftergrowth in the Sabbatical year received their pay out of the terumath ha-lishkah’, but in contradiction to this we have also learnt:[8] For food.[9] but it must not be burnt!’[10] — He replied. ‘The Divine Law says, Throughout your generations,[11] and you are suggesting that it be dispensed with!’[12] ‘Am I suggesting’, retorted the other, ‘that it be dispensed with? [I say] it can be offered of last year's produce!’ — ‘It must be fresh.[13] and it is not so in that case’. ‘Then it can be offered of the fresh corn of last year's produce!’ — ‘The text says. Thou shalt bring . . . fresh.[13] that is, it must be fresh at the time of offering, and it is not so in that case. It was stated: R. Johanan said,[14] [It is written,] ‘Thou shalt bring . . . fresh’; R. Eleazar said,[14] [It is written.] The first of your harvest,[15] but not the end of your harvest.[16]

Rabbah raised the following objection:[17] The verse, And if thou bring a meal-offering of first-fruits.[18] refers to the meal-offering of the ‘Omer. Of what was it offered? Of barley. You say ‘of barley’; but perhaps it is not so but rather of wheat! Said R. Eliezer, The expression ‘in the ear’[19] is stated in regard to the incidents in Egypt, and the expression ‘in the ear’[18] is also stated as an ordinance for generations: just as ‘in the ear’ stated in regard to the incidents in Egypt referred to the barley, so ‘in the ear’ stated as an ordinance for generations refers to barley only. R. Akiba said, We

find that an individual must offer wheat as an obligation and also barley as an obligation; likewise we find that the community must offer wheat as an obligation and also barley as an obligation. Should you say, then, that the ‘Omer was offered of wheat, we would not find a case when the community must offer barley as an obligation! Another explanation: Should you say that the ‘Omer was offered of wheat, then the Two Loaves would not be first-fruits! Hence the reason for it is that it must be first-fruits.[20] This is indeed a refutation.

We have learnt elsewhere:[21] First-fruits may be brought only from the seven species.[22] and not

---

(1) Ibid. 10.

(2) Before the offering of the ‘Omer.

(3) Lev. XXIII, 14.

(4) Thus the prohibition of the new corn applies to the produce grown outside Palestine but comes into force only when Israel enter the Land.

(5) Shek. IV, 1; B.M. 118a.

(6) As there was no sowing in this year the spontaneous growth in the fields would in certain regions be guarded so as to bring from it the ‘Omer-offering.

(7) תרומת הלשכה, lit., ‘the offering of the chamber’; i.e., the funds contributed by the Shekel payers. V. Glos. s.v. terumah.

(8) Bek. 12b.

(9) Lev. XXV, 6.

(10) How then can the aftergrowth be used for the ‘Omer’-offering seeing that a handful thereof must be burnt?

(11) Ibid. XXIII, 14. I.e, this law was to continue in force for all time without interruption.

(12) Every Sabbatical year.

(13) Ibid. II, 14.

(14) It is for the following reason that’ the ‘Omer may not be offered from last year's produce.

(15) Ibid. XXIII, 10. Read קצירכם for קצירך.

(16) And by taking last year's produce for the ‘Omer one would be offering it at the time when the harvest (sc. last year's harvest) is already at its end.

(17) V. supra p. 405 and notes.

(18) Lev. II, 14.

(19) Ex. IX, 31.

(20) I.e., the Two Loaves must be offered of this year's produce at the time when the wheat is at the beginning of its harvest; likewise the ‘Omer-offering when the barley is at the beginning of its harvest; hence last year's produce is invalid. This argument is in accord with R. Eleazar and refutes R. Johanan's view.

(21) Bik. I, 3; Pes. 53a.

(22) For which the land of Israel was famed, viz., wheat, barley, grapes, figs, pomegranates, olives, and dates. V. Deut. VIII, 8.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 84b

from the dates in the hill-country nor from the produce in the valleys.[1] Said ‘Ulla, If one brought these they are not consecrated [as first-fruits].

Rabbah was once sitting and reciting this statement [of ‘Ulla] when R. Aha b. Abba raised the following objection against Rabbah: It is written, An offering of first-fruits.[2] this signifies that it[3] is to be the first of all meal-offerings; and so, too, it says, Also in the day of the first-fruits, when ye bring a new meal-offering unto the Lord in your feast of weeks.[4] I thus know that it[5] is to be the first[6] before [all the meal-offerings of] wheat; whence do I know that it is to be the first before [all meal-offerings of] barley?[7] Because the text repeats the word ‘new’;[8] and as this word is not required [twice] for [the teaching that it[5] is to be] the first before [all meal-offerings] of wheat, you may use it for [the teaching that it is to be] the first before [all meal-offerings] of barley. And whence

do I know that it[5] shall be offered before the first-fruits?[9] Because the text states, And thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, even of the first-fruits of wheat harvest.[10] I thus know that it shall be offered before the first-fruits of the wheat harvest; but whence do I know that it shall be offered before the first-fruits of the barley harvest? Because the text states, And the feast of harvest, the first-fruits of thy labours which thou sowest in the field.[11] I thus know that it shall be before [the harvest] which thou sowest; whence do I know that it shall be before that which grew of itself? Because the text states, In the field.[11] I thus know that it shall be before that which grew in the field; but whence do I know that it shall also be before that which grew on the roof, or among ruins, or in a plant-pot, or in a ship?[12] Because the text states, The first-fruits of all that is in their land.[13] And whence do I know that it shall be before the drink-offerings [of the new fruits] and the new fruits of the tree?[14] Because it says here, The first-fruits of thy labours,[15] and it says there, When thou gatherest in thy labours out of the field;[16] as there it[17] includes the [fruits for the] drink-offerings and the fruits of the tree, so here it includes the drink-offerings and the fruits of the tree. Now it stated above 'that which grew on the roof, or among ruins, or in a plant-pot, or in a ship'![18] — This last clause refers to meal-offerings.[19] To this R. Adda b. Ahabah demurred, saying, But then it says in that same verse, Every one that is clean in thy house may eat thereof;[20] [so that it cannot refer to meal-offerings since] meal-offerings may be eaten only by the males of the priesthood! — R. Mesharsheya replied. There are two [ordinances in this] verse: Shall be thine,[21] and 'Every one that is clean in thy house may eat thereof'. How are they to be explained? The latter refers to the first-fruits and the former to meal-offerings. R. Ashi said, The entire verse speaks of meal-offerings, but the latter part refers to the [priestly portion of the] cakes of the thank-offering.[22]

There is also the following dispute [on the matter]. R. Johanan said, If one brought [these fruits],[23] they are not consecrated [as first-fruits]. But Resh Lakish said, If he brought them they are consecrated [as first-fruits], for they are considered in the same light as a lean beast that was offered for an offering.[24] Now Resh Lakish's view is clear, as he states his reason for it; but what is the reason for R. Johanan's view? — R. Eleazar replied. 'I saw R. Johanan in a dream, so [I am sure that] I will say an excellent thing. The verse says. Of the first,[25] but not all the first[-fruits];[26] it also says, From thy land,[25] but not from every part of thy land'.[27] And to what purpose does Resh Lakish apply this expression 'from thy land'? — He requires it for the exposition given in the following Baraitha: R. Gamaliel son of Rabbi says, The word 'land'[25] is stated here and the word 'land' is stated there;[28] as there it refers to the species for which the land was famed, so here it refers to the species for which the land was famed.[29] And the other?[30] — [For that exposition the expression] 'land' [is sufficient], but [there is also written] 'from thy land'.[31] And the other?[32] — He does not accept [as separate expositions] 'land' and 'from thy land'.

One [Baraitha] taught: A man may bring the produce grown on a roof, or among ruins, or in a plant-pot, or in a ship [as firstfruits], and also make the recital.[33] But another [Baraitha] taught: He may bring it but does not make the recital. Now according to Resh Lakish there is no contradiction between [the rulings concerning the produce grown on] a roof, for one[34] [Baraitha] speaks of the roof of a cave[35] and the other[36] of the roof of a house. Likewise there is no contradiction between [the rulings concerning what is grown among] ruins, for one[34] [Baraitha] speaks of ruins that have been tilled,[35] and the other of ruins that have not been tilled. Likewise there is no contradiction between [the rulings concerning what is grown in] a plant-pot, for one[34] [Baraitha] speaks of a perforated [pot] and the other of an unperforated [pot]. Likewise there is no contradiction between [the rulings concerning what is grown in] a ship, for one [Baraitha][36] speaks of a ship made of wood and the other[37] of a ship made of clay.[38]

---

(1) For they are of inferior quality.

(2) Lev. II, 12. According to Rabbinic interpretation this refers to the Two Loaves and to the first-fruits; v. supra 58a.

(3) Sc. the offering of the Two Loaves; and so throughout this passage.

(4) Num. XXVIII, 26.

(5) Sc. the offering of the Two Loaves; and so throughout this passage.
(6) Lit., 'the newest.'
(7) I.e., that no private offering of the new produce of barley (e.g.. the meal-offering of jealousy. cf. Num. V, 15) shall be offered before the Two Loaves, V. Rashi MS.
(8) Cf. Lev. XXIII, 16 and Num. XXVIII, 26.
(9) I.e., before the first-fruits of wheat.
(10) Ex. XXXIV, 22. Thus the offering of the Feast of Weeks, I.e., the Two Loaves, shall even be before the first-fruits of the wheat harvest.
(11) Ibid. XXIII, 16. 'Thy labours which thou sowest' includes the barley harvest.
(12) That the first-fruits gathered from the roof etc. shall not be offered before the Two Loaves.
(13) Num. XVIII, 13.
(14) I.e., that drink-offerings from the new crops of olives and grapes, and the fruits of the first-fruits (excluding the corn) shall not be offered before the Two Loaves.
(15) Ex. XXIII, 16.
(16) Ex. XXIII, 16. This refers to the feast of ingathering, Sukkoth, at the end of the agricultural year when everything is gathered in from the field.
(17) The expression 'thy labours'.
(18) It was said that the produce grown on a roof etc. may be offered as first-fruits (save it may not be offered before the offering of the Two Loaves; v. supra p. 510, n.9); how much more is it permitted to offer as first-fruits that which grew on the hill-country or in the valleys! Thus 'Ulla's view is refuted.
(19) I.e., that meal-offerings brought from produce grown on a roof etc. (although invalid as first-fruits, in accordance with 'Ulla's view) may not be offered before the offering of the Two Loaves.
(20) Num. XVIII, 13.
(21) Ibid. This regulation implies only the males.
(22) Which may be eaten by every one of the priestly stock, males and females alike. V. Zeb. V, 7.
(23) Sc. the dates of the hill-country and the produce of the valley as first-fruits.
(24) Which undoubtedly is consecrated.
(25) Deut. XXVI, 2.
(26) Thus excluding all other kinds of fruit apart from the seven species enumerated in Deut. VIII. 8. V. supra p. 509, n. 6.
(27) Thus excluding the dates in the hill-country and the produce in the valleys.
(28) Deut. ibid.
(29) But among the seven species all fruits are valid as first-fruits, even those growing in the hill-country and in the valleys.
(30) What answer can R. Johanan give to this argument?
(31) This suggests another exposition, taking 'from' in a partitive sense, thus excluding inferior quality fruits.
(32) Resh Lakish.
(33) At the presentation of the first-fruits at the Sanctuary. V. Deut. XXVI, 5-11.
(34) The first Baraitha.
(35) This is regarded as land in the ordinary sense, and the produce thereof may be brought as first-fruits.
(36) The second Baraitha.
(37) The first Baraitha.
(38) What is grown in this ship is regarded as grown on land. V, however, Tosaf. s.v. כאן).

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 85a

There is here, however, a difficulty for R. Johanan![1] — Tannaim [differ in this matter], for it was taught: A man may bring [as first-fruits] what [is grown] on a roof or among ruins[2] and also make the recital; but what [is grown] in a plant-pot and in a ship he may not bring at all.[3]

ALL [OFFERINGS] MUST BE OFFERED FROM THE CHOICEST PRODUCE etc. Johana[4] and Mamre[4] said to Moses, 'Wouldst thou carry straw to Hafaraim?'[5] He answered them, 'There is a

common saying. "Bring herbs to Herbtown".'[6]

MISHNAH. ONE MAY NOT BRING [IT][7] FROM THE PRODUCE OF A MANURED FIELD[8] OR FROM AN IRRIGATED FIELD[9] OR FROM A FIELD STOCKED WITH TREES;[10] BUT IF ONE DID BRING IT [FROM THESE] IT WAS VALID. HOW WAS IT[11] PREPARED? IN THE FIRST YEAR IT WAS BROKEN UP AND IN THE SECOND YEAR IT WAS SOWN SEVENTY DAYS BEFORE PASSOVER; THUS IT WOULD PRODUCE FINE FLOUR IN ABUNDANCE. HOW WAS IT TESTED?[12] THE TEMPLE-TREASURER USED TO THRUST HIS HAND INTO IT; IF SOME DUST CAME UP IN [HIS HAND] IT WAS INVALID, UNTIL IT WAS SIFTED [ONCE MORE]. IF IT HAD BECOME MAGOTTY IT IS INVALID.

GEMARA. How WAS IT PREPARED? IN THE FIRST YEAR IT WAS BROKEN UP etc. The question was raised: What is meant by this? [Does it mean that] it was broken up in the first year and in the second year it was again broken up and then sown, or that it was broken up in the first year and in the second year it was sown without having been broken up again? — Come and hear: R. Jose said, They would have brought it[13] even from the wheat of Karzaim[14] and of Kefar Ahim[15] if only they had been nearer to Jerusalem;[16] since they may bring the 'Omer-offering only from the fields in the south,[17] and which had been broken up for the purpose, for upon these fields the sun rises and upon these the sun sets.[18] How was [the field] prepared? In the first year it was broken up and in the second year it was ploughed twice, and it was sown seventy days before the Passover so that it might be close upon the [increasing strength of the] sun;[19] thus it would bring forth stalks one span long and ears two spans long. It was then reaped, bound into sheaves, threshed, winnowed, cleansed, ground, and sifted, and then brought to the Temple-treasurer. The Temple-treasurer would thrust his hand into it; if some dust came up in his hand he would say to him [who brought it]. 'Go and sift it a second time' — In the name of R. Nathan it is said, The Temple-treasurer used to smear his hand with oil and thrust it into the flour until he had brought up all the dust.[20] Now it expressly stated above, '[And in the second year] it was ploughed twice'![21] — But even as you would have it, [is not this Baraitha in conflict with our Mishnah]? For our Mishnah does not say 'twice',

---

(1) For according to both Baraithas the produce grown on a roof etc, may be brought as first-fruits, yet R. Johanan holds that what is grown in the hill-country or in the valleys is not consecrated as first-fruits!

(2) I.e., on the roof of a cave, which is soil in its natural state, and among ruins that have been broken up and tilled. This is a superior growth to that grown in the hill-country or in the valley.

(3) For it is of inferior quality; and so too the fruits of the hill-country and in the valleys.

(4) They were the chief magicians in Egypt in the time of Moses. They are mentioned in Jewish literature also under the name of Jannes and Jambres. V. J. E. VIII, p. 71.

(5) So MS.M. and other MSS.; in cur. edd. 'Afraim, v. note on this word in Mishnah, supra p. 506. Hafaraim was a town where apparently there was a plentiful supply of straw, and so it became proverbial to describe wasted efforts as 'carrying straw to Hafaraim'. (Cf. to carry coals to Newcastle'). As Egypt was reputed to be a land of magic and sorcery these magicians thus taunted Moses when he performed his wonders before the Pharaoh.

(6) For all merchants flock there and the demand for herbs is great.

(7) Sc. the 'Omer-offering or the Two Loaves (Rashi MS.). According to Tosaf., the reference is to all meal-offerings.

(8) For it is feared that the field might not have been sufficiently manured; or because the manure would impair the taste of the crops.

(9) For it may not have been sufficiently watered.

(10) And the crops are sown among the trees. The trees draw off the richness of the soil so that the crops are of a poor quality.

(11) Sc. the field, that it might produce an abundant crop of the finest quality.

(12) To ascertain whether the flour had been sufficiently sifted.

(13) Here apparently the reference is to all meal-offerings, notwithstanding the mention of the 'Omer-offering later in this sentence, since wheat is expressly mentioned and wheat was not offered in the 'Omer-offering but barley. On the other hand, it might very well be that the word 'חוּטַי, translated wheat, is part of the name of the place, the whole

being a compound place-name חיטי כרזיים V. Tosaf. s.v. אין.

(14) Var. lec. Barhaim (Tosef. IX). Karwaim (MS.M.). Probably It is the Kharazin mentioned in the N.T. (Matt. XI, 21, Luke X, 13). V. Neubauer Geographie p. 220.

(15) Var. Kefar Ahus (Tosef. ibid.). K. Ahis, K. Ahia (MSS.). The name is very likely a variant of Kefar Nahum, i.e., Capernaum. V. Neubauer p. 221.

(16) For it is not proper to let pass the opportunity of performing the precept, and as there could be found produce of a similar good quality in places nearer Jerusalem that must be used.

(17) Sc. of Palestine (Rashi). According to Tosaf fields on a hill-side facing south.

(18) I.e., the sun is shining on these fields for the greater part of the day.

(19) When the sun's rays would have a beneficial effect upon the sowing.

(20) For only the fine dust in the flour would adhere to his hand.

(21) From this Baraitha it is evident that our Mishnah must mean that the field was broken up (i.e., ploughed) even in the second year.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 85b

whilst this Baraitha expressly says 'twice'! — This is no difficulty, for in the one case the field had been tilled[1] [in the first year], and in the other it had not been tilled. How is it then [with regard to our original question]?[2] — Come and hear, for it was taught: Half of [the field] was broken up and the other half sown, and [in the following year] half of it was broken up and the other half sown.[3]

R. Johanan said. The 'Omer-offering was brought only from [the produce of] fields in the south of the Land of Israel, upon which the sun rises and upon which the sun sets. Half of the field was broken up while the other half was sown.[4]

It was taught: Abba Saul said, The 'Omer-offering was usually brought from the [produce of the] valley of Beth Makleh.[5] which was an area that produced three se'ahs; it lay in the south and the sun rose upon it and the sun set upon it. Half of it was broken up while the other half was sown, and [in the following year] half of it was broken up and the other half was sown.

R. Hilkiah b. Tobi had a piece of land; one half he broke up and the other half he sowed, and [similarly in the following year] one half he broke up and the other half he sowed. It thus brought forth twofold, and he sold the wheat for fine flour.

IF IT HAD BECOME MAGGOTY IT IS INVALID. Our Rabbis taught: If the greater part of the fine flour became maggoty it is invalid; if the greater part of the wheat became maggoty it is invalid. R. Jeremiah enquired. Does it mean the greater part of each grain [of wheat],[6] or the greater part of the se'ah [of wheat]?[7] — The question remains undecided.

Raba raised this question. If a man consecrated [maggoty flour for a meal-offering] does he incur stripes for consecrating a blemished thing or not?[8] Since it is unfit for the offering it is like a blemished animal; or [shall we say that the prohibition of] a blemished thing applies only to animals? — The question remains undecided.

We have learnt elsewhere: Any wood in which was found a worm is unfit [to be burnt] upon the altar.[9] Samuel said, This was taught only [if found] in damp wood, but in dry wood it can be scraped away and [the wood] is valid. Raba raised the question. If a man consecrated it[10] does he incur stripes for consecrating a blemished thing or not? Since it is unfit it is like a blemished animal; or [shall we say that] the prohibition of a blemished thing applies only to animals? — This too remains undecided.

MISHNAH. TEKOA[11] RANKS FIRST FOR THE QUALITY OF ITS OIL. ABBA SAUL SAYS,

SECOND TO IT IS REGEB[12] BEYOND THE JORDAN. THE [OIL OF THE] WHOLE LAND WAS VALID, BUT THEY USED TO BRING IT ONLY FROM THESE PLACES. ONE MAY NOT BRING IT FROM A MANURED FIELD[13] OR FROM AN IRRIGATED FIELD[13] OR FROM OLIVE-TREES[13] PLANTED IN A FIELD SOWN WITH SEEDS; BUT IF ONE DID BRING IT [FROM THESE] IT WAS VALID. ONE MAY NOT BRING ANFAKINON,[14] YET IF ONE DID BRING IT IT WAS VALID.[15] ONE MAY NOT BRING IT FROM OLIVE-BERRIES WHICH HAD BEEN SOAKED IN WATER OR PRESERVED OR STEWED; AND IF ONE DID BRING IT IT WAS INVALID.

GEMARA. And Joab sent to Tekoa and fetched thence a wise woman.[16] Why to Tekoa? — R. Johanan said, Because they were accustomed to olive oil, wisdom could be found among them.

Our Rabbis taught: And let him dip his foot in oil:[17] this refers to the territory of Asher which flowed with oil like a fountain. It is related that once the people of Laodicea were in need of oil; they appointed an agent[18] and instructed him, 'Go and purchase for us a hundred myriad [manehs'] worth of oil'. He came first to Jerusalem and was told, 'Go to Tyre'. He came to Tyre and was told, 'Go to Gush Halab'.[19] When he came to Gush Halab he was told, 'Go to So-and-so in that field'. [He went there] and found the man breaking up the earth around his olive trees. [The agent] said to him. 'Have you a hundred myriad [manehs'] worth of oil that I require'? 'Yes', replied the other; 'but wait until I finish my work'. He waited until the other had finished his work. After he had finished his work he threw his tools on his back and went on his way, removing the stones from his path as he went.[20] The agent thought to himself,[21] 'Has this man really got[21] a hundred myriad [manehs'] worth of oil? I see that the Jews have merely made game of me'. As soon as he reached his home town that man's maidservant brought out to him a bowl of hot water and he washed his hands and his feet. She then brought out to him a golden bowl of oil and he dipped in it his hands and his feet, thus fulfilling the verse, 'And let him dip his feet in oil'. After they had eaten and drunk the man measured out to the agent a hundred myriad [manehs'] worth of oil, and then asked, 'Do you perhaps need any more oil?' 'I do, indeed', replied the agent; 'but I have no more money with me'. 'Well, if you wish to buy more, take it, and I will go back with you for the money', said the man. He then measured out for him another eighteen myriad [manehs'] worth of oil. It is said that he[22] hired every horse, mule, camel and ass that he could find in all the Land of Israel. When he reached his home town all the townspeople came out to meet him and applaud him. 'Do not applaud me', he said to them, 'but this man, my companion. who measured out for me a hundred myriad [manehs'] worth of oil, and whom I still owe eighteen myriad [manehs]'. This illustrates the verse, There is that pretendeth himself rich, yet hath nothing; there is that pretendeth himself poor, yet hath great wealth.'[23] ONE MAY NOT BRING IT FROM A MANURED FIELD etc. But has it not been taught that one may not bring anfakinon

---

(1) This is the case of our Mishnah, hence the Tanna of our Mishnah did not state 'twice', for since the field was tilled in the first year it was not necessary to plough it twice in the second year. The question, however, still remains whether according to the Tanna of our Mishnah it is necessary to plough it once in the second year before the sowing or not!

(2) V. prec. n. The most lucid interpretation of the entire passage is to be found in the commentary לחם משנה on Maim. Yad, Issure Mizbeah. VII, 4.

(3) Each year only half of the field was sown and the other half lay fallow, but the parts were reversed in alternate years, thus the half that lay fallow in the previous year was now sown, and the half that was sown then was now broken up. It is evident therefore that there was no breaking up of the field before the sowing. There is, however, a difference of opinion between the commentators as to whether it was necessary in the first year. i.e., at the outset when cultivating the field, to break up the whole field or only half.

(4) So MS.M. and Sh. Mek. This sentence is omitted in cur. edd.

(5) In the valley of Kidron; cf. Tosef. Men. X.

(6) But if only a small part of each grain had become maggoty it is still valid.

(7) I.e., if the greater part of the quantity of wheat intended for the meal-offering had become maggoty, even though

there are in the mass many grains that have not been affected, the whole is invalid.

(8) For consecrating a blemished animal one incurs the penalty of stripes on five counts, v. Tem. 6b.

(9) Mid. II, 5.

(10) Sc. wood with worms.

(11) Cf. Amos I, 1; a city S.E. of Bethlehem (Neub. op. cit. p. 129). According to Graetz and Bacher, it is a town in Galilee.

(12) Probably Ragaba mentioned in Josephus, Ant. XIII, 15, 5.

(13) The olives grown here are of an inferior quality.

(14) אנפקינון (so MS.M.; cur. edd. אנפקטן is corrupt) = **, oil made of unripe olives. V. Gemara.

(15) In many MSS. and in the Mishnah edd. the reading is INVALID.

(16) II Sam. XIV, 2.

(17) Deut. XXXIII, 24.

(18) פולמוסטום Jast. suggests the reading אפימליטים, **. manager, commissioner. V. B.B., (Sonc. ed.) p. 617 n. 7.

(19) In Upper Galilee. Cf. Gischala mentioned by Josephus.

(20) This led the agent to believe that the man whom he was accompanying was not wealthy and that he certainly could not supply him with all the oil he required.

(21) Adopting' the reading as in MS.M. אמר פולמוסרא לזה יש לו וכו.

(22) The agent. Lit., 'that man did not leave out either a horse . . . which he did not hire'.

(23) Prov. XIII, 7.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 86a

and if one did bring it it was invalid, for it is only the sap [of the olive]? — R. Joseph answered, It is no difficulty; one teaching[1] represents the view of R. Hiyya, and the other represents the view of R. Simeon son of Rabbi. For R. Hiyya used to throw it[2] away, while R. Simeon son of Rabbi used to dip his food in it. And in order to remember this think of the saying. 'The rich are parsimonious'.[3]

'Six months with oil of myrrh.[4] What is oil of myrrh? — R. Huna b. Hiyya said, It is stacte.[5] R. Jeremiah b. Abba said, It is oil from olives not a third grown.

It was taught: R. Judah says. Anfakinon is the oil of olives not a third grown. And why is it used for smearing? Because it removes the hair and softens the skin.

ONE MAY NOT BRING IT FROM OLIVE-BERRIES WHICH HAD BEEN SOAKED IN WATER. Our Rabbis taught: Oil from olives which had been preserved or stewed or soaked in water, or oil from the olive dregs, or from foul smelling olives may not be brought, and if it was brought it is invalid.

Rabba raised the question, If a man consecrated it does he incur stripes for consecrating a blemished thing or not? Since it is unfit it is like a blemished animal; or [shall we say that] the prohibition of a blemished thing applies only to animals? — This question remains undecided.

MISHNAH. THERE ARE THREE [PERIODS OF GATHERING IN THE] OLIVES AND EACH CROP GIVES THREE KINDS OF OIL.[6] THE FIRST CROP OF OLIVES IS WHEN THE OLIVES ARE PICKED[7] FROM THE TOP OF THE TREE; THEY ARE POUNDED[8] AND PUT INTO THE BASKET[9] (R. JUDAH SAYS, AROUND THE BASKET);[10] THIS GIVES THE FIRST OIL. THEY[11] ARE THEN PRESSED WITH THE BEAM (R. JUDAH SAYS, WITH STONES);[12] THIS GIVES THE SECOND OIL. THEY[13] ARE THEN GROUND AND PRESSED AGAIN; THIS GIVES THE THIRD OIL. THE FIRST [OIL] IS FIT FOR THE CANDLESTICK AND THE OTHERS FOR MEAL-OFFERINGS. THE SECOND CROP IS WHEN THE OLIVES AT ROOF-LEVEL[14] ARE PICKED FROM THE TREE; THEY ARE POUNDED AND PUT INTO

THE BASKET (R. JUDAH SAYS, AROUND THE BASKET); THIS GIVES THE FIRST OIL. THEY ARE THEN PRESSED WITH THE BEAM (R. JUDAH SAYS, WITH STONES); THIS GIVES THE SECOND OIL. THEY ARE THEN GROUND AND PRESSED AGAIN; THIS GIVES THE THIRD OIL. THE FIRST [OIL] IS FIT FOR THE CANDLESTICK AND THE OTHERS FOR MEAL-OFFERINGS. THE THIRD CROP IS WHEN THE LAST OLIVES[15] OF THE TREE ARE PACKED IN THE VAT UNTIL THEY BECOME OVERRIPE;[16] THEY ARE THEN TAKEN UP AND DRIED ON THE ROOF, AND THEN POUNDED AND PUT INTO THE BASKET (R. JUDAH SAYS, AROUND THE BASKET); THIS GIVES THE FIRST OIL. THEY ARE NEXT PRESSED WITH THE BEAM (R. JUDAH SAYS, WITH STONES) THIS GIVES THE SECOND OIL. THEY ARE THEN GROUND AND PRESSED AGAIN; THIS GIVES THE THIRD OIL. THE FIRST [OIL] IS FIT FOR THE CANDLESTICK AND THE OTHERS FOR MEAL-OFFERINGS.

GEMARA. It was asked: Does the Mishnah read megargero or megalgelo?[17] — Come and hear, for it was taught: Olive oil,[18] that is, from the olive tree.[19] Hence they said, The first crop is when the fully ripe olives are picked[20] from the top of the tree; they are brought into the olive-press, are ground in a mill and put into baskets. The oil which oozes out is the first kind [of oil]. They are then pressed with the beam, and the oil which oozes out is the second kind. Then they are taken out [of the olive-press] and ground and pressed again; this gives the third kind. The first kind is fit for the candlestick and the others for meal-offerings. The same [procedure applies] to the second crop of olives. The third crop of olives is when the last olives of the tree are packed in the vat until they become overripe; they are then taken up on to the roof and dried in the same manner as dates, until the juice has run off. They are then brought into the olive-press, are ground in a mill and put into baskets; and the oil which oozes out is the first kind [of oil]. They are then pressed with the beam; and the oil which oozes out is the second kind. Then they are taken out [of the olive-press] and ground and pressed again; this gives the third kind. The first kind is fit for the candlestick and the others for meal-offerings. R. Judah says. The olives were not ground in a mill but pounded in a mortar; they were not pressed with the beam but with stones; and they were not put into the baskets but around the sides of the baskets.

Is not [the text itself of our Mishnah] self-contradictory? The statement THEY ARE POUNDED is in agreement with R. Judah whilst the statement PUT INTO THE BASKET is in agreement with the Rabbis! — This Tanna [of our Mishnah] agrees with R. Judah in one thing and disagrees with him in the other.

MISHNAH. As TO THE FIRST OIL OF THE FIRST CROP, THERE IS NONE BETTER THAN IT. THE SECOND OIL OF THE FIRST CROP AND THE FIRST OIL OF THE SECOND CROP ARE EQUAL. THE THIRD OIL OF THE FIRST CROP. THE SECOND OIL OF THE SECOND CROP. AND THE FIRST OIL OF THE THIRD CROP ARE EQUAL. THE THIRD OIL OF THE SECOND CROP AND THE SECOND OIL OF THE THIRD CROP ARE EQUAL. AS TO THE THIRD OIL OF THE THIRD CROP. THERE IS NONE WORSE THAN IT. BY RIGHT IT COULD BE INFERRED BY THE FOLLOWING ARGUMENT THAT MEAL-OFFERINGS SHOULD REQUIRE THE PUREST OLIVE OIL: IF THE CANDLESTICK, WHICH DOES NOT NEED [THE OIL] FOR EATING, REQUIRES PURE OLIVE OIL, HOW MUCH MORE DO MEAL-OFFERINGS, WHICH [NEED THE OIL] FOR EATING,[21] REQUIRE PURE OLIVE OIL! BUT THE TEXT STATES, PURE OLIVE OIL BEATEN FOR THE LIGHT,[22] BUT NOT 'PURE OLIVE OIL BEATEN FOR MEAL-OFFERINGS.

---

(1) Sc. the Baraitha which states that anfakinon is absolutely invalid.

(2) Sc. anfakinon, the sap of the olives.

(3) Thus informing us that it was R. Simeon, the son of the Nasi and a wealthy man, who would use it with his food. Cf. Hul. 46a.

(4) Esth. II, 12.
(5) סטכתא, oil of myrrh.
(6) Another interpretation is: There are three ways of making ready the olives and from each of them come three kinds of oil.
(7) Heb. מגרגרו from root גרגר= to pick single berries as soon as they ripen. According to the other interpretation the translation of this sentence would read: The first way of making ready the olives is this: the olives are allowed to become fully ripe. then they are pounded etc.
(8) In a mortar.
(9) And the oil oozes out and filters through the basket into the vessel below.
(10) The pounded olives are placed around the sides of the basket so that the oil when it oozes out does not mix with any solid matter but runs down the sides and filters through the bottom of the basket.
(11) Sc. the pounded olives.
(12) But not with the beam, for the heavy pressure of the beam would squeeze out the dregs with the oil.
(13) Sc. the olives after being pressed.
(14) I.e., the middle branches of the tree, whose fruits do not ripen as early as the fruit on the top branches. As olive-trees often grew near the houses it was even possible to pluck the olives from the middle branches while standing on the roof. According to the other interpretation mentioned supra p. 519, n. 6, the translation here would be: The second way of making ready the olives is this: The olives are allowed to become fully ripe on the rood-tops, then they are ground etc.
(15) I.e., those on the lowest branches which for lack of sun will never ripen on the tree. According to the other interpretation mentioned the rendering here would be: The third way of making ready the olives is this: the olives are packed etc.
(16) Lit., 'become rotten'.
(17) מגרגרו or מגלגלו The question may be simply orthographical, and the two words really bear the same meaning. viz., to pick single fruits as soon as they ripen. Aliter: מגרגרו, to pick single berries; מגלגלו, to allow the olives to remain on the tree until they are fully ripe (cf. ביצה מגולגלת, a well-roasted egg) and then pick them.
(18) Ex. XXVII, 20.
(19) I.e., the olives must be fully ripe on the tree before being plucked.
(20) Heb. מגלגלו. V. notes on the Mishnah.
(21) I.e., for burning upon the altar, which is described as 'eating'. cf. Lev. VI, 3.
(22) Ex. XXVII, 20.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 86b

GEMARA. ARE EQUAL! [But is this possible?] Have you not said, 'The first kind is fit for the candlestick and the others for meal-offerings'?[1] — R. Nahman b. Isaac answered, The statement ARE EQUAL means that they are equal in respect of meal-offerings.[2]

BY RIGHT IT COULD BE INFERRED BY THE FOLLOWING ARGUMENT THAT MEAL-OFFERINGS etc. Our Rabbis taught:[It is written.] 'Pure'; [and the expression] 'pure' means nothing else but clear.[3] R. Judah says. [It is written,] Beaten; [and the expression] 'beaten' means nothing else but pounded.[4] I might then think that this pounded oil is not valid for meal-offerings.[5] therefore the text states, And a tenth part of an ephah of fine flour mingled with the fourth part of a hin of beaten oil.[6] Why then did the text state, For the light?[7] — Out of regard to the sparing [of expense]. What is meant by 'out of regard to the sparing'? — Said R. Eleazar, The Torah wished to spare Israel unnecessary expense.[8]

Command the children of Israel that they bring unto thee pure olive oil beaten for the light.[9] R. Samuel b. Nahmani said, 'Unto thee', but not unto Me, for I am not in need of light.

The table was on the north side and the candlestick on the south side.[10] R. Zerika said in the name of R. Eleazar, I am not in need of food and l am not in need of light.[11]

And for the house he made windows broad and narrow;[12] 'broad' without and 'narrow' within, for I am not in need of light.[13]

Without the veil of the testimony in the tent of meeting.[14] It is a testimony to mankind that the Divine Presence rests in Israel. For how can you say He[15] is in need of light, when the whole of the forty years that the Israelites travelled in the wilderness they travelled only by His[16] light! But it is a testimony to mankind that the Divine Presence rests in Israel. What is the testimony?Rab said, It was the western lamp[17] [of the candlestick] into which the same quantity of oil was poured as into the others,[18] yet he kindled the others from it and ended with it.[19]

MISHNAH. FROM WHENCE DID THEY BRING THE WINE?[20] KERUHIM[21] AND 'ATTULIM RANK FIRST FOR THE QUALITY OF THEIR WINE. SECOND TO THEM ARE BETH RIMMAH, BETH LABAN ON THE HILL. AND KEFAR SIGNA IN THE VALLEY. [WINE OF THE] WHOLE LAND WAS VALID BUT THEY USED TO BRING IT ONLY FROM THESE PLACES. ONE MAY NOT BRING IT FROM A MANURED FIELD OR FROM AN IRRIGATED FIELD OR FROM VINES PLANTED IN A FIELD SOWN WITH SEEDS;[22] BUT IF ONE DID BRING IT [FROM THESE] IT WAS VALID. ONE MAY NOT BRING WINE FROM SUN-DRIED GRAPES,[23] BUT IF ONE DID BRING IT IT WAS VALID. ONE MAY NOT BRING OLD WINE.[24] SO RABBI. BUT THE SAGES PERMIT IT. ONE MAY NOT BRING SWEET WINE[25] OR SMOKED WINE OR COOKED WINE, AND IF ONE DID BRING IT IT WAS INVALID. ONE MAY NOT BRING WINE FROM THE GRAPES OF THE ESPALIER, BUT ONLY FROM THE VINES GROWING FROM THE GROUND AND FROM WELL-CULTIVATED VINEYARDS. ONE DID NOT PUT [THE WINE] IN LARGE CASKS BUT IN SMALL BARRELS; AND ONE DID NOT FILL THE BARRELS TO THE BRIM SO THAT ITS SCENT MIGHT SPREAD.[26] ONE MAY NOT TAKE THE WINE AT THE MOUTH OF THE BARREL BECAUSE OF

---

(1) Thus the second kind of oil of the first crop is not fit for the candlestick but only for meal-offerings, whereas the first kind of oil of the second crop is fit even for the candlestick!

(2) I.e., they are of equal quality. and if a man has to bring a meal-offering he may bring with it either kind of oil.

(3) I.e., the oil which oozes by itself from the olives without any pressure being applied.

(4) Sc. in a mortar, but not ground in a mill.

(5) For Scripture expressly says. Beaten (i.e. pounded) for the light. but for no other purpose.

(6) Ex. XXIX, 40.

(7) Seeing that beaten oil is valid also for meal-offerings.

(8) V. Sifra on Lev. XIV, 36. And since the meal-offering required a considerable amount of oil the Torah therefore ordained pure beaten oil only for the light.

(9) Lev. XXIV, 2.

(10) In the Sanctuary.

(11) This is demonstrated by the fact that God ordained the placing of the candlestick far away from the table; with human beings it is usual to place the lamp close to the table.

(12) I Kings VI, 4.

(13) The windows were thus constructed in a manner contrary to the usual practice to prove that God has no need of light.

(14) Lev. XXIV,3 with reference to the preparation and kindling of the candlestick.

(15) According to R. Tam the reference is to Aaron the priest; v. Tosaf s.v. מהו"ין and Shab. 22b.

(16) V. p. 523, n. 13.

(17) I.e., the central lamp (for its wick was turned towards the west), according to the view that the candlestick was so placed that its branches extended to the north and to the south; or the second lamp counting from the east, assuming that the candlestick was so placed that its branches extended to the east and to the west. V. infra 98b.

(18) Sc. half a log. the quantity estimated to burn through the longest night.

(19) By the morning the oil in the lamps had burnt out and the priest came in and cleaned out the lamps, removing the old wicks and putting in new wicks, and pouring oil into them ready for kindling in the evening. The western lamp (v. supra n. 2). however, although it had no more oil than any of the other lamps, miraculously continued to burn the whole day long, so that when the lamps were to be kindled in the evening they were kindled from this one. The western lamp itself was then extinguished and cleaned out, a fresh wick put in, oil poured in, and then relit. Thus this lamp provided the fire for lighting the other lamps, and yet was the last to be cleaned out. This miracle testified to the Divine Presence in Israel.
(20) For the drink-offerings.
(21) The place names enumerated in this Mishnah admit of many variants and the suggested identifications are doubtful. According to Neubauer, Geographie p. 82ff, Keruhim = Coreae (in north of Judah), 'Attulim = Kefer Hatla (north of Gilgal). Beth Rimmah and Laban = the present Beit Rima and Lubban (north-west of Jerusalem), and Kefar Signa = Sukneh (near Jaffa).
(22) As to the question of kil'ayim'. v. Com. of Rashba, a.l.
(23) הליסטון or אליסטון = **, a sweet wine made from grapes dried in the sun.
(24) i.e., which is more than a year old and its redness is not so sparkling.
(25) Made from a kind of sweet grapes. in contradistinction from grapes sweetened in the sun. Aliter: new wine, must.
(26) The scent would fill the space in the barrel above the wine and settle there, thus the wine would retain its scent. Were the barrel to be filled to the brim its scent would be lost as soon as it was opened.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 87a

THE SCUM, NOR THAT AT THE BOTTOM BECAUSE OF THE LEES; BUT ONE SHOULD TAKE IT ONLY FROM THE MIDDLE THIRD OF THE BARREL.[1] HOW WAS IT TESTED?[2] THE TEMPLE-TREASURER USED TO SIT NEARBY WITH HIS STICK[3] IN HIS HAND; WHEN THE FROTH BURST FORTH HE WOULD KNOCK WITH HIS STICK.[4] R. JOSE SON OF R. JUDAH SAYS, WINE ON WHICH THERE IS A SCUM IS INVALID, FOR IT IS WRITTEN, THEY SHALL BE UNTO YOU WITHOUT BLEMISH, AND THEIR MEAL-OFFERING;[5] AND THEY SHALL BE UNTO YOU WITHOUT BLEMISH, AND THEIR DRINK-OFFERINGS.[6] GEMARA. ONE MAY NOT BRING SWEET WINE OR SMOKED WINE OR COOKED WINE. AND IF ONE DID BRING IT IT WAS INVALID. But does not [the Mishnah] state in an earlier clause, ONE MAY NOT BRING WINE FROM SUN-DRIED GRAPES.[7] BUT IF ONE DID BRING IT IT WAS VALID? — Rabina answered, Combine them and learn them together.[8] R. Ashi answered, If the sweetness is by reason of the sun it is not nauseous, but if the sweetness is in the fruit itself it is nauseous.[9]

ONE MAY NOT BRING OLD WINE. SO RABBI. BUT THE SAGES PERMIT IT. Hezekiah said, What is the reason for Rabbi's view? Because the verse reads, For a lamb wine;[10] as a lamb [for an offering] may be only one year old, so wine may be only one year old. Then it should follow, should it not, that as a lamb that is two years old is invalid, so wine that is two years old is invalid? And should you say that it is indeed so, but it has been taught: One may not bring wine that is two years old, but if one did bring it it was valid. Now who is it that rules that one may not bring [old wine]? Obviously Rabbi; yet it says 'But if one did bring it it was valid'! — Rather said Raba, this is the reason for Rabbi's view; it is written, Look not thou upon the wine when it is red.[11]

ONE MAY NOT BRING WINE FROM THE GRAPES OF THE ESPALIER etc. A Tanna taught: [It must come from] vineyards that are cultivated twice in the year.

R. Joseph once had a garden-plot which he used to give an extra hoeing and it produced wine that could take twice the usual amount of water.[12]

ONE DID NOT PUT [THE WINE] IN LARGE CASKS. A Tanna taught: [By BARRELS are meant] the medium-sized pitcher-shaped Lydian vessels.[13] They should not be put away in twos but

singly.[14]

HOW WAS IT TESTED? THE TEMPLE-TREASURER USED TO SIT NEARBY WITH HIS STICK IN HIS HAND; WHEN THE FROTH BURST FORTH HE WOULD KNOCK WITH HIS STICK. A Tanna taught: When the froth of the lees burst forth the Temple-treasurer would knock with his stick. And why did he not say so?[15] — This supports R. Johanan. for R. Johanan said', In the same way as speech is beneficial to the spices[16] so is speech injurious to wine.

R. JOSE SON OF R. JUDAH SAYS etc., R. Johanan[17] raised the question. If a man consecrated it[18] does he incur stripes for consecrating a blemished thing or not? Since it is unfit it is like a blemished animal; or [shall we say that the prohibition of] a blemished thing applies only to animals? — This question remains undecided.

Our Rabbis taught: Rams [were brought] from Moab, lambs from Hebron, calves from Sharon, and doves from the Royal Mountain.[19] R. Judah said, One should bring lambs whose height was equal to their breadth.[20] Raba son of R. Shila said, What is the reason for R. Judah's view? — For it is written, In that day shall thy cattle feed, the broad lambs.[21]

It is written, I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem; they shall never hold their peace day nor night; ye that are the Lord's remembrancers, take ye no rest.[22] What do they say? — Raba son of R. Shila said. [They say,] Thou wilt arise and have compassion upon Zion.[23] R. Nahman b. Isaac said, [They say,] The Lord doth build up Jerusalem.[24] And what did they say before this?[25] — Raba son of R. Shila said, [They used to say.] For the Lord hath chosen Zion; He hath desired it for His habitation.[26] CHAPTER X

MISHNAH. THERE WERE TWO DRY-MEASURES IN THE TEMPLE: THE TENTH[27] AND THE HALF-TENTH.[28] R. MEIR SAYS, A TENTH, [ANOTHER] TENTH, AND A HALF-TENTH. FOR WHAT PURPOSE DID THE TENTH MEASURE SERVE? BY IT ONE USED TO MEASURE THE MEAL-OFFERINGS. ONE DID NOT MEASURE WITH A THREE-TENTHS MEASURE [THE MEAL-OFFERING] FOR A BULLOCK[29] OR WITH A TWO-TENTHS MEASURE [THE MEAL-OFFERING] FOR A RAM,[30] BUT ONE MEASURED THEM BY SO MANY TENTHS. FOR WHAT PURPOSE DID THE HALF-TENTH MEASURE SERVE? BY IT ONE USED TO MEASURE THE GRIDDLECAKES OF THE HIGH PRIEST[31] [WHICH WAS OFFERED] THE HALF IN THE MORNING AND THE HALF TOWARDS EVENING.

GEMARA. It was taught: R. Meir used to say. Wherefore does the text state, A tenth, a tenth for every lamb?[32] To teach you that there were two tenth measures in the Temple, one heaped[33] and the other level. With the heaped measure they used to measure all meal-offerings.

---

(1) I.e., the barrel is pierced in its side in the middle and the tap inserted there; in this manner the wine drawn off is from the middle of the barrel.

(2) To ascertain whether the wine was of a good quality.

(3) A measuring stick (Rashi). A staff, the symbol of his authority (Tif. Yis.).

(4) As a sign that no more wine shall be drawn off, for the wine that follows is not so pure but is mixed with the lees (Maim.).

(5) Num. XXVIII, 19, 20. The meal-offering must also be free from blemishes, hence if the meal was maggoty it is invalid.

(6) Ibid, 31. The drink-offering shall also be free from blemish, hence if there is a scum on the wine it is invalid.

(7) Which is a sweet wine.

(8) Thus: one may not bring wine from sun-dried grapes or sweet wine etc., and if one did bring it it was invalid. According to Tosaf s.v. כרוך it was valid.

(9) And therefore invalid.
(10) Num. XXVIII, 14.
(11) Prov. XXIII, 31. Hence red wine is the choicest; but after one year the wine loses its redness and brightness.
(12) Usually wine was adulterated with water in the proportion of three parts of water to one of wine (cf. Shab. 77a); this wine could stand an admixture of water in the proportion of six parts of water to one of wine.
(13) Or 'the medium-sized Lydian pitchers'. Cf. however Tosef. Men. IX, where it reads: The wine was not put in large casks or in small barrels but in medium-sized pitcher-shaped vessels.
(14) So that if one barrel turned bad none of the others would be affected.
(15) That the froth is now coming out and no more wine should be drawn from the barrel.
(16) During the preparation of the spices for the incense much talking was going on as this was considered beneficial for it. Cf. Ker. 6b.
(17) Sh. Mek. 'Raba'; cf. supra p. 516.
(18) Sc. wine with scum.
(19) Lit., 'the mountain of the King'. I.e., the hill-country of Judea. V. Git. (Sonc. ed.) p. 254. n. 4.
(20) According to another reading: שגביהן רחבים 'whose backs are broad'.
(21) Isa. XXX, 23. So according to Talmudic exposition; in the E.V. in large pastures.
(22) Ibid. LXII, 6.
(23) Ps. CII, 14.
(24) Ps. CXLVII, 2.
(25) Sc. before the destruction of Jerusalem.
(26) lbid. CXXXII, 13.
(27) Sc. of an ephah. And so throughout.
(28) These were the two measuring standards used in the Temple for dry-stuffs; but of course there were many vessels of each size.
(29) Which consisted of three tenths of flour.
(30) Which consisted of two tenths.
(31) Cf. Lev. VI, 13ff.
(32) Num. XXVIII, 29.
(33) I.e., the vessel was actually less than a tenth and only when heaped did it amount to a tenth.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 87b

With the level measure they used to measure the griddle-cakes of the High Priest.[1] But the Sages said, There was but one tenth measure there, as it is said, And one tenth for every lamb.[2] Wherefore then does the text state, 'A tenth, a tenth'? In order to include the half-tenth. Whence does R. Meir derive the half-tenth [measure]? — He derives it from [the expression], And one tenth.[3] And the Rabbis? — They base no exposition upon the letter waw ['and']. And for what purpose does R. Meir apply the verse, And one tenth for every lamb? — To teach that one should not measure with a three-tenths measure [the meal-offering] for a bullock or with a two-tenths measure [the meal-offering] for a ram. And the Rabbis?[4] They derive it from the dot[5] [above the word]. For it has been taught: R. Jose said, Wherefore is there a dot above the waw in the middle of the first 'issaron[6] stated in connection with the offerings for the first day of the Feast [of Tabernacles]? [To teach] that one may not measure with a three-tenths measure [the meal-offering] for a bullock or with a two-tenths measure [the meal-offering] for a ram. And R. Meir? — He bases no exposition upon the dot [above the word].

FOR WHAT PURPOSE DID THE HALF-TENTH MEASURE SERVE? BY IT ONE USED TO MEASURE THE GRIDDLE-CAKES OF THE HIGH PRIEST. 'ONE USED TO MEASURE'![7] But I can point out a contradiction, for we have learnt: The griddle-cakes of the High Priest must not be brought in [two separate] halves, but he must bring a whole tenth and then divide it![8] — R. Shesheth answered, The expression 'MEASURE' that is used is to be understood in the sense of divide.

Rami b. Hama enquired of R. Hisda, Was the half-tenth according to R. Meir a heaped measure or a level measure? (Mnemonic: Half; Griddle-cakes of the High Priest; Table).[9] But you might ask the same question according to the Rabbis? — [Indeed so, and] according to the Rabbis the question is as regards the tenth as well, Was it heaped or level? — He replied, From R. Meir's statement [in one case] we can understand the view of R. Meir [in the other]; and also from R. Meir's statement we can understand the view of the Rabbis. Thus since R. Meir stated that the tenth measure [used for measuring the meal-offering of the High Priest] was level, we know that the half-tenth measure[10] was also level; and since according to R. Meir [both measures were] level, according to the Rabbis too [they were both] level.

Rami b. Hama further enquired of R. Hisda, How were the griddle-cakes of the High Priest divided into cakes?[11] By hand or by a utensil? — Surely it is obvious that it was divided by hand, for should you say by a utensil, would one bring in scales [into the Temple]? But why not bring it in? — It is not proper to do so since it is stated in connection with the curses.[12]

Rami b. Hama further enquired of R. Hisda, Would the table hallow the handfuls[13] placed as a pile upon it or not? [Shall we say] since it hallows the Shewbread it would hallow the handfuls too; or it only hallows what is prescribed for it[14] but not what is not prescribed for it? — He replied, It would not hallow them. But this cannot be right, for did not R. Johanan say that according to the one who holds that two and a half handbreadths [of each cake] were turned up [at either end], it will be seen that the table hallowed everything that was on it to a height of fifteen handbreadths;[15] and according to the one who holds that two handbreadths [of each cake] were turned up [at either end], it will be seen that the table hallowed everything that was on it to a height to twelve handbreadths?[16] — He replied, It would not hallow them so far as being offered upon the altar is concerned,[17] but it would hallow them to the extent that they can become invalid.[18]

MISHNAH. THERE WERE SEVEN LIQUID-MEASURES IN THE TEMPLE: THE HIN,[19] THE HALF-HIN, THE THIRD-HIN, THE QUARTER-HIN, THE LOG, THE HALF-LOG, AND THE QUARTER-LOG. R. ELIEZER SON OF R. ZADOK SAYS, THERE WERE MARKINGS IN THE HIN MEASURE [INDICATING] THUS FAR FOR A BULLOCK, THUS FAR FOR A RAM, AND THUS FAR FOR A LAMB.[20] R. SIMEON SAYS, THERE WAS NO HIN MEASURE THERE AT ALL; FOR WHAT PURPOSE COULD THE HIN SERVE?[21] BUT THERE WAS AN ADDITIONAL MEASURE[22] OF ONE LOG AND A HALF BY WHICH ONE USED TO MEASURE [THE OIL][23] FOR THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE HIGH PRIEST, A LOG AND A HALF IN THE MORNING AND A LOG AND A HALF TOWARDS EVENING. GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: There were seven liquid-measures in the Temple: the quarter-log, the half-log, the log, the quarter-hin, the third-hin, the half-hin, and the hin. So R. Judah. But R. Meir says. [They were:] the hin, the half-hin, the third-hin, the quarter-kin, the log, the half-log, and the quarter-log. R. Simeon says, There was no hin measure there at all; for what purpose could the kin serve?

---

(1) This meal-offering of the High Priest was not measured by the heaped measure, for when dividing it into halves the flour would certainly pour out on to the ground.

(2) Num. XXIX, 4.

(3) The additional waw, ‘and’, intimates another vessel, namely the half-tenth.

(4) Whence do they derive this last teaching.

(5) In the Masoretic text there is seen a dot above the second waw of the word ועשרון in Num. XXIX, 15. The dot points to an exposition connected with this word, namely that only the tenth shall be used as a measure even though it is necessary to measure three tenths as for the meal-offering for a bullock.

(6) Num. XXIX, 15. The word עשרון (tenth) is stated twice at the beginning of the verse, but the dot is placed over the waw in the first word.

(7) It is understood from this expression that the High Priest measured out a half-tenth in the morning and brought it to the Temple, and did likewise in the evening.

(8) Supra 50b.
(9) These are the subjects of the three questions put by Rami b. Hama to R. Hisda in the passage which follows.
(10) Also used in connection with the meal-offering of the High Priest, namely for dividing it into two.
(11) For it was baked into twelve cakes, six being offered in the morning and six in the evening. The question therefore is, Was the dough (according to Tosaf., the flour) divided into twelve equal parts by scales, or only by guesswork?
(12) That bread will be divided by weight; cf. Lev. XXVI, 26.
(13) Of frankincense, heaped up on the table and not put in the dishes. According to Tosaf. s.v. מהו (so, too, Maim.) the reference is to the handful of a meal-offering that was not put into a vessel of ministry but was placed in a heap on the table.
(14) Sc. the Shewbread which is to be placed directly on the table, whereas the frankincense is to be put in dishes which are to be set on the table.
(15) V. infra 96a. The cakes of the Shewbread were each ten handbreadths long, and the table, according to R. Judah, was five handbreadths wide. Now as the cakes were set lengthwise across the breadth of the table, two and a half handbreadths of the cake would overlap the table at each end. Accordingly this amount was turned up; then the second cake was placed upon it and likewise turned up at its ends and so on, so that the six cakes rose to a height of fifteen cubits (6 X 2 1/2) above the surface of the table.
(16) The table, according to R. Meir, was six handbreadths wide, thus only two handbreadths at each end of the cake, the amount that would be overlapping on either side, was turned up. The six cakes thus rose to a height of twelve handbreadths (6 X 2) above the table.
(17) The table would not hallow the frankincense put upon its bare surface to that extent that it is permitted to be burnt upon the altar.
(18) If taken out of the Sanctuary or if touched by a tebul yom (v. Glos.).
(19) A liquid-measure equal to twelve logs.
(20) So that it was not necessary to have a separate measure for a half or a third or a quarter of a hin.
(21) The measure of a hin was prescribed for use only once at the preparation of the anointing oil by Moses, cf. Ex. XXX, 24.
(22) To make up the seven measures.
(23) Sc. three logs of oil; cf. supra 51a.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 88a

What then can I put in its place?[1] But there was an additional measure there of a log and a half, by which one used to measure [the oil] for the griddle-cakes of the High Priest, a log and a half in the morning and a log and a half towards evening. They said to him, But there was there the half-log measure, and one could therefore measure it[2] with the half-log measure! He replied, In that case, even according to your view, there was no need for the half-log measure, for since there was there the quarter-log measure it was possible to measure it with the quarter-log! But the following rule was established in the Temple: The vessel that served for one measure did not serve for another measure.[3] R. Eliezer b. R. Zadok says, There were markings in the hin measure [indicating] thus far for a bullock, thus far for a ram, and thus far for a lamb.[4]

What is the difference between R. Meir and R. Judah? — R. Johanan said, There is a difference between them as regards the overflow of the measures. He who counts the measures from below upwards[5] is of the opinion that the overflow of the measures was also holy; for the All-Merciful gave unto Moses a quarter-log measure and instructed him to calculate [the larger measures] by including the overflow [of the smaller measure].[6] But he who counts the measures from the top downwards[7] is of the opinion that the overflow of the measures was not holy; for the All-Merciful gave unto Moses a hin measure and instructed him to calculate [the smaller measures] by excluding the overflow [of the larger measure].[8]

Abaye said, All [may be of the opinion] that the overflow of the measures was either holy or not holy, but they differ as to the meaning of the word ‘full’.[9] He who counts the measures from the top

downwards maintains that the word 'full' implies that it may be neither less [than the prescribed measure] nor more.[10] But he who counts the measures from below upwards maintains that the word 'full' implies that it may not be less [than the prescribed measure], but if it is more it is still regarded as 'full'.[11]

The Master said, 'R. Simeon says, There was no hin measure there at all'. R. Simeon is surely quite right in his argument with the Rabbis. What can the Rabbis reply? — There was the hin measure used by Moses in the preparation of the anointing oil, as it is written, And of olive oil a hin.[12] Now one is of the opinion that since it was not necessary for later generations, it was only made for that occasion and thereafter hidden away, but the other is of the opinion that once it was put to a use it remained as a measure.

The Master said, 'What then can I put in its place?' But is it absolutely essential to substitute another? As Rabina said elsewhere: There is a tradition that among the offerings of the congregation only two require the laying on of hands;[13] similarly here there is a tradition that there were seven liquid-measures in the Temple.

R. ELIEZER SON OF R. ZADOK SAYS, THERE WERE MARKINGS IN THE HIN MEASURE. Does he not then accept the tradition of seven liquid-measures? — He does not. Alternatively I can say, By seven measures he understood seven measurings.[14]

MISHNAH. FOR WHAT PURPOSE DID THE QUARTER-LOG SERVE? [TO MEASURE] A QUARTER-LOG OF WATER FOR THE LEPER[15] AND A QUARTER-LOG OF OIL FOR THE NAZIRITE.[16] FOR WHAT PURPOSE DID THE HALF-LOG SERVE? [TO MEASURE] A HALF-LOG OF WATER FOR THE SUSPECTED WOMAN[17] AND A HALF-LOG OF OIL FOR THE THANK-OFFERING. WITH THE LOG ONE MEASURED [THE OIL] FOR ALL THE MEAL-OFFERINGS. EVEN A MEAL-OFFERING OF SIXTY TENTHS[18] REQUIRED SIXTY LOGS [OF OIL]. R. ELIEZER B. JACOB SAYS, EVEN A MEAL-OFFERING OF SIXTY TENTHS REQUIRED ONLY ONE LOG [OF OIL], FOR IT IS WRITTEN, FOR A MEAL-OFFERING, AND A LOG OF OIL.[19] SIX [LOGS][20] WERE REQUIRED FOR A BULLOCK. FOUR[21] FOR A RAM, AND THREE[22] FOR A LAMB; THREE LOGS AND A HALF FOR THE CANDLESTICK, A HALF-LOG FOR EACH LAMP.

GEMARA. Rabbi was sitting and raised this difficulty: Wherefore was the quarter-log measure anointed?[23] If [it was in order to hallow the quarter-log of water] of the leper,

---

(1) To make up the seven liquid-measures.

(2) The log and a half of oil.

(3) It was thus not permissible to measure a half-log by filling twice the quarter-log measure, similarly to measure a log and a half by filling the half-log measure three times.

(4) This is the continuation of the Baraitha, and not the quotation from our Mishnah, v. Rashi.

(5) Sc. R. Judah, who enumerates the measures beginning from the smallest, the quarter-log.

(6) For when the smaller measuring vessel is filled to overflowing and is quickly poured out into 'the larger vessel the latter vessel will take in also the overflow of the former. Accordingly the half-log measure was a little more than two full quarter-logs since it held the two quarter-logs plus the overflow of each. And so also with the larger measures.

(7) Sc. R. Meir, who enumerates the measures beginning with the largest, the hin.

(8) For when pouring from a larger vessel which is filled to overflowing into two smaller vessels, by the time the smaller vessels are filled the overflow of the larger will have run off. Hence the several measures were exact measures without the overflow.

(9) Stated in Num. VII, 13 in regard to the measures.

(10) Accordingly all the measures had to be determined with accuracy, and this could only be done by filling the largest measure, the hin, to the brim and carefully dividing it into halves and into quarters etc. Conversely, to fill the smaller

vessel several times and pour it into the larger vessel would not give an accurate measure, for two full half-measures when poured into a larger vessel are more than one whole measure (Rashi MS.).

(11) Since the measures were calculated from the smallest they were a little more than the measure they represented; thus the half-log was a little more than two exact quarter-logs, for when pouring two quarter-logs into a large vessel there would be therein more than a half-log by reason of the froth that is formed (Rashi MS.). Tosaf. s.v. ומאן suggest the following interesting interpretation: It is agreed that the term 'full' precludes what is less than the prescribed measure, but as to what is more, he who maintains that the largest measure was given to Moses and was divided up into smaller measures, takes this as a symbol to exclude anything that is more than the measure, but he who maintains that the smallest measure was given to Moses and by increasing it the other measures were arrived at, takes it as a symbol that even what is more than the measure is still regarded as the full measure.

(12) Ex. XXX, 24.

(13) Supra 62b.

(14) I.e., seven markings in the hin measure.

(15) Cf. Lev. XIV, 5. One of the birds used in the purification rites of the leper was to be killed over running water in an earthen vessel. The quantity of water was determined by the Rabbis at one quarter-log, for in this quantity the blood of the bird would still be recognizable. V. Sot. 16b.

(16) For his cakes and wafers; v. Num. VI, 15.

(17) In the preparation of the bitter waters; cf. ibid. V, 17 and Sot. 15b.

(18) This was the maximum quantity of flour that might be brought as a meal-offering in a single vessel. Infra 103b.

(19) Lev. XIV, 21. Thus no matter how large the meal-offering was only one log of oil was necessary.

(20) Of oil and of wine, measured by the half-hin measure. The hin comprised twelve logs.

(21) Measured by the third-hin measure.

(22) Measured by the quarter-hin measure.

(23) All the Temple measures were anointed with the anointing oil and thereby consecrated, so that they could hallow whatever was put in them.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 88b

but that was outside [the camp];[1] and if [to hallow the quarter-log of oil] of the Nazirite,[2] but the bread-offering of the Nazirite was hallowed only by the slaughtering of the ram![3] — Said to him R. Hiyya. By it one measured the oil for the griddle-cakes of the High Priest, a quarter-log of oil for each cake.[4] Rabbi then applied to him the verse, The man of my counsel from a far country.[5]

FOR WHAT PURPOSE DID THE HALF-LOG SERVE? Rabbi was sitting and raised this difficulty: Wherefore was the half-log measure anointed? If [it was in order to hallow the water used] in the case of a suspected woman, but was it unconsecrated [water that was used]? Is it not written, Holy water?[6] And if [to hallow the half-log of oil] of the thank-offering, but the bread of the thank-offering was hallowed only by the slaughtering of the thank-offering![3] Said to him R. Simeon, Rabbi's son, By it [the priest] divided the oil for the Candlestick, a half-log for each lamp. Rabbi then exclaimed, O Lamp of Israel, it was so indeed.

R. Johanan said in the name of Rabbi, If a lamp had gone out,[7] both the oil and the wick have become unfit.[8] What must he do? He must clean it out, put in it fresh oil [and a fresh wick], and relight it.

R. Zerika was sitting and asked the following question, When he puts in fresh oil does he put in the same quantity of oil as at first, or only the quantity needed [for the remainder of the night]?[9] — It is obvious, said R. Jeremiah. that he puts in as much oil as at first, for should you say only the quantity needed [for the remainder of the night, the question will be asked]. How do we know how much is needed? But should you say that it[9] can be measured,[10] then there must have been not only seven measures but numerous measures? [R. Zerika] thereupon applied [to R. Jeremiah] the verse, And in thy majesty prosper, ride on, on behalf of truth and meekness and righteousness.[11] And so it

has been stated: R. Abbahu said in the name of R. Johanan-others say, R. Abba said it in the name of R. Hanina who said it in the name of Rabbi — If a lamp had gone out, both the oil and the wick have become unfit. What must he do? He must clean it out, put in fresh oil as much as at first, [put in a fresh wick] and relight it.

R. Huna the son of Rab Judah said in the name of R. Shesheth: The lamp [at the top of each branch of the Candlestick] in the Temple was flexible.[12] He is of the opinion that the expressions 'a talent'[13] and 'beaten work'[14] apply to the Candlestick and also to the lamps; and since the latter had to be cleaned out, were they not flexible, they could not very well be cleaned out.

An objection was raised: How did he do it?[15] He removed [the lamps from the Candlestick] and put them in a cleansing mixture.[16] He then dried them with a sponge, put oil in them, and lit them![17] — He[18] agrees with the following Tanna, for it was taught: The Sages say, They did not move it [the lamp] from its place at all. Does this mean to imply that it could be moved if one wanted to do so? — Say rather, They could not move it from its place at all. Who are 'The Sages'? — R. Eleazar son of R. Zadok is meant. For it was taught: R. Eleazar son of R. Zadok says, There was a kind of thin plate of gold over [each lamp]; when cleaning out [the lamp the priest] used to press it down towards the mouth of the lamp,[19] and when putting oil in it he used to press it down towards the back of the lamp.[20]

And this matter is the subject of dispute between the following Tannaim. For it was taught: The Candlestick and the lamps were made out of the talent,[21] but the tongs and the snuff dishes were not made out of the talent. R. Nehemiah said, The Candlestick [only] was made out of the talent, but neither the lamps nor the tongs nor the snuff dishes were made out of the talent. Wherein do they differ? — In the exposition of the following verse. For it was taught: Of a talent of pure gold shall it be made;[22] we thus learn that the Candlestick was made out of the talent, but whence do I know that it included the lamps too? Because Scripture says, With all these vessels.[22] Then I might think that it included even the tongs and the snuff dishes; the text therefore states, It.[22] This is the opinion of R. Nehemiah. (But is there not here a contradiction between the two statements of R. Nehemiah?[23] — Two Tannaim differ as to R. Nehemiah's view.) R. Joshua b. Korha says, The Candlestick was made out of the talent, but neither the lamps nor the tongs nor the snuff dishes were made out of the talent. How then do I interpret the words 'with all these vessels'? That the vessels were of gold. But that they were of gold is expressly stated in the verses, And thou shalt make the lamps thereof seven; and they shall light the lamps thereof, to give light over against it. And the tongs thereof and the snuff dishes thereof, shall be of pure gold![24] — [The former verse] was stated only for the sake of the mouth of the lamp.[25] For I might have thought that since the mouth of the lamp becomes black the Torah has consideration for the money of Israel,

---

(1) The water did not need to be hallowed for that purpose.

(2) I.e., the measuring vessel should hallow the oil and the oil when mixed with the bread should hallow the bread.

(3) But not before by the oil.

(4) For the six cakes that were offered in the morning one log and a half of oil was used, that is, a quarter-log for each cake. Similarly for the six cakes offered in the evening.

(5) Isa. XLVI, 11. R. Hiyya had come from Babylon to Palestine.

(6) Num. V, 17. As the water used was already consecrated, being taken from the laver, there was no need for a consecrated measuring vessel to hallow the water (Rashi MS. and Tosaf.).

(7) Each lamp was filled every evening with a half-log of oil which was estimated to burn through the night until the morning. In this case the lamp had accidentally gone out in the night.

(8) Lit., 'have become ashes'.

(9) That is the amount of oil left unburnt which was thrown out.

(10) The oil is placed in a measure before it is thrown out.

(11) Ps. XLV, 5. Cf. Shab. 63a where והדרך 'thy majesty' is interpreted as והדדך 'thy sharpness, thy acumen'.

(12) Lit., separate parts'. The meaning is that although the whole Candlestick, including the lamps, was beaten (מקשה) out of one piece of gold, the ends of the branches which supported the lamps were made quite thin and flexible so that the whole lamp could be turned in any direction and thus be cleaned out well.

(13) Ex. XXV, 39. This word is omitted in MS.M.

(14) Ibid, 31, 36.

(15) I.e., how did the priest clean the lamps?

(16) Heb. אוהל, a mineral substance used for cleansing (Jast.). 'Among aloes' (Goldschmidt). According to Rashi: 'in the tent', i.e., in the Temple.

(17) It is evident from this Baraitha that the lamps could be removed from the Candlestick, which is contrary to R. Shesheth.

(18) R. Shesheth.

(19) Thus ejecting all burnt-out matter.

(20) Thus making a wide opening to receive the oil.

(21) The talent of pure gold used in the making of the Candlestick; cf. Ex. XXV, 39

(22) Ex. ibid.

(23) For above it was taught that according to R. Nehemiah the lamps were not made out of the talent.

(24) Ex. XXV, 37, 38.

(25) Where the flame is.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 89a

and therefore it may be made of any kind of gold; the verse therefore teaches us [that it, too, must be of pure gold].

A HALF-LOG OF OIL FOR THE THANK-OFFERING. It was taught: R. Akiba says, Why is the expression 'with oil' stated twice?[1] Had the verse stated 'with oil' once only, I should have said that it[2] was like all other meal-offerings in respect of the log of oil; but now that 'with oil' is stated twice, there is here an amplification following an amplification, and whenever an amplification follows an amplification it implies limitation. Thus the verse has [impliedly] reduced [the quantity of oil] to a half-log. But is there here an amplification following another amplification? There is only one amplification here![3] — Rather the argument is this: Had not the verse stated 'with oil' at all, I should have said that it was like all other meal-offerings in respect of the log of oil;[4] but now that 'with oil' is stated twice, there is here an amplification following an amplification. and whenever an amplification follows another amplification it implies limitation. Thus the verse has reduced [the quantity of oil] to a half-log. I might think that this half-log of oil was to be divided equally among the three kinds of cakes,[5] namely the cakes, the wafers, and the soaked cakes; but since the verse stated 'with oil' with the soaked cakes, which was quite unnecessary,[6] it thereby increased the quantity of oil for the soaked cakes. How then [was it divided]? A half-log of oil was to be brought and divided into halves, one half to be used for the cakes and wafers and the other half for the soaked cakes. Thereupon R. Eleazar b. Azariah rejoined. Akiba, even though you repeat the word 'with oil' the whole day long I shall not listen to you; but [the fact is that] the half-log of oil of the thank-offering, the quarter-log of oil of the Nazirite, and the eleven days between two periods of menstruation,[7] are laws delivered to Moses on Sinai.

WITH THE LOG ONE MEASURED [THE OIL FOR ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS]. Our Rabbis taught: It is written,[8] And one tenth [part of an ephah of fine flour] mingled [with oil for a meal-offering,] and a log [of oil].[9] This teaches that every tenth requires a log of oil. So the Sages. But R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer [b. Jacob] say, Even a meal-offering of sixty tenths requires but one log, for it is said, For a meal-offering and a log of oil.[10] For what exposition do R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer b. Jacob require the words 'And one tenth . . . mingled . . . and a log of oil'? — They require them for their own purpose; the Divine Law ordaining thereby that he must bring one tenth [for a meal-offering]. And the others?[11] — They say that for that purpose no verse is required. for since the

Divine Law ordained in the case of a leper of affluent means that he must bring three animal-offerings and three tenths [of flour for a meal-offering], here [in the case of a leper of poor means], since he brings but one animal-offering, only one tenth [is required for a meal-offering]. And the others?[12] — The verse is indeed necessary; for otherwise I might have said that, since the All Merciful has spared him expense by allowing him to bring a poor [man's] sacrifice, no meal-offering at all is to be brought! And the others?[13] — We do not find [they say] that he should be [exempt] entirely [from the offering].[14] And for what exposition do the Rabbis require the words 'For a meal-offering and a log of oil'? — They need them to teach that whosoever makes a freewill-offering of a meal-offering shall bring nothing less than the quantity for which one log of oil is prescribed, and that is, one tenth. And the others?[15] — Both teachings [they say] can be derived [from these words].

SIX [LOGS] WERE REQUIRED FOR A BULLOCK, FOUR FOR A RAM, AND THREE FOR A LAMB. How do we know this?Because it is written, And their drink-offerings shall be half a hin of wine for a bullock.[16] And a hin has twelve logs, for it is written, And of olive oil a hin;[17] and it is also written, This [zeh] shall be a holy anointing oil unto Me throughout your generations.[18] the numerical value of zeh being twelve.[19]

THREE LOGS AND A HALF FOR THE CANDLESTICK, A HALF-LOG FOR EACH LAMP. Whence is this derived? — Our Rabbis taught: [It is written.] To burn from evening to morning:[20] provide it with its requisite measure so that it may burn from evening to morning. Another interpretation: 'From evening to morning': you have no other service that is valid from evening to morning save this[21] alone. And the Sages have calculated that a half-log of oil [will burn] from evening to morning. Some say that they calculated it by reducing [the original quantity of oil];[22] while others say that they calculated it by increasing it.[23] Those who say that they calculated it by increasing [the quantity of oil adopt the principle that] the Torah has consideration for the money of Israel;[24] and those who say that they calculated it by reducing it [adopt the principle that] there is no poverty in the place of wealth.

MISHNAH. ONE MAY MIX THE DRINK-OFFERINGS[25] OF BULLOCKS WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF RAMS,[26] OR THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF LAMBS WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF OTHER LAMBS, OR THOSE OF AN INDIVIDUAL OFFERING WITH THOSE OF A COMMUNAL OFFERING,

---

(1) Lev. VII, 12 with reference to the various cakes offered with the thank-offering.

(2) Sc. the thank-offering.

(3) For the words 'with oil' stated the first time are essential to teach that oil is required.

(4) Since we know of no meal-offering consisting of cakes and wafers that is brought without oil.

(5) The leavened cakes of the thank-offering required no oil.

(6) For from Lev. VI, 14 we already learn that soaked cakes required oil.

(7) Any discharge of blood during these intervening eleven days is deemed a flux (זיבה), and under no circumstances can it be accounted as menstrual blood (נידה). For full details v. Nid. 71b ff. V. Pes., Sonc. ed., p 422, n. 5.

(8) Cur. edd. insert. here: 'with reference to the offering of a leper of poor means. This is clearly an explanatory gloss and is omitted in all MSS.

(9) Lev. XIV, 21.

(10) Ibid. No matter how large the meal-offering is only one log of oil is required.

(11) The Sages. Do they not agree that these words of the verse are necessary for their own purpose; how then can they interpret the verse otherwise so as to derive their teaching that for every tenth one log of oil is required?

(12) R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer b. Jacob.

(13) The Sages.

(14) The Divine Law has reduced the number and cost of the offerings for a man of poor means, but by no means has it exempted him entirely therefrom.

(15) Do not R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer b. Jacob agree that the verse is required for this last teaching; how then can they interpret the verse otherwise so as to derive therefrom their ruling that only one log is required for the meal-offering, no matter how large it is?
(16) Num. XXVIII, 14.
(17) Ex. XXX. 24.
(18) Ibid. 31. Heb. זֵה.
(19) ז = 7 and ה = 5. Thus it is established that the hin consists of twelve logs, for the log is the smallest unit of liquid measure mentioned in the Torah (Rashi).
(20) Ex. XXVII, 21.
(21) Sc. the kindling of the lights.
(22) Lit., 'from above downwards'. They first filled each lamp with a large quantity of oil and on finding in the morning that the lamp was still alight and that there was still oil in the lamp, they gradually reduced the quantity until they arrived at a half-log. This measure was found to be sufficient for the longest night of the winter; in the summer a thicker wick was used so that the oil was consumed more quickly.
(23) Lit., 'from below upwards'. They first filled the lamp with a small quantity of oil and on finding in the morning that it had burnt out, the next evening they increased the quantity of oil and so on until they arrived at the standard of the half-log.
(24) And to calculate by using the larger quantity of oil in the first instance entailed the waste of the oil that was still in the lamp by the morning.
(25) This term includes the meal-offering, i.e., the quantities of flour and oil, as well as the wine-offering. It is assumed for the present that the Mishnah is dealing with the meal-offerings.
(26) For the mixture of each meal-offering was of equal consistency, the meal-offering of the bullock consisting of three tenths flour and a half-hin (six logs) of oil, and that of a ram of two tenths flour and a third-hin (four logs) of oil, thus in each case there were two logs of oil to every tenth of flour. The meal-offering of a lamb, however, was of a thinner consistency, consisting of one tenth of flour and a quarter-hin (three logs) of oil.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 89b

OR THOSE OF [AN OFFERING OFFERED] TO-DAY WITH THOSE OF [AN OFFERING OFFERED] YESTERDAY;[1] BUT ONE MAY NOT MIX THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF LAMBS WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF BULLOCKS OR OF RAMS.[2] IF AFTER EACH WAS MINGLED[3] BY ITSELF THEY WERE MIXED TOGETHER, THEY ARE VALID; BUT IF BEFORE EACH WAS MINGLED BY ITSELF [THEY WERE MIXED TOGETHER], THEY ARE INVALID. ALTHOUGH THE MEAL-OFFERING OF THE LAMB THAT WAS OFFERED WITH THE 'OMER WAS DOUBLED,[4] ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS WERE NOT DOUBLED.[5]

GEMARA. [ONE MAY MIX etc.]. I can point out a contradiction to this, [for it has been taught]: And he shall burn it:[6] [this intimates] that he shall not mix the fat portions [of one sacrifice] with the fat portions [of another]![7] -R. Johanan answered, [The Mishnah only] speaks of the case where they had been mixed.[8] BUT ONE MAY NOT MIX THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF LAMBS WITH THE DRINK-OFFERINGS OF BULLOCKS OR OF RAMS; that is, even though they had been mixed they are not [valid].[9] But surely since it states in the next clause, IF AFTER EACH WAS MINGLED BY ITSELF THEY WERE MIXED TOGETHER, THEY ARE VALID, it follows that the first clause teaches [that they may be mixed together] in the first instance! — Abaye therefore answered, [The Mishnah] means to say this: One may mix the wine-offerings[10] together if the flour and oil[10] had already been mixed together.[11] But may not one mix the wine-offerings in the first instance?[12] But it has been taught: This rule[13] applies only to the flour and oil, but one may mix the wine-offerings![14] — Rather, said Abaye, If the flour and oil [of the two offerings] have already been burnt [upon the altar],[15] one may then mix the wine-offerings in the first instance.[16] If they have not yet been burnt, but they[17] have been mixed together, one may mix the wine-offerings;[18] but if they have not [been mixed together], one may not mix [the wine-offerings], for this might lead to the mixing of the flour and oil in the first instance.[19]

[ALTHOUGH THE MEAL-OFFERING OF] THE LAMB THAT WAS OFFERED WITH THE ‘OMER etc. Our Rabbis taught: And the meal-offering thereof shall be two tenth parts:[20] this teaches us that the meal-offering of the lamb that was offered with the ‘Omer was doubled. I might then think that as its meal-offering was doubled so its wine was also doubled; the text therefore stated, And the drink-offering thereof shall be of wine, the fourth part of a hin.[20] I might further think that its wine was not doubled since it was not mingled with the meal-offering, but its oil [I say] was doubled, seeing that it was mingled with the meal-offering; the text therefore stated, ‘And the drink-offering thereof’, thus intimating that all the drink-offerings thereof shall be the fourth part of a hin. How is this intimated in the verse? — R. Eleazar said, Because it is written we-niskah[21] and we read it we-nisko.[22] Now what is the explanation thereof? — The drink-offering of the meal-offering, [namely the oil,] shall be equal to the drink-offering of [the lamb, namely] the wine, and as of wine there was the fourth part of a hin so of oil there was the fourth part of a hin.

R. Johanan said, If the guilt-offering of a leper was slaughtered. under any name other than its own, it still requires the drink-offerings; for should you not say so, you would render it invalid.[23] R. Menashia b. Gadda demurred, In that case, if the lamb that is offered with the ‘Omer was slaughtered under any name other than its own, its meal-offering should nevertheless be doubled; for should you not say so, you would render it invalid.[24] Furthermore, if the daily morning-offering was slaughtered under any name other than its own, it should nevertheless require the offering of two logs of wood by a priest;[25] for should you not say so, you would render it invalid. And furthermore, if the daily evening-offering was slaughtered under any name other than its own, it should nevertheless require the offering of two logs of wood by two priests;[25] for should you not say so, you would render it invalid! — It is indeed so,[26] for[27] Abaye has said, He[28] stated but one of several cases. Raba[29] said, [It is not so.] for in the latter cases the offerings are burnt-offerings,

---

(1) The drink-offerings may be offered many days after the offering of the animal. V. supra 15b.

(2) For the meal-offerings are of unequal consistencies and it is inevitable that the thicker mixture (sc. the meal-offering of the bullock or of the ram) should not absorb some of the thinner mixture (sc. the meal-offering of the lamb), accordingly both meal-offerings would be invalid, the former because it is too much and the latter because it is too little.

(3) Sc. the flour with the oil.

(4) Two tenths of flour instead of the usual one tenth. V. Lev. XXIII, 13.

(5) And it required only a quarter-hin (three logs) of oil and of wine.

(6) Lev. III, 11.

(7) Pes. 64b. Likewise one shall not mix the meal-offering which accompanies one sacrifice with the meal-offering which accompanies another sacrifice, even though the same kind of animal was offered in each case.

(8) But one may not mix them in the first instance.

(9) The text followed here is that of MS.M. (omitting אי הכי and taking the sentence as the continuation of R. Johanan's argument). So Sh. Mek. and also in the text quoted by Kesef Mishneh on Maim. Yad, Temidin u-Musafin X, 14.

(10) Of bullocks and rams.

(11) But not where the flour and oil of the two offerings had not been mixed together. And so, too, where the flour and oil of two dissimilar meal-offerings had been mixed together (e.g., the meal-offering of a bullock with that of a lamb), one may not mix the wine-offerings.

(12) In the case where the flour and oil of the two meal-offerings had not been mixed together.

(13) That one may not mix the drink-offering of a bullock with that of a lamb.

(14) Of bullocks and lambs in all circumstances, whether the flour and oil of the two offerings had already been mixed together or not.

(15) Even if they had never been mixed together.

(16) Even the wine-offering of a bullock or a ram with that of a lamb. This is the ruling embodied in the last quoted Baraitha.

(17) Sc. the meal-offerings of bullocks and rams, but not the meal-offerings of bullocks or rams and lambs. V. Glosses

of R. Samuel Strashoun a.l., and Com. 'Olath Shelomoh.

(18) In accordance with the ruling of the first clause of our Mishnah.

(19) And this would be a transgression of the verse And he shall burn it; v. supra p. 543.

(20) Lev. XXIII, 13.

(21) Lev. XXIII. 13. ונסכה 'her drink-offering', i.e., that of the meal-offering (מנחה being feminine in Heb.), namely the oil.

(22) ונסכו, 'his drink-offering', i.e., that of the lamb (being masculine), namely the wine.

(23) And it could not be offered at all; for it is not permissible to offer it as another offering since it was originally set apart as a guilt-offering, and to regard it as a freewill-offering is out of the question for a guilt-offering is only brought as an obligation; accordingly it can only be offered as the guilt-offering of a leper, and as such it requires drink-offerings (v. infra 90b).

(24) For it cannot be offered as another offering, and as the lamb of the 'Omer it requires a double meal-offering.

(25) V. Yoma 26b.

(26) That in the other cases mentioned, besides that mentioned by R. Johanan, the offering must be offered according to all the prescribed rites, as though it had been slaughtered under its own name.

(27) So most MSS., reading והאמר instead of אלא אמר

(28) R. Johanan.

(29) So all MSS., and also according to Rashi and Tosaf. Cur. edd. 'R. Abba'.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 90a

and if they are not admissible as the original obligatory burnt-offerings, they are nevertheless admissible as freewill burnt-offerings;[1] but here [in the case of the guilt-offering of a leper] if you do not regard it as the originally named [offering, it cannot be offered at all, for] there is no such thing as a freewill guilt-offering.

There has been taught [a Baraitha] that is in accord with R. Johanan: If the guilt-offering of a leper was slaughtered under any name other than its own, or if [the priest] did not apply some of the blood upon the thumb and great toe [of the leper], it is nevertheless offered upon the altar and it requires drink-offerings; but [the leper] must bring another guilt-offering to render him permitted.[2]

MISHNAH. ALL THE MEASURES IN THE TEMPLE WERE HEAPED EXCEPTING [THAT USED FOR] THE HIGH PRIEST'S [MEAL-OFFERING] WHICH INCLUDED IN ITSELF THE HEAPED MEASURE.[3] THE OVERFLOW OF THE LIQUID-MEASURES WAS HOLY, BUT THE OVERFLOW OF THE DRY-MEASURES WAS NOT HOLY. R. AKIBA SAID, THE LIQUID-MEASURES WERE HOLY, THEREFORE THEIR OVERFLOW WAS HOLY TOO; THE DRY-MEASURES WERE NOT HOLY, THEREFORE THEIR OVERFLOW WAS NOT HOLY. R. JOSE SAID. IT IS NOT ON THAT ACCOUNT BUT BECAUSE LIQUIDS ARE STIRRED UP[4] AND DRY-STUFFS ARE NOT. GEMARA. Who is [the author of our Mishnah]? Should you say R. Meir,[5] but according to him only one measure was heaped up. And should you say the Rabbis,[5] but according to them there was only one [tenth-measure] and that was levelled! — R. Hisda answered, Indeed it is R. Meir, but the expression ALL THE MEASURES' means all the measurings.[6]

THE OVERFLOW OF THE LIQUID-MEASURES WAS HOLY. What is the point at issue between them? — The first Tanna is of the opinion that the liquid-measures were anointed both inside and outside,[7] but the dry-measures were anointed inside only but not outside. R. Akiba is of the opinion that the liquid-measures were anointed both inside and outside but the dry-measures were not anointed at all.[8] R. Jose is of the opinion that both [the liquid-measures and the dry-measures] were anointed inside only and not outside, but this is the reason [for the ruling of our Mishnah]: liquids are stirred up, and therefore the overflow comes from the inside of the vessel', but dry-stuffs are not stirred up at all.

But even if [liquids are] stirred up, what does it matter? The man surely intends to hallow only that which he requires?[9] — Said R. Dimi b. Shishna in the name of Rab, This proves that vessels of ministry can hallow even without the [owner's] intention.[10] Rabina, however, said, I can still hold that vessels of ministry hallow only with the [owner's] intention, [nevertheless the overflow is deemed to be holy, for otherwise] it is to be feared that people will say that one may take out what has already been in a vessel of ministry for secular use.[11]

R. Zera raised the following objection: [We have learnt:][12] If he set the Shewbread and the dishes [of frankincense] on the day after the Sabbath and burnt the dishes of frankincense on the next Sabbath,[13] it is not valid.[14] What should he do? He should leave it until the following Sabbath,[15] for even if it remains many days on the table there is no harm. But why [is it allowed to be left for a longer period]? Might not people say, that one may allow holy things to remain in a vessel of ministry?[16] — You surely cannot point out a contradiction between [what is performed] inside[17] and [what is performed] outside;[18] [what is performed] inside not everybody is aware of, but [what is performed] outside everybody is aware of.[19]

We have learnt elsewhere:[20] The surplus of the drink-offerings was used for the altar's 'dessert'.[21] What is meant by 'the surplus of the drink-offerings'? — R. Hiyya b. Joseph said, It is the overflow of the measures. R. Johanan said, It is as we have learnt:[22] If a man had undertaken to supply fine flour at four [se'ahs a sela'][23] and the price subsequently stood at three [se'ahs a sela'], he must still supply it at four;[24]

---

(1) Accordingly in the circumstances stated, neither the lamb of the 'Omer would require a double meal-offering, nor the daily offerings the special offering of wood, since they could be offered as freewill burnt-offerings.

(2) To enter the camp of Israel, for he has not fulfilled his obligation with the first guilt-offering.

(3) This measure when filled level held as much as the others when heaped.

(4) When a liquid is being poured into a vessel what comes into the vessel last does not merely lie on the surface of what was poured in before it, but the entire liquid in the vessel is stirred up. Accordingly when the vessel is filled to overflowing, the overflow is not only of that liquid which was poured on the vessel after the vessel had been filled, but is also of the liquid displaced from the inside of the vessel; and as the latter has been hallowed in the vessel the overflow must of necessity be holy.

(5) V. supra 87a.

(6) I.e., whenever this one measure was used it was filled to a heap.

(7) Sc. the outer rim of the vessel. Hence the overflow as it passes over this rim becomes hallowed.

(8) But what was placed in them was hallowed by word of mouth. Accordingly only what was required for the man's purpose was thus hallowed, but not the overflow.

(9) And not the overflow. This question lies against all three Tannaim. V. Mishneh le-melek on Maim. Yad, Ma'ase Hakorb., II, 9.

(10) The overflow is automatically hallowed by the vessel even though the owner does not desire it.

(11) Because of this apprehension it was decreed that the overflow of liquids which comes from the inside of the vessel is holy.

(12) V. infra 100a; Yoma 29b.

(13) As is normally required.

(14) For the Shewbread must remain on the table for seven days, whereas here it remained there only for six days.

(15) I.e., for thirteen days.

(16) And so long as it is in a vessel of ministry it does not become invalid by being kept overnight or for any longer period.

(17) Sc. the arrangement of the Shewbread, which is performed inside the Temple where only priests entered.

(18) Sc. the measuring of the meal-offering, which is performed outside the Temple in the Temple court where all Israelites were permitted to enter.

(19) And there is ground for the apprehension.

(20) Shek. IV, 4; Keth. 106b.

(21) קיץ 'summer fruit'; cf. II. Sam. XVI, 1, 2. These were the burnt-offerings offered after all the public and private offerings of that day had been offered so that the altar should not remain idle. V. Shebu., Sonc. ed., p. 50 n. 3.

(22) Shek. IV, 9; B.M. 57b.

(23) And he was paid by the Temple-treasurer a certain sum of money.

(24) For in regard to Temple matters the payment of money binds the contract even though the goods have not yet passed either actually or symbolically into the possession of the Temple.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 90b

if [he had undertaken to supply it] at three and the price subsequently stood at four, he must supply it at four,[1] for the Temple has always the upper hand. There has been taught [a Baraitha] which agrees with R. Hiyya b. Joseph and there has also been taught [a Baraitha] which agrees with R. Johanan. There has been taught [a Baraitha] which agrees with R. Hiyya b. Joseph, vis., What did they do with the overflow of the measures? If there was another animal-offering, it may be offered with it; and if it[2] had been kept overnight, it is thereby[3] rendered invalid. Otherwise[4] it is offered as 'dessert' for the altar. What is this 'dessert'? Burnt-offerings; the flesh [is burnt] unto God, and the skins fall to the priests. There has also been taught [a Baraitha] which agrees with R. Johanan, viz., If a man had undertaken to supply fine flour at four [se'ahs a sela'] and the price subsequently stood at three [se'ahs a sela'], he must still supply it at four; if [he had undertaken to supply it] at three and the price subsequently stood at four, he must supply it at four, for the Temple has the upper hand. This [illustrates] what we have learnt: The surplus of the drink-offerings was used for the altar's 'dessert'.

MISHNAH. ALL THE OFFERINGS OF THE CONGREGATION AND OF THE INDIVIDUAL REQUIRE DRINK-OFFERINGS[5] EXCEPT THE FIRSTLING, THE TITHE OF CATTLE, THE PASSOVER-OFFERING, THE SIN-OFFERING AND THE GUILT-OFFERING; BUT THE SIN-OFFERING AND GUILT-OFFERING OF THE LEPER REQUIRE DRINK-OFFERINGS.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: [Since it is written,] And ye will make an offering by fire unto the Lord,[6] I might think that every offering that is offered upon the fire [of the altar] requires drink. offerings, hence even the meal-offering requires the drink-offerings; the text therefore added, A burnt-offering.[7] Whence do I know that peace-offerings [require drink-offerings]? Because the text added, A sacrifice.[8] And whence the thank-offering? Because the text added, Or a sacrifice.[9] I would then include also the firstling, the tithe of cattle, the Passover-offering, the sin-offering, and the guilt-offering; but the text stated, In fulfilment of a vow clearly uttered or as a freewill-offering:'[8] that which is offered in fulfilment of a vow or as a freewill-offering requires drink-offerings, but that which is not offered in fulfilment of a vow or as a freewill-offering does not require drink-offerings; the implication being to exclude the above.[10] I would then exclude also the obligatory offerings that are offered on account of the festival on the festival, namely the 'appearance burnt-offerings[11] and the festival peace-offerings; but the text stated, Or in your appointed seasons:[8] whatever is offered on your appointed seasons requires drink-offerings; the implication being to include the above. I would then include the he-goats for sin-offerings.[12] since they are offered as an obligation on the festival; but the text stated, And when thou preparest a bullock for a burnt-offering.[13] Now the bullock was included in the general law,[14] why then was it singled out? To teach you that everything be compared with it: as the bullock is distinguished in that it may be offered either in fulfilment of a vow or as a freewill-offering, so everything that is offered either in fulfilment of a vow or as a freewill-offering [requires drink-offerings].[15] Wherefore did the text state, To make a sweet savour unto the Lord, of the herd or of the flock?[16] It is because it says 'A burnt-offering', and that, I would have said, included the burnt-offering of a bird; the text therefore stated, 'Of the herd or of the flock', [thereby excluding the burnt-offering of a bird]. So R. Josiah. R. Jonathan says, This is quite unnecessary, for the text stated, 'A sacrifice', and a bird-offering is no sacrifice.[17] Wherefore then did the text state, 'Of the herd or of the flock'? It is because it is said previously, When any man of

you bringeth an offering unto the Lord, ye shall bring your offering of the cattle, even of the herd and of the flock.[18] Now I might have thought that if a man said, 'I take upon myself [to offer] a burnt-offering', he must bring [one animal] from each of the two kinds; the text therefore stated here, 'Of the herd or of the flock': if he so desires he brings one [animal] or if he so desires two.

But why, according to R. Jonathan, is any verse necessary to teach this? Has he not said, 'Unless the verse expressly states "together"'?[19] — It is necessary, for I might have said that

---

(1) For in this case Temple matters are on a par with ordinary lay transactions, and therefore so long as the goods have not yet passed into the hands of the purchaser the contract is not binding. Now the extra se'ah of flour that is supplied to the Temple is deemed to be 'the surplus of the drink-offerings', for the flour was intended to be used for the drink-offerings, and is used for the altar's 'dessert'.

(2) Sc. the overflow of the measures.

(3) Lit., 'by being kept overnight'.

(4) If there is no other animal-offering available.

(5) These are the meal-offering of flour and oil and the wine-offering that accompanied the animal-offering.

(6) Num. XV, 3, with reference to the drink-offerings.

(7) Num. XV, 3. Only an animal-offering requires drink-offerings.

(8) Ibid., with reference to the drink-offerings.

(9) Ibid. The expression 'or' extends the scope of the law.

(10) For the firstling and the tithe of cattle etc. are obligatory offerings.

(11) The offerings to be offered by every Israelite on appearing at the Temple on the three great festivals. Cf. Deut. XVI, 16.

(12) I.e.,that the musaf or additional sacrifices of the festivals should require drink-offerings.

(13) Num. XV, 8.

(14) Laid down in v. 3: And ye will make an offering by fire, which includes everything that is offered by fire (Rashi MS.). Or expressly stated in the end of that verse: Of the herd or of the flock (R. Gershom, Tosaf.).

(15) This excludes the he-goats for the sin-offerings, since the sin-offering is an obligatory offering.

(16) Num. XV, 3.

(17) For the Heb. זבח is strictly an animal-offering to which the law of slaughtering זביחה applies; it therefore excludes a bird-offering which does not require slaughtering but nipping off the head.

(18) Lev. I, 2.

(19) Wherever in any law Scripture states two items, the two may be taken either together or separately, according to the other rules governing that law, unless Scripture expressly states 'together', as, e.g., in Deut. XXII, 10. The dispute between R. Josiah and R. Jonathan is stated primarily regarding the cursing of parents in Lev. XX, 9. V. Sanh. 85b and Hul. 78b. As the expression 'together' is not found in Lev. I, 2, one would have assumed at the outset that an offering of one kind alone was permissible.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 91a

since it is written there, And of the flock, it is as though the expression 'together' had been used.[1] Then according to R. Josiah who says that even though the expression 'together' is not expressly used it is interpreted as though 'together' had been used, a verse is surely necessary [to teach that both need not be brought]![2] — There is written, If his offering be a burnt-offering of the herd,[3] and there is also written, And if his offering be of the flock.[4] And the other?[5] — I might have thought that that was so only when a man expressly said so,[6] but when he did not say so expressly[7] [I would say that] he must bring from [each of] the two kinds; we are therefore taught [otherwise].

The Master stated: 'And whence the thank-offering? Because the text added. Or a sacrifice'. But is not the thank-offering also a sacrifice?[8] — I might have thought that since it is accompanied by a bread-offering it does not require the drink-offerings.[9] But wherein does it differ from the Nazirite ram, which is accompanied by a bread-offering and yet requires the drink-offerings? — I might have

thought that only there [where the bread-offering consists only] of two kinds[10] [are drink-offerings required] but [not] here [where] it consists of four kinds; we are therefore taught otherwise.

But the Divine Law should only have stated, In fulfilment of a vow clearly uttered or as a freewill-offering, and it need not have stated, A burnt-offering![11] — Had not the Divine Law stated, 'A burnt-offering'. I should have said that the expression 'and ye will make an offering by fire unto the Lord'[12] was a general proposition, 'in fulfilment of a vow clearly uttered or as a freewill-offering'[13] a specification, and 'to make a sweet savour'[13] another general proposition; we would thus have two general propositions separated by a specification, in which case everything that is similar to the matter specified would be included; and as the matter specified is distinguished in that it is an offering not brought [in atonement] for any sin, so every offering that is not brought [in atonement] for any sin [would require drink-offerings]. I would thus exclude [from drink-offerings] the sin-offering and the guilt-offering as they are brought [in atonement] for a sin, but I would include the firstling, the tithe of cattle, and the Passover-offering, as they are not brought [in atonement] for any sin;[14] the text therefore stated, A burnt-offering.[15] But now that [Scripture] has stated, A burnt-offering, what then is [there left] to be included by the general propositions and the specification? — [The inference from the specification is made thus:] As the matter specified is an offering which one is under no obligation to offer,[16] so every offering which one is under no obligation to offer [requires drink-offerings]; this includes [for drink-offerings] the young of consecrated animals[17] and their substitutes, the burnt-offering brought out of the surplus,[18] the guilt-offering condemned to pasture,[19] and all offerings that were slaughtered under any name other than their own.

Now that you have established that the term 'or' was inserted for an exposition,[20] was there any need for [the term 'or' in the expression] 'in fulfilment of a vow clearly uttered or as a free will-offering' to indicate disjunction? — It was necessary, for [without 'or'] I might have thought that unless one brought an offering in fulfilment of a vow and also a freewill-offering one would not have to bring drink-offerings; we are therefore taught that if one brings an offering in fulfilment of a vow alone one must bring drink-offerings, and so, too, if one brings a freewill-offering alone one must bring drink-offerings. This is quite in order according to R. Josiah.[21] but what need was there for that term according to R. Jonathan?[22] — It was necessary, for [without 'or'] I might have thought that if one brought an offering in fulfilment of a vow alone one must bring drink-offerings, and if one brought a freewill-offering alone one must bring drink-offerings, but if one brought an offering in fulfilment of a vow and also a freewill-offering it is sufficient if the drink-offerings are brought for one only; we are therefore taught [otherwise].

And what need was there for the term 'or' in the expression or in your appointed seasons'? — It was necessary, for [without it] I might have thought that that[23] was so only where one brought a burnt-offering in fulfilment of a vow and a freewill peace-offering or vice versa, but where one brought a burnt-offering and a peace-offering both in fulfilment of a vow or both as freewill-offerings, since there is only one class of offering here, viz., in fulfilment of a vow or freewill-offerings, it is sufficient if the drink-offerings for one only are brought; we are therefore taught [otherwise]. And what need was there for [the 'or' in] the verse, And when thou preparest a bullock for a burnt-offering or for a sacrifice?[24] — It was necessary, for [without it] I might have thought that that[23] was so only where one brought a burnt-offering and a peace-offering both in fulfilment of a vow or both as freewill-offerings, but where one brought two burnt-offerings one in fulfilment of a vow and one as a freewill-offering, or two peace-offerings one in fulfilment of a vow and one as a freewill-offering, since there is only one type of offering here, viz., the peace-offering or the burnt-offering, it is sufficient if the drink-offerings for one only are brought; we are therefore taught [otherwise].

And what need was there for [the 'or' in] the expression 'in fulfilment of a vow clearly uttered or

for peace-offerings'?[25] — It was necessary, for [without it] I might have thought that that[26] was so only where one brought two burnt-offerings one in fulfilment of a vow and one as a freewill-offering, or two peace-offerings one in fulfilment of a vow and one as a freewill-offering, but where one brought two burnt-offerings each in fulfilment of a vow, or each as a freewill-offering, or two peace-offerings each in fulfilment of a vow or each as a freewill-offering, since there is only one type of offering here, viz., the burnt-offering or the peace-offering, it is sufficient if the drink-offerings for one only are brought; we are therefore taught [otherwise].

And according to R. Josiah what need was there for [the 'or' in] the expression 'of the herd or of the flock'?[27] — It was necessary. for [without it] I might have thought that that[26] was so only [where the two animals were] of two kinds,[28] but where they were both of one kind it is sufficient if the drink-offerings for one only are brought; we are therefore taught [otherwise].

And what need was there for the verse, So shall ye do for every one according to their number?[29] — [Without it] I might have thought that that[26] was so only [where the two animals were consecrated] one after the other, but where they were [consecrated] simultaneously[30] it is sufficient if the drink-offerings for one only are brought; we are therefore taught [otherwise].

BUT THE SIN-OFFERING AND THE GUILT-OFFERING OF THE LEPER REQUIRE DRINK-OFFERINGS. How do we know this? — Our Rabbis taught: And three tenth parts of an ephah of fine flour for a meal-offering:[31] this verse refers to the meal-offering that is offered with the animal-offering.[32] You say it refers to the meal-offering that is offered with the animal-offering, but perhaps it is not so but rather it refers to the meal-offering that is offered by itself! Since it says, And the priest shall offer the burnt-offering and the meal-offering,[33] you may be sure that the other verse [also] refers to the meal-offering that is offered with the animal-offering. But I still do not know whether it[34] requires a drink-offering [of wine] or not; the text therefore states, And wine for the drink-offering, the fourth part of a hin, shalt thou prepare with the burnt-offering or for the sacrifice, for each lamb.[35] The expression 'the burnt-offering' refers to the burnt-offering of the leper, 'the sacrifice' to the sin-offering of the leper, and 'or for the sacrifice' to the guilt-offering of the leper. But surely both [the sin-offering and the guilt-offering of the leper] can be derived from 'the sacrifice'![36]

---

(1) For according to the construction of that verse the interpretation might well be that the words 'and of the flock' must be taken in addition to 'cattle', thus indicating that two animals must be brought for the offering, and that the intervening expression 'of the herd' is merely in apposition to 'cattle'. According to Tosaf. the suggestion that the expressions in this verse must be taken conjunctively is made by reason of the repetition of the particle מִן 'of', in the verse.

(2) But R. Josiah actually utilizes the verse, which according to R. Jonathan signifies disjunction, for another purpose, namely to exclude bird-offerings.

(3) Lev. I, 3.

(4) Ibid. 10. Since each is dealt with separately it is obvious that each may be brought by itself.

(5) How can R.Jonathan suggest that both kinds were to be brought together seeing that each is dealt with alone in separate passages?

(6) E.g., 'I take upon myself to offer a lamb (or a bullock) for a burnt-offering'. In this case he expressly mentioned one animal.

(7) But simply said, 'I take upon myself to offer a burnt-offering'.

(8) The thank-offering is surely included under the term 'sacrifice', consequently the expression 'or' is rendered superfluous.

(9) For the bread-offering (cf. Lev. VII, 12, 13) would take the place of the drink-offerings.

(10) The bread-offering which accompanied the Nazirite's ram consisted of two kinds only, viz., unleavened cakes and unleavened wafers (cf. Num. VI, 15), whereas the thank-offering had two additional kinds of cakes, viz., soaked cakes and leavened cakes.

(11) For the burnt-offering would have been included since it is usually brought in fulfilment of a vow or as a

freewill-offering. Moreover it was not necessary to state the burnt-offering in order to exclude the meal-offering for that is excluded by the expression ‘sacrifice’.

(12) Num. XV, 3.

(13) Num. XV, 3.

(14) Accordingly by the application of the principle of two general propositions separated by a specification we would have to include those offerings which were not quite similar to the specification, and therefore even what is not offered in fulfilment of a vow or as a freewill-offering (e.g. the firstling) would still require drink-offerings provided it was like the specification in this one respect, viz., that it was not offered in atonement for any sin.

(15) Ibid. The expression ‘a burnt-offering’ is also taken as a specification inserted between two general propositions, and it serves to exclude the firstling and the tithe.

(16) For the burnt-offering mentioned in the verse is clearly a freewill-offering.

(17) E.g., the young of a peace-offering.

(18) I.e., from the overflow of measures, v. supra 90a. According to another reading given in Rashi MS. and also found in R. Gershom: ‘the substitute of the burnt-offering’ (reading התמורות, for המותרות).

(19) I.e., when the guilt-offering was no longer required for its purpose as when the owner thereof had died. The animal was condemned to pasture until it became blemished when it was redeemed and the proceeds used for burnt-offerings. V. supra 4a.

(20) To indicate disjunction, namely that a burnt-offering of any one animal of the herd or of the flock requires drink-offerings.

(21) Who holds that in the absence of any disjunctive term the particular items would be taken together as one; accordingly the term ‘or’ is essential here.

(22) Since he holds that without any disjunctive term the items can be taken individually.

(23) That for each offering drink-offerings are required.

(24) Num. XV, 8.

(25) Num. XV, 8.

(26) That for each offering drink-offerings are required.

(27) Ibid. 3. The expression in general has been utilized by him to exclude bird-offerings, but what is the point of the disjunctive term ‘or’?

(28) E.g., a bullock and a sheep.

(29) Ibid. 12. This verse also implies that for each offering there must be the drink-offerings.

(30) And brought into the Temple at the same time.

(31) Lev. XIV, 10, in reference to the sacrifices brought by a leper of substantial means on the day of his purification. These animal-offerings consisted of three lambs, one for a burnt-offering, the other for a sin-offering, and the third for a guilt-offering.

(32) I.e., each of the three animal-offerings (v. prec. n.) was accompanied by a meal-offering of one tenth of an ephah of flour as a drink-offering.

(33) Ibid. 20. In this verse the meal-offering is clearly that which accompanies the burnt-offering as a drink-offering.

(34) Sc. each of the leper's animal-offerings.

(35) Num. XV, 5.

(36) Why are two separate expressions required?

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 91b

For a Master has said, Whence do I know it of the sin-offering and of the guilt-offering?[1] Because the text states, The sacrifice.[2] — That is so[3] only where both offerings serve the same purpose.[4] but where the guilt-offering serves to qualify [the person] and the sin-offering to make atonement [for him][5] we require two separate expressions [to include both].

‘"The sacrifice" refers to the sin-offering of the leper’. Perhaps it refers to the sin-offering and guilt-offering of the Nazirite![6] — You cannot think of it, for it has been taught: It is written, And their meal-offering and their drink-offerings:[7] this verse refers to his[8] burnt-offering and his peace-offerings. You say it refers to his burnt-offering and his peace-offerings, but perhaps it is not

so but rather it refers to his sin-offering;[9] the text therefore states, And he shall offer the ram for a sacrifice of peace-offerings.[10] Now the ram was included in the general statement of the law,[11] why then was it singled out here? That everything be compared with it: as the ram[12] is distinguished in that it may be offered either in fulfilment of a vow or as a freewill-offering, so everything that is offered either in fulfilment of a vow or as a freewill-offering [requires drink-offerings].[13]

'The expression "the burnt-offering" refers to the burnt-offering of the leper'. Perhaps it refers to the burnt-offering of a woman after childbirth![14] — Abaye answered, The burnt-offering of a woman after childbirth[14] is derived from the latter part of the verse. For it was taught: R. Nathan says. 'Lamb'[15] refers to the burnt-offering of a woman after childbirth, and 'each'[15] to the eleventh of the cattle tithe.[16] And this, that the accessory should be more weighty than the principal,[17] we do not find elsewhere in the whole of the Torah. Raba said,[18] What case is there that requires three separate terms to include [its offerings]? You must say it is the case of the leper.[19]

What need was there for the expression 'for a ram'?[20] — R. Shesheth said, It includes Aaron's ram.[21] But is not Aaron's ram derived from the expression 'in your appointed seasons'?[22] — [No, for] I might have thought that that applied only to the offerings of the community but not to the offering of an individual. But wherein does it differ from the burnt-offering of a woman after childbirth?[23] — I might have thought that only [an individual offering] which has no fixed time[24] was included but not that which has a fixed time; the verse is therefore stated [to include Aaron's ram]. What need is there for the expression 'or for a ram'?[25] — It includes the pallax.[26] This is quite in order according to R. Johanan who holds that it is a distinct species.[27] For we have learnt:[28] If a man [under an obligation to bring a lamb or a ram for his sacrifice] offered it [a pallax], he must bring for it the drink-offerings as for a ram, but he does not thereby discharge the obligation of his sacrifice. And R. Johanan said that the expression 'or for in ram' included the pallax. But according to Bar Padda who holds that he must bring [for it the drink-offerings as for a ram] and account for the possibilities,[29] for it is only a case of doubt, it will be asked, is a verse ever stated in order to include what is in a condition of doubt?[30] — This is obviously a difficulty according to Bar Padda. Thus shall it be done for each bullock, or for each ram, or far each of the lambs or of the kids.[31] Wherefore did the text state, 'For each bullock'?[32] — It is because we find that Holy Writ distinguished between the drink-offerings of a ram and the drink-offerings of a lamb; and I might have thought that there should also be a distinction between the drink-offerings of a bullock and the drink-offerings of a calf; the text therefore stated, For each bullock.[33]

Wherefore did the text state, 'Or for each ram'?[32] — It is because we find that Holy Writ distinguished between the drink-offerings of a sheep in its first year and those of one in its second year; and I might have thought that there should likewise be a distinction between the drink-offerings of a sheep in its second year and those of one in its third year; Scripture therefore stated, 'Or for each ram'.[34] Wherefore did the text state, 'Or for each of the lambs'?[35] — It is because we find that Holy Writ distinguished between the drink-offerings of a lamb and the drink-offerings of a ram; and I might have thought that there should likewise be a distinction between the drink-offerings of a ewe in its first year and those of a ewe in its second year; the text therefore stated, 'Or for each of the lambs'.[36]

Wherefore did the text state, 'Or of the kids'?[37] — It is because we find that Holy Writ distinguished between the drink-offerings of a lamb and the drink-offerings of a ram; and I might have thought that there should likewise be a distinction between the drink-offerings of a kid and those of an older goat; the text therefore stated, 'Or of the kids'.

R. Papa said, Raba once tested us [with the following question]:

---

(1) That if the Nazirite placed the hair of his head under the cauldron containing his sin-offering or his guilt-offering,

instead of under the cauldron containing his peace-offering as is expressly stated in Scripture (Num. VI, 18), he has thereby fulfilled his obligation (Rashi). V. Nazir 45b. According to Tosaf. Whence do we know that the sin-offering and the guilt-offering are eaten the same day and the night until midnight? V. Zeb. 36a.

(2) Ibid. VI, 18. According to Tosaf. (v. prec. n.) the reference is to Lev. VII, 15. We thus see that the term 'sacrifice' includes both the sin-offering and the guilt-offering.

(3) That from the one expression 'the sacrifice' both the guilt-offering and the sin-offering can be derived.

(4) As in the case of the Nazirite; the guilt-offering brought by the Nazirite who had suffered uncleanness unwittingly serves to qualify him to resume his Nazirite vow, and the sin-offering brought at the completion of the Nazirite's vow serves to qualify him to resume a normal living, to drink wine and to cut his hair.

(5) As in the case of the leper; for the guilt-offering serves to qualify him that he may now join the congregation, and the sin-offering makes atonement for him, for the affliction of leprosy was regarded as a punishment for the seven sins enumerated in 'Ar. 16a.

(6) Teaching us that these offerings require drink-offerings.

(7) Num. VI, 15.

(8) The Nazirite's.

(9) And the verse teaches that the sin-offering brought by the Nazirite at the completion of his vow requires drink-offerings; and so, too, the guilt-offering brought by the Nazirite after his involuntary defilement.

(10) Ibid. 17. The verse concludes: And the priest shall offer the meal-offering thereof and the drink-offering thereof.

(11) Cf. ibid. XV, 6, where drink-offerings are prescribed for a ram.

(12) Which is a peace-offering.

(13) Thus excluding the sin-offering and the guilt-offering which are obligatory offerings.

(14) I.e., that the lamb for a burnt-offering which she has to bring (v. Lev. XII, 6) requires drink-offerings.

(15) Num. XV, 5.

(16) V. Bek. 60a. Where a man who was counting his cattle one by one for the purpose of the tithe erred in his counting and called the ninth tenth, the tenth ninth, and the eleventh tenth, all three become holy: the ninth may only be consumed when it has suffered a blemish, the tenth becomes the tithe, and the eleventh must be offered as a peace-offering and with it also drink-offerings.

(17) For actual cattle tithe does not require the drink-offerings whereas the eleventh animal, which is only an 'accessory' or subsidiary to the cattle tithe does.

(18) In reply to the question that perhaps it refers to the burnt-offering of a woman after childbirth.

(19) Thus the verse in question which contains three inclusive terms can only refer to the case of the leper who requires three offerings: a burnt-offering, a sin-offering and a guilt-offering.

(20) Ibid. 6. The drink-offerings for a ram are already prescribed in Num. XXVIII, 12, 14.

(21) I.e., the ram offered by the High Priest on the Day of Atonement; cf. Lev. XVI, 3. This offering, the verse informs us, also requires drink-offerings.

(22) Num. XV, 3.

(23) Which is an individual offering, nevertheless it is included in this passage for drink-offerings. In the same way the expression 'in your appointed seasons' includes Aaron's ram, accordingly the expression 'for a ram' is superfluous.

(24) As the burnt-offering of a woman after childbirth.

(25) Num. XV, 6.

(26) Heb. פלגם from Greek ** (spec. a youth not yet arrived at adolescence), a sheep in its thirteenth month; in its first twelve months it is termed a 'lamb' and after thirteen months it is termed a 'ram'. Thus the pallax is included that it shall have the same drink-offerings as for a ram.

(27) Hence it was necessary for Scripture to include it.

(28) Par. I, 3; Hul. 23a.

(29) Lit., 'and stipulate', by declaring: if the pallax is a ram then these drink-offerings are just right, but if it is a lamb then let that quantity which is required for a lamb be taken from these drink-offerings and let the remainder be regarded as a freewill-offering.

(30) Of course not, for the Divine Law could not have had any doubts about it.

(31) Ibid. 11.

(32) For its prescribed drink-offerings have already been stated previously in this passage.

(33) Signifying that whatever its age there is but one quantity of drink-offerings for an offering of the herd.

(34) I.e., whatever goes by the name ‘ram’ requires the drink-offerings as prescribed in this passage for a ram.
(35) V. p. 559. n. 8.
(36) I.e., there is but one quantity of drink-offerings for any animal among the lambs.
(37) Since we find kids included under the term ‘lambs’.

What is the quantity of drink-offerings for a ewe in its second year? And we answered him that this was clearly stated in a Mishnah:[1] [The seal inscribed with] 'Kid' signified drink-offerings for [offerings from] the flock, whether large or small, male or female, excepting rams.[2]

MISHNAH. NONE OF THE OFFERINGS OF THE CONGREGATION REQUIRE THE LAYING ON OF HANDS EXCEPT THE BULLOCK THAT IS OFFERED FOR THE TRANSGRESSION [BY THE CONGREGATION][3] OF ANY OF THE COMMANDMENTS, AND THE SCAPEGOAT.[4] R. SIMEON SAYS, ALSO THE HE-GOAT OFFERED FOR THE SIN OF IDOLATRY.[5] ALL THE OFFERINGS OF AN INDIVIDUAL REQUIRE THE LAYING ON OF HANDS EXCEPT THE FIRSTLING, THE CATTLE TITHE, AND THE PASSOVER-OFFERING. THE HEIR MAY LAY HIS HANDS [ON HIS FATHER'S OFFERING].[6] MAY BRING THE DRINK-OFFERINGS FOR IT, AND CAN SUBSTITUTE [ANOTHER ANIMAL FOR IT].[7]

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: None of the offerings of the congregation require the laying on of hands except the bullock that is offered for the transgression [by the congregation] of any of the commandments, and the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry. So R. Simeon. But R. Judah says, The he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands. What then must I include in their place? The scapegoat. (But is it absolutely necessary to include [another in their place]? — Rabina answered, There is a tradition that among the offerings of the congregation there are two that require the laying on of hands.) R. Simeon said to him, Is it not the law that the laying on of hands must be performed by the owners [of the offering]? But on that[8] Aaron and his sons lay the hands![9] He replied, Even in that case [the laying on of the hands is performed by the owners] since Aaron and his sons obtain atonement through it.

R. Jeremiah said, They are indeed consistent in their views, for it has been taught:[10] And he shall make atonement for the most holy place.[11] this means the Holy of Holies;[12] and the tent of meeting.[11] this means the Holy place; and the altar,[11] this is to be taken in its usual sense; he shall make atonement,[11] this means the various Temple courts; and for the priests,[11] this is to be taken in its usual sense; and for all the people of the assembly,[11] this means the Israelites; he shall make atonement,[11] this means the Levites. They are all[13] declared alike in respect of one atonement, in that they obtain atonement through the scapegoat for other sins.[14] So R. Judah.[15] But R. Simeon says, Just as the blood of the he-goat that is offered within [the Holy of Holies] makes atonement for Israelites for all matters of uncleanness touching the Temple and the holy things thereof, so does the blood of the bullock make atonement for the priests for all matters of uncleanness touching the Temple and the holy things thereof; and just as the confession of sin pronounced over the scapegoat[16] makes atonement for Israelites for other sins, so does the confession of sin pronounced over the bullock[17] make atonement for priests for other sins.[18]

But according to R. Simeon [it will be asked]: Surely they are declared alike![19] — Yes. they are all declared alike in that they all obtain atonement, but each obtains atonement through its own [offering].[20] This means,[21] therefore, that, according to R. Judah, for transgressions of the laws of uncleanness touching the Temple and the holy things thereof Israelites obtain atonement through the blood of the he-goat that is sprinkled within [the Holy of Holies], and priests through Aaron's bullock,[22] and for other sins all obtain atonement through the confession over the scapegoat; according to R. Simeon, even for other sins priests obtain atonement through the confession pronounced over the bullock. And so it is stated in [the Tractate] Shebu'oth:[23] [For all other sins the scapegoat makes atonement] alike for Israelites, priests and the anointed High Priest. Wherein do Israelites differ from priests and the anointed High Priest? Only in that the blood of the bullock makes atonement for priests for the transgressions of the laws of uncleanness touching the Temple and the holy things thereof.[24] R. Simeon says, As the blood of the he-goat that is sprinkled within the

Holy of Holies makes atonement for the Israelites, so does the blood of the bullock make atonement for the priests; and as the confession of sin pronounced over the scapegoat makes atonement for the Israelites, so does the confession of sin pronounced over the bullock make atonement for the priests.

Our Rabbis taught: It is written, And the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock:[25] this signifies that only the bullock requires the laying on of hands, but the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands. So R. Judah. But R. Simeon says, [It signifies that] only the bullock requires the laying on of hands by the elders, but the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands by the elders but by Aaron.[26] There is, however, [a Baraitha] which conflicts with the above, for it was taught: It is written, The live [goat]:[27] this signifies that only the live [goat] requires the laying on of hands, but the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands. So R. Judah. But R. Simeon says, [It signifies that] only the live [goat] requires the laying on of hands by Aaron

---

(1) Shek. V, 3.

(2) A man who required drink-offerings for his offering did not bring them from his own home but came to the Temple to the officer in charge of the seals, paid him money, and received from him a seal. On handing the seal to another officer who was in charge of the drink-offerings he would receive the necessary quantities of drink-offerings as indicated by the inscription on the seal. The seal inscribed with 'Kid' signified the drink-offerings for an offering from the flock. V. Shek. V, 4. Thus a ewe in its second year required the drink-offerings of a lamb.

(3) Who sinned in error by reason of an erroneous ruling of the Beth din; v. Lev. IV, 13-21.

(4) Ibid. XVI, 21.

(5) Where the congregation sinned in error by reason of an erroneous ruling of the Beth din in regard to idolatry; v. Num. XV, 24. Cf. Hor. 5b.

(6) Where the father died having already set aside a beast for his burnt-offering or peace-offering, and the heir is offering it on behalf of his father.

(7) I.e., if he substituted another animal for his father's offering, both animals are holy; v. Lev. XXVII, 10.

(8) Sc. the scapegoat.

(9) And not the owners, for the owners are the entire congregation.

(10) Yoma 61a, Shebu. 13b. Hul. 131b.

(11) Lev. XVI, 33. From this verse it is deduced that the High Priest effected atonement for the transgression of the laws of uncleanness in the Holy of Holies, in the Holy place etc. with the bullock and the he-goat, the former making atonement for priests who erred in this way and the latter for Israelites.

(12) I.e., if a person became unclean whilst in the Holy of Holies or in the Holy place and tarried there for the prescribed period (v. Shebu. 16b), or if he offered incense on the golden altar whilst unclean, or if he unwittingly entered the Temple courts whilst unclean.

(13) Priests, Levites and Israelites.

(14) I.e., for all sins except the transgression of the laws of uncleanness connected with the Temple.

(15) Thus according to R. Judah priests also obtained atonement through the scapegoat, consequently when they lay the hands on it they do so in the capacity of owners.

(16) Lev. XVI, 21; cf. Yoma 66a.

(17) Cf. Yoma 35b.

(18) According to R. Simeon, therefore, priests do not obtain any atonement through the scapegoat.

(19) For the last phrases of the quoted verse imply that all sections of the people, Israelites as well as priests, obtain atonement alike for other sins.

(20) For other sins, Israelites through the scapegoat and priests through the bullock.

(21) Heb. פירוש, so MS.M., and Sh. Mek. An unusual expression. The entire passage is an addition by the Saboraim (Sh. Mek.).

(22) I.e., the High Priest's bullock; v. Lev. XVI, 6.

(23) Shebu. 2b. So in MS.M. and Sh. Mek.; cur. edd. omit 'in Shebu'oth'.

(24) Cur. edd. insert here: 'This is the opinion of R. Judah'.

(25) Lev. IV, 15 with reference to the bullock offered when the congregation sinned in error by reason of an erroneous

ruling of the Beth din.
(26) I.e., a priest.
(27) Ibid. XVI, 21 with reference to the scapegoat.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 92b

. but the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands by Aaron but by the elders![1] — Thereupon R. Shesheth said, And do you think that the first [Baraitha] is correct? Has not R. Simeon laid down the rule that the laying on of hands must be performed by the owners?[2] But you must correct [the Baraitha] as follows: The bullock; this signifies that only the bullock requires the laying on of hands, but the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands. So R. Judah. R. Simeon says. The live [goat]: this signifies that only the live [goat] requires the laying on of hands by Aaron, but the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands by Aaron but by the elders. And this is really what R. Simeon said to R. Judah: The he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry [most certainly] require the laying on of hands, for if you have heard anything to the effect that they do not require the laying on of hands, you must have heard it only in regard to Aaron;[3] for they[4] were excluded by 'the live [goat]'.[5]

But according to R. Judah what need was there to exclude them[6] by a verse? Has not Rabina stated that there is a tradition that among the offerings of the congregation there are two that require the laying on of hands?[7] — It was merely an exercise in interpretation.[8]

Whence does R. Simeon derive the law that the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry require the laying on of hands [by the elders]?[9] — He derives it from the following [Baraitha] which was taught:[10] And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the goat:[11] this includes Nahshon's goat[12] in respect of the laying on of hands. So R. Judah. But R. Simeon says. It includes the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry in respect of the laying on of hands; for R. Simeon ruled that every sin-offering whose blood was brought within[13] required the laying on of hands.[14] Why is it stated [in this Baraitha], 'for [R. Simeon ruled etc.]'?[15] — It is merely an indication [of his view]. But perhaps it[16] includes the he-goat that is offered within [on the Day of Atonement]![17] — [What is included] must be like the he-goat of a ruler which makes atonement for the person who has knowledge of the transgression of the precept.[18]

But according to Rabina who said that there is a tradition that among the offerings of the congregation there are [only] two that require the laying on of hands, wherefore is a verse required [to include the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry]?[19] — Both the verse and the tradition are necessary. For if [the law[20] were derived] from the verse alone I should have said that the peace-offerings of the congregation also [require the laying on of hands] — as indeed this question was raised in the chapter entitled 'All meal-offerings were offered unleavened',[21] against that Mishnah where R. Simeon stated, There are three kinds of offering which [between them] require three rites,[22] in the following terms: 'Surely the peace-offerings of the congregation should require the ceremony of the laying on of hands by the following a fortiori argument: if the peace-offerings of the individual which do not require waving for the living animals require the laying on of hands etc.'[23] — the tradition is therefore necessary.[24] And if it were derived from the tradition alone I should not have known which was [the other case],[25] the verse therefore informs us that it includes what is like the he-goat of a ruler which makes atonement for the person who has knowledge of the transgression of the precept.[26]

ALL THE OFFERINGS OF THE INDIVIDUAL REQUIRE THE LAYING ON OF HANDS EXCEPT THE FIRSTLING, THE CATTLE TITHE, AND THE PASSOVER-OFFERING. Our Rabbis taught: His offering,[27] [requires the laying on of hands], but not the firstling. For without this exposition I should have argued as follows: if the peace-offering which is not holy from the womb

requires the laying on of hands, the firstling which is holy from the womb surely requires the laying on of hands! The text therefore stated, 'His offering', but not the firstling. 'His offering', but not the tithe. For without this exposition I should have argued as follows: if the peace-offering which does not sanctify what comes before it or what comes after it requires the laying on of hands, the tithe which sanctifies what comes before it and what comes after it[28] surely requires the laying on of hands! The text therefore stated, 'His offering', but not the tithe. 'His offering', but not the Passover-offering. For without this exposition I should have argued as follows: if the peace-offering which one is not bound to bring[29] requires the laying on of hands, the Passover-offering which one is bound to bring surely requires the laying on of hands! The text therefore stated, 'His offering', but not the Passover-offering. But surely all these arguments can be refuted: It is so with the peace-offering since it requires drink-offerings and also the waving of the breast and the thigh![30] — Indeed the verses are merely a support. But

---

(1) This contradicts the view of R. Simeon as stated in the former Baraitha.

(2) Supra p. 561. And the owners of the he-goats offered by the congregation for the sin of idolatry are the elders of the congregation, yet R. Simeon states in the first Baraitha that the laying on of hands was to be performed by Aaron and not by the elders!

(3) I.e., that the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands by Aaron, but they certainly require the laying on of hands by the elders.

(4) I.e., that the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry do not require the laying on of hands by Aaron.

(5) Thus only on the scapegoat shall Aaron lay his hands but not on these goats. This is the proper inference. viz., the he-goats from the scapegoat; but one may not infer the he-goats from 'the bullock' (as was originally stated in the first Baraitha), for they are of different kinds.

(6) Sc. the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry.

(7) I.e., two and no more. And the two, according to R. Judah, are: the scapegoat, and the bullock offered for the transgression of the congregation. V. our Mishnah.

(8) To interpret the verses in order to arrive at the traditional view as reported by Rabina. Aliter: R. Judah does not accept this tradition but arrives at that view by the exposition of verses.

(9) All that R. Simeon established above was that these goats do not require the laying on of hands by the priest, but whence does he derive it that it must be performed by the elders? Perhaps they do not require it at all?

(10) Supra 55b; Zeb. 48b.

(11) Lev. IV, 24. with reference to the he-goat offered by a ruler, i.e., a prince of a tribe, for a sin committed by him in error.

(12) Sc. the he-goat offered by each of the princes of the tribes at the dedication of the altar, called 'Nahshon's goat' because he, Nahshon b. Aminadab, the prince of Judah, was the first to bring his offering. Cf. Num. VII, 12.

(13) To be sprinkled upon the golden altar or upon the veil.

(14) And the blood of the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry was sprinkled within, whereas the blood of Nahshon's goat was not.

(15) For the only two cases to which this rule applies are the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry and the sin-offering of the anointed High Priest. How the former is here included for the rite of laying on of hands, and as for the latter, Scripture has expressly stated that it requires the laying on of hands (v. Lev. IV, 4); obviously then R. Simeon's rule is superfluous!

(16) Sc. the verse that prescribes the laying on of hands in the case of the he-goat brought by a ruler.

(17) Since its blood is sprinkled within the Holy of Holies it should require the laying on of hands, in accordance with R. Simeon's ruling.

(18) Whereas the he-goat of the Day of Atonement makes atonement for the transgression of the laws of uncleanness relating to the Temple and the holy things where the transgressor has no knowledge thereof. V. Shebu. 2a.

(19) Since R. Simeon is of the opinion that the laying on of hands must be performed by the owners, and therefore the laying of the hands by Aaron on the scapegoat is not a proper laying on of hands, inasmuch as Aaron is not the owner since he does not even obtain any atonement through it, then by virtue of the tradition the only two possible offerings of the congregation that require the laying on of hands are the bullock offered for the transgression of the congregation and the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry. Hence the verse is superfluous!

(20) Sc. of laying on the hands in offerings of the congregation.
(21) Chap. V.
(22) Supra 61a.
(23) V. supra p. 369.
(24) That there are only two cases of laying on of hands among the offerings of the congregation.
(25) One offering of the congregation, namely the bullock offered for the transgression of the congregation, is expressly stated in Scripture as requiring the laying on of hands, but we should not know which was the other offering that required it, whether it was the he-goats offered for the sin of idolatry, or the he-goat of the Day of Atonement, or the peace-offerings of the congregation.
(26) Hence the he-goat of the Day of Atonement cannot be included, v. supra p. 566, n. 1; neither can the peace-offerings of the congregations be included as they do not make atonement at all.
(27) Lev. III, 1. The expression 'his offering' occurs seven times in the passage dealing with the peace-offering (Lev. 111, 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14) and each is interpreted for some purpose in connection with the law of the laying on of hands. V. Sifra a.l. The basis for the interpretations in this passage is the definition of the word 'offering', which is defined as that which is made holy by a person of his own free will and which he offers as a gift to God to win His favour. Accordingly the firstling is excluded since it is holy from the moment it is born and not made holy by any person, moreover it is an obligatory offering and is not brought to win God's favour. The tithe and the Passover-offering are also excluded for the reason last stated.
(28) For if in the course of counting the animals for the purpose of the tithe the ninth was by error called the tenth, the tenth the ninth, and the eleventh the tenth, all three become holy. V. supra p. 558, n. 4 and Bek. 60a.
(29) Lit., 'which is not (subject to the command of) arise and bring it'.
(30) And therefore it also requires the laying on of hands, but neither the firstling nor the tithe nor the Passover-offering require drink-offerings or the waving of the breast and thigh. Accordingly no verses are required to exclude these offerings as there are no valid reasons for including them.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 93a

what is the real purpose of these verses? — [To teach the following:] 'His offering' [requires the laying on of hands], but not the offering of another.[1] 'His offering', but not the offering of a gentile, His offering, this includes every owner of the offering for the rite of the laying on of hands.[2]

THE HEIR MAY LAY HIS HANDS. R. Hananiah recited the following teaching in the presence of Raba: The heir may not lay his hands [on his father's offering], and the heir cannot substitute [another animal for his father's offering].[3] [Raba said to him.] But we have learnt: THE HEIR MAY LAY HIS HANDS [ON HIS FATHER'S OFFERING]. MAY BRING THE DRINK-OFFERINGS FOR IT, AND CAN SUBSTITUTE [ANOTHER ANIMAL FOR IT]! Shall I then reverse it?[4] he asked. No, replied the other, for the teaching [quoted by you] is the view of R. Judah. For it was taught: The heir may lay his hands [on his father's offering], and the heir can also substitute [another animal for it]. R. Judah says. The heir may not lay his hands [on his father's offering], and the heir cannot substitute [another animal for it].

What is the reason for R. Judah's view? — It is written, His offering.[5] but not the offering of his father;[6] and he compares the inception of the consecration[7] with the termination of the consecration:[8] just as at the termination of the consecration the heir may not lay his hands [on his father's offering], so at the inception of the consecration the heir cannot substitute [another animal for his father's offering]. And what is the reason for the view of the Rabbis?[9] — It is written, And if he shall at all change,[10] this includes the heir;[11] and they compare the termination of the consecration with the inception of the consecration: just as at the inception of the consecration the heir can substitute [another animal for his father's offering], so at the termination of the consecration the heir may lay his hands [on his father's offering].

For what purpose do the Rabbis utilize the expression 'his offering'?[12] — For the following: 'His

offering' [requires the laying on of hands], but not the offering of a gentile. 'His offering', but not the offering of another. 'His offering', this includes every owner of the offering for the rite of the laying on of hands. And R. Judah?[13] — He does not hold the view that every owner of the offering is included for the rite of the laying on of hands. Alternatively, he may even hold [that view] but the offering of another and the offering of a gentile are excluded from one verse, hence two verses are at his disposal, one for the teaching that only 'his offering' [requires the laying on of hands] but not the offering of his father, and the other to include every owner of the offering for the rite of the laying on of hands.

And for what purpose does R. Judah utilize the expression 'and if he shall at all change'? — He requires it in order to include a woman.[14] For it was taught: Since the whole passage[15] is stated in the masculine form, whence do we know[16] to include a woman? Because the text states, And if he shall at all change. And the Rabbis?[17] — They derive it by expounding the expression 'and if'.[18] And R. Judah? — He bases no exposition on the expression 'and if'.

MISHNAH. ALL MAY LAY THE HANDS ON THE OFFERING EXCEPT A DEAF-MUTE, AN IMBECILE, A MINOR, A BLIND MAN, A GENTILE, A SLAVE, AN AGENT, OR A WOMAN. THE LAYING ON OF HANDS IS OUTSIDE THE COMMANDMENT.[19] [ONE MUST LAY] BOTH HANDS ON THE HEAD OF THE ANIMAL; AND IN THE PLACE WHERE ONE LAYS ON THE HANDS THERE THE ANIMAL MUST BE SLAUGHTERED; AND THE SLAUGHTERING MUST IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THE LAYING ON OF HANDS.

GEMARA. We understand a deaf-mute, an imbecile, or a minor being disqualified, because they do not know what they are doing; also a gentile, because it is written, The children of Israel:[20] [only they] may lay on the hands but gentiles may not lay on the hands. But why should a blind man be disqualified? R. Hisda and R. Isaac b. Abdimi [suggest different reasons]. One Says, It is because we deduce the laying on of hands [for all offerings] from the laying on of hands performed by the elders of the congregation.[21] And the other says, It is because we deduce the laying on of hands [for all offerings] from the laying on of hands performed on the 'appearance' burnt-offering.[22]

Why does not he that deduces the law from the 'appearance' burnt-offering rather deduce it from the elders of the congregation? —

---

(1) A man may not lay his hands on his neighbour's offering even though he was instructed to do so on his behalf.

(2) I.e., every person that has a share in the offering must lay his hands on it.

(3) I.e., if he did so it is of no effect.

(4) And substitute 'may' for 'may not' and 'can' for 'cannot'.

(5) Lev. III, 2: And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering.

(6) Thus the heir may not lay his hands on his father's offering.

(7) Viz., the substitution of another animal for the offering. This is an original act of consecration whereby a profane animal becomes holy.

(8) Viz., the laying on of hands. This is almost the last act with the consecrated animal, since the slaughtering must immediately follow the laying on of his hands.

(9) l.e., the first view in the above-mentioned Baraitha, quoted anonymously. In the parallel passage, Tem. 2a this is R. Meir's view.

(10) Lev. XXVII, 10.

(11) Thus the heir can effectively substitute another animal for his father's offering, and both animals become holy.

(12) This was interpreted by R. Judah to exclude the heir from the laying on of hands.

(13) Since he uses the expression 'his offering' to exclude the heir, he is then short of one of these expressions for the three foregoing teachings.

(14) I.e., that the law of substitution also applies to a woman.

(15) Concerning the law of substitution.

(16) Lit., ‘what is our end’.
(17) How do they know that a woman can effectively substitute another animal for the offering?
(18) For the waw, ‘and’, is superfluous.
(19) Lit., ‘the remnant of the commandment’. I.e., the laying on of hands may be omitted and yet the offering is valid, for the atonement is not dependent upon this act.
(20) Lev. I, 2.
(21) In connection with the bullock offered for the transgression of the congregation; cf. Lev. IV, 15. And as the elders of the congregation had to be free from every physical blemish, v. Sanh. 17a, hence the blind may not lay on the hands.
(22) I.e., the burnt-offering offered by every Israelite on appearing at the Temple on the three great Festivals; cf. Deut. XVI, 16. And as a blind man was exempt from the ‘appearance’ burntoffering. v. Hag. 2a, the inference may therefore be made that a blind man may not lay on the hands.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 93b

It is more proper to deduce the offering of an individual from another offering of the individual[1] rather than to deduce the offering of the individual from the offering of the congregation. And why does not he that deduces the law from the elders of the congregation rather deduce it from the ‘appearance’ burnt-offering? — It is only proper to deduce the offering for which the rite of laying on the hands is expressly prescribed[2] from that offering for which the rite of laying on the hands is also expressly prescribed;[3] but this is not the case with the ‘appearance’ burnt-offering, for that[4] is itself derived from the freewill burnt-offering. For a Tanna recited before R. Isaac b. Abba: And he presented the burnt-offering; and offered it according to the ordinance,[5] that is, according to the ordinance of a freewill burnt-offering; this teaches that the obligatory burnt-offering[6] requires the laying on of hands.

A SLAVE, AN AGENT, OR A WOMAN. Our Rabbis taught: His hand,[7] but not the hand of his slave; his hand,[8] but not the hand of his agent; his hand,[9] but not the hand of his wife. Why are all these required? — They are all necessary, for if the Divine Law had only stated once [the expression ‘his hand’]. I should have said that it only excluded the slave, since he is not subject to the commandments, but an agent, since he is subject to the commandments, and moreover a man's agent is like himself,[10] [I would say] may lay the hands [on his principal's offering]. And if only these two[11] had been stated [I should have said that the reason they are disqualified is that] they[11] are not as part of himself, but a man's wife, since she is as part of himself,[12] [I would say] may lay the hands [on her husband's offering]. Therefore [all three verses] are necessary.

THE LAYING ON OF HANDS IS OUTSIDE THE COMMANDMENT. Our Rabbis taught: And he shall lay his hand . . . and it shall be accepted for him [to make atonement for him].[13] Does the laying on of hands make the atonement? Does not the atonement come through the blood, as it is said, For it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life?[14] This, however, informs you that if a man treated the laying on of the hands as outside the commandment[15] Scripture accounts it to him as though he has not obtained [the highest form of] atonement, but he has obtained atonement.[16]

The same was also taught with regard to the rite of waving. To be waved, to make atonement for him.[17] Does the waving make the atonement? Does not the atonement come through the blood, as it is said, For it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life? This, however, informs you that if a man treated the waving as outside the commandment Scripture accounts it to him as though he has not obtained [the highest form of] atonement, but he has obtained atonement.

ON THE HEAD. Our Rabbis taught: [And he shall lay] his hand upon the head [of his offering],[18] but not his hand upon the neck;[19] his hand upon the head, but not his hand upon the back; ‘his hand upon the head’,but not his hand upon the breast. Why are all [the three verses] required? — They are

all necessary, for if the Divine Law had only stated once [the expression 'his hand upon the head,] I should have said that it only excluded the hand upon the neck, since it is not on the same plane as the head, but the [laying of the] hand upon the back, which is on the same plane as the head, I would say was not [excluded].[20] And if only these two[21] had been stated, [I should have said that] the reason [they are excluded] is that they are not included in the rite of waving, but the breast, since it is included in the rite of waving, I would say was not [excluded]. Therefore all [three verses] are necessary.

The question was asked: What if the hands were laid upon the sides [of the head]? — Come and hear, for it was taught: Abba Bira'ah taught in the School of R. Eleazar b. Jacob: The expression 'his hand upon the head' excludes the hand upon the sides of the head.

R. Jeremiah enquired, Would a cloth[22] be regarded as an interposition or not?[23] — Come and hear: But nothing shall interpose between him and the offering.[24]

BOTH HANDS. Whence do we derive it? — Resh Lakish said, Because the verse says, And Aaron shall lay both his hands.[25] Now actually there is written in the verse 'his hand',[26] and yet it says 'both', this establishes the rule that wherever 'his hand' is stated both [hands] are meant unless Holy Writ clearly specifies one.

R. Eleazar went and reported this statement in the Beth-Hamidrash,[27] but did not report it in the name of Resh Lakish. When Resh Lakish heard of it he was annoyed. Resh Lakish then said to him,[28] If it is as you say that wherever 'his hand' is stated both [hands] are meant, why did [Scripture] state at all 'his hands'? He thus questioned him from twenty-four passages where 'his hands' occurs; e.g.. His hands shall bring,[29] his hands shall contend for him,[30] he guided his hands wittingly.[31] The other remained silent. When Resh Lakish's mind had been appeased he said to the other, Why do you not answer me that you mean the expression 'his hand'[32] stated in connection with the rite of the laying on of hands. But is there not written, even with regard to the laying on of hands, And he laid his hands upon him, and gave him a charge?[33] — I refer to the laying on of hands in connection with an animal-offering.

AND IN THE PLACE WHERE ONE LAYS ON THE HANDS THERE THE ANIMAL MUST BE SLAUGHTERED; AND THE SLAUGHTERING MUST IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THE LAYING ON OF HANDS. What does he mean by this?[34] — He means to say, In the place where one lays on the hands there the animal must be slaughtered because the slaughtering must immediately follow the laying on of hands.[35]

MISHNAH. THE RITE OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS IS [IN CERTAIN RESPECTS] MORE STRINGENT THAN THE RITE OF WAVING. AND THE RITE OF WAVING IS [IN OTHER RESPECTS] MORE STRINGENT THAN THE RITE OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS. [THE RITE OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS IS MORE STRINGENT,] FOR ONE MAY PERFORM THE WAVING ON BEHALF OF ALL THE OTHER FELLOW-OWNERS BUT ONE MAY NOT PERFORM THE LAYING ON OF HANDS ON BEHALF OF ALL THE OTHER FELLOW-OWNERS. THE RITE OF WAVING IS MORE STRINGENT, FOR THE RITE OF WAVING TAKES PLACE IN OFFERINGS OF THE INDIVIDUAL[36] AND IN OFFERINGS OF THE CONGREGATION,[37]

---

(1) Sc. the 'appearance' burnt-offering.

(2) Sc. the freewill-offering of the individual; v. Lev. I, 4.

(3) Sc. the bullock offered for the transgression of the congregation; ibid. IV, 15.

(4) I.e., that the 'appearance' burnt-offering requires the laying on of hands.

(5) Lev. IX, 16. The verse is dealing, according to Rashi, with the obligatory burnt-offering offered by Aaron on the

eighth day of his consecration (ibid. 2), but according to Tosaf. with the people's burnt-offering (ibid. 15). V. Bez. 20a.
(6) Which includes the 'appearance' burnt-offering.
(7) Lev. III, 2.
(8) Ibid. 8.
(9) Ibid. 13.
(10) V. Kid. 41b.
(11) The slave and the agent.
(12) V. Ber. 24a.
(13) Lev. I, 4.
(14) Ibid. XVII, 11.
(15) Lit., 'remnants of the precept'. I.e., he omitted to perform this rite.
(16) By the sprinkling of the blood.
(17) Ibid. XIV, 21.
(18) This expression is stated three times in the chapter dealing with the peace-offering. viz., Lev. III, 2, 8, 13.
(19) I.e., the front of the neck.
(20) Hence a verse was necessary to exclude the laying of hands on the back of the offering.
(21) I.e., verses excluding the neck and the back.
(22) I.e., if a man wrapped a cloth round his hands and thus laid them on the head of the animal; or a cloth was covering the head of the animal and he laid his hands thereon.
(23) Is it regarded as a proper laying on of hands or not?
(24) When laying the hands upon the head of the offering. V. Yoma 36a and Tosef. Men. X.
(25) Lev. XVI, 21.
(26) The Heb. for 'his hands' is written defectively thus ידו and it might be read as ידו his hand.
(27) V. Glos.
(28) R. Eleazar.
(29) Lev. VII, 30.
(30) Deut. XXXIII, 7.
(31) Gen. XLVIII, 14.
(32) So MS.M., and so apparently in the text before Rashi; in cur. edd. 'his hands'.
(33) Num. XXVII, 23, with reference to the appointment of Joshua as leader. Why did Scripture state here 'his hands' and not 'his hand'?
(34) Since the slaughtering must follow the laying on of hands obviously then the animal would be slaughtered in the same place where the laying on of hands was performed in order to avoid any delay; hence the first statement is superfluous.
(35) For in Scripture 'And he shall lay his hand' (Lev. I, 4) is immediately followed by And he shall slaughter (ibid. 5).
(36) The waving of the breast and thigh of the peace-offering.
(37) The waving of the two lambs of Pentecost. V. supra 61a.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 94a

FOR LIVING ANIMALS AND FOR SLAUGHTERED ANIMALS, AND FOR THINGS THAT HAVE LIFE AND FOR THINGS THAT HAVE NOT LIFE;[1] BUT IT IS NOT SO WITH THE RITE OF THE LAYING ON OF HANDS. GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: [It is written.] 'His offering', this includes every owner of the offering for the rite of the laying on of hands.[2] For [without this exposition] I should have argued as follows: if the rite of waving which has been extended to apply to slaughtered animals is restricted in the case of fellow-owners,[3] the rite of the laying on of hands which has not been extended to apply to slaughtered animals is surely restricted in the case of fellow-owners![4] The text therefore stated, 'His offering', to include every owner of the offering for the rite of the laying on of hands. But should not the rite of waving be extended even in the case of fellow-owners[5] [by the following] a fortiori [argument]: if the rite of the laying on of hands which has not been extended to apply to slaughtered animals is extended in the case of fellow-owners, is it then not logical that the rite of waving which has been extended to apply to

slaughtered animals should be extended also in the case of fellow-owners? — [No,] because it is not possible to do so; for how should it be done? If you say. Let all wave it together.[6] there would then be an interposition.[7] And if you say, Let one first wave it and then the other, but the Divine Law speaks of one waving and not of many wavings.

But is the rite of the laying on of hands never applied to a slaughtered animal? Behold we have learnt:[8] Whenever the High Priest wished to burn the offering.[9] he used to go up the ascent, having the deputy [High Priest] at his right hand. When he had reached half way up the ascent, the deputy took him by the right hand and led him up. The first priest[10] handed to him the head and the hind-leg, and he laid his hands on them and threw them [upon the altar fire]. The second priest handed to the first priest the two fore-legs, and he gave them to the High Priest who laid his hands on them and threw them. The second priest then slipped away and departed. In this way[11] they used to hand to him the rest of the limbs of the offering, and he laid his hands on them and threw them. If he so desired he would only lay his hands on them while others threw them! — Abaye said, That was done there only out of respect for the High Priest's dignity.[12]

CHAPTER XI

MISHNAH. THE TWO LOAVES [OF PENTECOST] WERE KNEADED SEPARATELY AND BAKED SEPARATELY. THE [CAKES OF THE] SHEWBREAD WERE KNEADED SEPARATELY AND BAKED IN PAIRS. THEY[13] WERE PREPARED IN A MOULD; AND WHEN THEY WERE TAKEN OUT FROM THE OVEN THEY WERE AGAIN PUT IN A MOULD LEST THEY BECOME DAMAGED.

GEMARA. Whence do we derive it? — Our Rabbis taught: Two tenth parts of an ephah shall be in one cake,[14] this teaches that they were kneaded separately. And whence do we know that the Two Loaves were also [kneaded] in like manner? Because Scripture says. Shall be. And whence do we know that [the cakes of the Shewbread] were baked in pairs? Because the text states, And thou shalt set them.[15] Perhaps then the Two Loaves were also [baked] in like manner! Scripture therefore says. Them.[16] 'But have you not already drawn a deduction from the word 'them'?[17] — If for that purpose alone Scripture would have used the expression 'and thou-shalt-set-them';[18] why 'and-thou-shalt-set them'? Two deductions may therefore be made.

Our Rabbis taught: 'And thou shalt set them', that is, in a mould. There were three moulds: [the Shewbread] was first put into a mould[19] while still dough; in the oven there was also a kind of mould; and when it was taken out from the oven it was put into a [third] mould lest it become damaged. But why was it not put back again in the first mould? — Because after the baking it would have swollen.[20]

It was stated: How did they fashion the Shewbread?

---

(1) E.g., the waving of the cakes of the thank-offering.

(2) V. supra p. 568.

(3) I.e., only one performs the waving on behalf of the others.

(4) I.e., that one only should lay on the hands on behalf of the others.

(5) I.e., that every fellow-owner should wave the offering.

(6) By one fellow-owner placing his hands under the offering, another placing his under the hands of the first, a third placing his under the hands of the second and so on, thus all would wave the offering together.

(7) Since none but the hands of the first actually touch the offering.

(8) Tam. VII, 3 (33b).

(9) Cf. Yoma 14a.

(10) Of the nine priests to whose lot fell the service of the daily offering; v. Tam. III, 1 (30a) and IV, 3 (31b).

(11) I.e., each priest in turn handing the parts of the offering to the first priest who gave them to the High Priest.
(12) The laying on of the hands by the High Priest was introduced in order to distinguish his act of service from the usual service of the ordinary priest. The rite of the laying on of hands as ordained in the Torah, however, applied only to the living offerings.
(13) The cakes of the Shewbread.
(14) Lev. XXIV, 5.
(15) Ibid. 6. Heb. ושמת אותם. The word 'them' stated in connection with the setting of the cakes, i.e., the placing of the cakes in the oven for baking, signifies that the cakes were baked in pairs and not singly.
(16) Thereby excluding the Two Loaves.
(17) Viz., that the baking of the Shewbread shall be in pairs.
(18) Heb. ושמתם: the pronoun 'them' might have been added as a suffix to the verb.
(19) So as to obtain the required shape for the cakes, v. infra.
(20) And would not fit in the first mould.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 94b

R. Hanina said, Like a broken box.[1] R. Johanan said, Like a ship's keel.[2] According to him who says 'like a broken box', we clearly understand where the dishes [of frankincense] were placed,[3] but according to him who says 'like a ship's keel', where were the dishes placed?[4] — A special place was made for them.[5] Again according to him who says 'like a broken box', we clearly understand how the rods lay [on the sides of the cakes],[6] but according to him who says 'like a ship's keel', how could the rods lie [on the side of the cakes]?[7] — Projections were attached to them [on top].[8] Again according to him who says 'like a broken box', we clearly understand how the props supported the cakes,[9] but according to him who says 'like a ship's keel', how could the props support the cakes?[10] — They were made obliquely.[11] Now according to him who says 'like a ship's keel', we clearly understand the need for props,[12] but according to him who says 'like a broken box', what need was there for props? — [For otherwise] they might break by reason of the pressure of the [upper] cakes.[13] Again according to him who says 'like a ship's keel', it is clear that the props rested on the table,[14] but according to him who says 'like a broken box', where were the props placed?[15] Were they perhaps placed on the ground? — Yes. for R. Abba b. Memel said, According to him who says 'like a ship's keel', the props stood on the table, and according to him who says 'like a broken box', they stood on the ground.[16]

With which view agrees the statement of R. Judah that the cakes held up the props and the props held up the cakes? With the view [that the cakes were] like a ship's keel.[17]

---

(1) I.e., in the shape of an open box with two of its sides, the front and the back, removed; in other words, each cake consisted of a base and two sides which rose perpendicularly, thus (Fig. 1).
(2) Lit., 'a rocking ship'; i.e., like the sides of a ship which narrow downwards until the keel is reached. In like manner the side of each cake narrowed downwards until there was but a fingerbreadth between Fig. 1 them at the bottom; v-shaped. It also appears (v. Rashi) that each side of the cake tapered upwards almost to a point, thus (Fig. 2). The sides (s) rose upwards at an angle from the dotted lines.
(3) Viz., on the base of the topmost cake. Cf. infra 96a.
(4) As the two sides came almost to a point there was no base upon which the dishes of frankin- Fig. 2 cense might be placed.
(5) In the topmost cake there was made a projection or ledge of dough upon which the dishes were placed.
(6) V: infra 96a. There were twenty-eight rods each shaped like the half of a hollow reed, fourteen being used for one row of the Shewbread and fourteen for the other. And the cakes were arranged as follows: the nethermost cake stood on the table; three rods were placed above it, their ends resting on the perpendicular or rising sides of the cake and also in the grooves of the two upright props (v. infra p. 579, n. 1), and the second cake was placed on the rods. Three rods were similarly placed above the second, third and fourth cakes, but only two above the fifth, since it only had to bear the pressure of one single cake.

(7) For since the sides of each cake tapered upwards almost to a point (v. supra n. 3) there was certainly no place on the top for three rods; there might at most have been sufficient space for one rod, but no more.
(8) At the top of each side of the cakes projections, made of dough, were attached horizontally like arms, and upon these projections the rods lay.
(9) V. infra 96a. For each row of the Shewbread there were two props which stood upright on opposite sides of the table. Now if it is assumed that the sides of each cake rose up perpendicularly at the edge of the table, then the props which stood close to the table gave abundant support to the sides of the cakes so that they could bear the pressure of the upper cakes.
(10) For the props came into contact only with the top point of each side of the cakes, since only the top reached the edge of the table, and that contact obviously afforded very little support.
(11) From the props there jutted forth curved brackets to fit in the outer curve of the sides of the cakes. The sides of the cakes thus rested on these brackets.
(12) And brackets, since the cakes had no base.
(13) The props thus strengthened the sides of each cake to withstand the pressure of the cakes above it.
(14) Since the cakes were v-shaped there were obviously spaces underneath the sides of each cake; accordingly the bracket under the lowest cake rested on the Fig. 1 table, v. Fig. 1.
(15) As the sides of the cakes a=props: b=cakes: c=rods. were flush with the edge of the table there was no room on the table for the props.
(16) Fig. 2 illustrates the arrangement of a row of the Shewbread according to the view that the cakes were fashioned in the shape of a box broken at two sides; Fig. 1 illustrates the arrangement according to the view that they were in the shape of a ship's keel, v-shaped.
(17) For the curved sides of the cakes lay on the brackets and held them firm, whilst the brackets and props supported the cakes.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 95a

An objection was raised: There was in the oven [a mould] in the form of a bee-hive,[1] and it resembled a square plate![2] — Render: the top of it resembled a square plate.[3]

There is [a Baraitha] taught which agrees with the view that they were like a ship's keel. For it was taught: There were four golden props there which put forth branches on top like brackets, and these supported the cakes which resembled a ship's keel.

The question was raised: Was the Shewbread rendered invalid on the journeys,[4] or not? — R. Johanan and R. Joshua b. Levi [hold different views]. One said, it was rendered invalid. The other said, It was not rendered invalid. One said, It was rendered invalid, because it is written, As they encamp so they shall journey;[5] therefore as when they encamped it was rendered invalid by being taken outside [the curtains of the Tabernacle], so when they journeyed it was rendered invalid, since it was taken outside [the Tabernacle].[6] The other says, It was not rendered invalid, because it is written, And the continual bread shall remain thereon.[7] And the other? Is there not written, As they encamp so they shall journey? — This means quite the reverse: just as when they encamped it was not rendered invalid if it had not been taken outside [the Tabernacle], so when they journeyed it was not rendered invalid if it had not been taken outside.[8] And the other? Is there not written, And the continual bread shall remain thereon? — The fact is that when R. Dimi came [from Palestine] he reported as follows: As regards [the bread] that was still set [on the table] they do not differ,[9] they differ only regarding the bread that had been removed.[10] He who said, It was rendered invalid, [argued thus:] It is written, ‘As they encamp so they shall journey’: therefore just as when they encamped it was rendered invalid by being taken outside [the Tabernacle], so when they journeyed it was rendered invalid, since it was taken outside. But he who said, It was not rendered invalid, [argued thus:] It is written, Then the tent of meeting shall set forward;[5] thus even though they had set forth it was still the tent of meeting.[11] And the other? Is there not written, ‘As they encamp so they shall journey’? — It means quite the reverse; just as when they encamped it was not rendered invalid

if it had not been taken outside [the Tabernacle], so when they journeyed it was not rendered invalid if it had not been taken outside. And the other? Is there not written, 'And the tent of meeting shall set forward'? — That only comes to teach us the [order of the] standards.[12] And the other? — He derives [the order of the standards] from the verse, The camp of the Levites in the midst of the camps.[13]

An objection was raised: When [the Tabernacle] was dismantled for journeying consecrated things became invalid since they were outside [the Tabernacle]; none the less persons suffering from an issue and lepers were to be put outside their respective bounds.[14] Now this applies, does it not, also to the Shewbread? — No, [it applies to everything] except the Shewbread. But what is your view? If you hold that it is still the tent of meeting[15] then the consecrated things should also [not become invalid], and if you hold that it is no more the tent of meeting then even the Shewbread should [become invalid]! — Rather [the true position is] as reported by Rabin when he came [from Palestine]: One stated his view[16] in respect of [the Shewbread] that was still set [on the table], while the other stated his view[17] in respect of [the Shewbread] that had been removed, and so they do not differ at all.

Abaye said, This[18] proves that the Tabernacle could be dismantled for journeying at night,[19] for should you hold that the Tabernacle could not be dismantled for journeying at night, but it was taken to parts only in the morning, then why [did the consecrated things become invalid] on the ground of being taken outside the Tabernacle? Surely they became invalid by being kept overnight! Is not this obvious? Holy Writ expressly says, That they might go by day and by night![20] — I might have thought that that was so[21] only when they had already set out by day, but if they had not set out by day they would not set out at night; we are therefore taught [that it was not so].

I can point out a contradiction [to the above teaching].[22] [It was taught:][23] As soon as the curtains [of the Tabernacle] were folded up those that had an issue and lepers were permitted to enter [into the camp]! — R. Ashi said, This is no difficulty, for one [Baraitha][24] represents the view of R. Eliezer, the other the view of the Rabbis. For it was taught:[25]

---

(1) I.e., perforated like a bee-hive (Tosaf.).

(2) in this mould the cake was baked (v. supra p. 577). It is evident, however, that the cake was not v-shaped, but had a square base, like the bottom of a box.

(3) But the sides narrowed downwards until they joined together; i.e., v-shaped.

(4) When the camp was about to break up and Israel was ordered to set forth on their journeys, the Tabernacle was dismantled Fig. 2 and its parts carried by the Levites. Now the only offering that was continually in progress a=props; b=cakes; c=rods. in the Tabernacle was the Shewbread, for every Sabbath fresh bread was set upon the table and the old bread which had stood for seven days on the table was removed and consumed by the priests. The question here is, whether the Shewbread was immediately rendered invalid on the dismantling of the Tabernacle or not.

(5) Num. II, 17.

(6) For the Tabernacle has now been dismantled.

(7) Ibid. IV, 7. I.e., even though the Tabernacle has been dismantled the bread is still holy.

(8) I.e., so long as it had not been removed from the table it was valid.

(9) That bread was certainly valid, for the last mentioned verse states that so long as the bread was on the table it remained in its sanctity.

(10) But which had not yet been consumed by the priests (Rashi). According to R. Gershom the reference is to the bread that was set before the Lord but which had for some reason or other been taken off the table at the time of the dismantling of the Tabernacle.

(11) And the bread remained in its sanctity.

(12) Sc. the arrangement of the camp and the order of the march.

(13) Num. II, 17.

(14) The leper was excluded from the whole camp, while those afflicted with issues were permitted to remain in the

camp of Israel but were excluded from the Sanctuary proper and from the Levite encampment.
(15) Even though the Tabernacle has been dismantled.
(16) That it was not invalid.
(17) That it became invalid.
(18) The statement in the foregoing Baraitha that all consecrated things at the dismantling of the Tabernacle became invalid on the ground of being 'outside'.
(19) I.e., if the cloud was lifted (which was the signal for the people to march onward, cf. Num. IX, 17ff) at night, the Tabernacle was immediately dismantled and the people straightway set forth on their journey and did not wait till the morning.
(20) Ex. XIII, 21.
(21) That they journeyed by night.
(22) Which stated that those afflicted with an issue and lepers were still excluded from the camp even when the Tabernacle was dismantled.
(23) Ta'an. 21b.
(24) The latter Baraitha.
(25) Pes. 67b.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 95b

R. Eliezer says, You might think that if those that had an issue and lepers had forced their way through and entered the Temple court at a time when the Passover-offering was being offered in uncleanness[1] — you might think that they are culpable, the text therefore stated, They shall put out of the camp every leper, and every one that hath an issue, and whosoever is unclean by the dead:[2] when those that are unclean by the dead are put out [of the Sanctuary], those that have an issue and lepers are put out [of their respective camps];[3] when those that are unclean by the dead are not put out, those that have an issue and lepers are not put out.[4]

MISHNAH. THE TWO LOAVES AND THE SHEWBREAD WERE ALIKE IN THAT THE KNEADING AND THE SHAPING WERE PERFORMED OUTSIDE [THE TEMPLE COURT], BUT THE BAKING INSIDE; AND IT[5] DID NOT OVERRIDE THE SABBATH. R. JUDAH SAYS, ALL THESE WORKS WERE PERFORMED INSIDE [THE TEMPLE COURT]. R. SIMEON SAYS, ACCUSTOM THYSELF TO SAY, THE TWO LOAVES AND THE SHEWBREAD WERE VALID WHETHER MADE IN THE TEMPLE COURT OR IN BETH PAGE.[6]

GEMARA. Is not this self-contradictory? You say, THE KNEADING AND THE SHAPING WERE PERFORMED OUTSIDE, which proves that the dry-measures were not hallowed,[7] and then you say, BUT THE BAKING INSIDE, which proves that the dry-measures were hallowed! — Said Raba: This question was raised by a hard man, who is as hard as iron,[8] namely R. Shesheth. But what is the difficulty? Perhaps the tenth [measure] does not hallow [whatsoever is put therein] whereas the oven does! Rather if a difficulty is to be pointed out it is the following: [You say,] BUT THE BAKING INSIDE, which proves that the oven hallows [whatsoever was baked in it], and then you say, IT DID NOT OVERRIDE THE SABBATH. The cakes would then become invalid by being kept overnight![9] Said Raba: This question was raised by a hard man, who is as hard as iron, namely R. Shesheth. R. Ashi said, But what is the difficulty? Perhaps 'INSIDE' means under the supervision of careful men.[10] This view of R. Ashi, however, is beside the mark. For take whichever view you will, if the baking required the supervision of careful men then the kneading and the shaping also required the supervision of careful men; and if the kneading and the shaping did not require the supervision of careful men, then the baking also did not require the supervision of careful men.[11] We must therefore say that R. Ashi's view is beside the mark.[12]

R. JUDAH SAYS, ALL THESE WORKS WERE PERFORMED INSIDE [THE TEMPLE

COURT] etc. R. Abbahu b. Kahana said, Both[13] derived their views from the same verse: And it is in a manner common, yea, though it were sanctified this day in the vessel.[14] R. Judah maintains that he[15] found [the priests] baking [the Shewbread] on a weekday and said to them, You are baking it on a weekday? But since it has been sanctified this day in the vessel[16] it will become invalid by being kept overnight![17] R. Simeon maintains that he found them baking it on the Sabbath and said to them, Should you not have baked it on a weekday? After all it is not the oven that hallows the bread but the table.[18] But how can it be said that he found them baking [the Shewbread]? Is it not written, So the priest gave him hallowed bread; for there was no bread there but the Shewbread that was taken from before the Lord?[19] — Rather it is this that he meant by 'in a manner common'. They said to him, There is no bread here but the Shewbread that has been taken from before the Lord. And he[15] replied, As to that bread there is no doubt at all,[20] for since it is no more subject to the law of sacrilege[21] it is in a manner common. But even that which has been sanctified this day in the vessel you may give him[22] to eat

---

(1) I.e., if the greater part of the community were unclean by contact with a dead body.

(2) Num. V, 2.

(3) V. supra p. 582, n. 3.

(4) Likewise with regard to the entering into the camp by unclean persons during the time that the Tabernacle was dismantled: since those that are unclean by the dead are not put out at all (for they were only excluded from the Sanctuary and now there is no Sanctuary), lepers and those afflicted with issues are likewise not put out of the camp.

(5) Sc. the baking. Accordingly the loaves were baked before the Sabbath.

(6) V. supra p. 468, n. 6. R. Simeon holds that they may even be baked outside the Temple court.

(7) I.e., the tenth measure by which the flour was measured was not hallowed, hence it could not hallow the flour and therefore it was permitted to knead it outside the Temple court. Had it been hallowed by the measuring vessel, the flour would have become invalid as soon as it was taken outside.

(8) Cf. Ta'an. 4a: a scholar who is not as hard as iron is no real scholar.

(9) Since they were baked, and thereby hallowed, on the day before the Sabbath.

(10) Lit., 'in the place of careful men', i.e., priests; but not in the Temple court.

(11) But there is no valid reason for distinguishing between the baking and the other works.

(12) The position therefore is that the two clauses of our Mishnah cannot be reconciled but they are the conflicting opinions of different Tannaim (Tosaf.).

(13) R. Judah and R. Simeon.

(14) I Sam. XXI, 6. The Heb. חוֹל usually meaning profane, common, non-holy, is taken in the sense of non-holy day, weekday.

(15) David.

(16) Sc. in the oven.

(17) It is therefore wrong to bake the Shewbread on a weekday.

(18) It could have been baked before the Sabbath and kept for the Sabbath, for it is not hallowed until it is set on the table.

(19) Ibid. 7.

(20) That it may be given to a non-priest to eat.

(21) In accordance with the rule laid down (Me'il. I, 1): The law of sacrilege does not apply to whatsoever is permitted to the priests.

(22) Sc. David.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 96a

for he is in danger of his life.[1] R. Judah and R. Simeon, however, differ as to the tradition.[2] And there is in fact evidence for this, for it reads: R. SIMEON SAYS, ACCUSTOM THYSELF TO SAY, THE TWO LOAVES AND THE SHEWBREAD WERE VALID WHETHER MADE IN THE TEMPLE COURT OR IN BETH PAGE. This proves it.[3] MISHNAH. THE KNEADING, THE SHAPING, AND THE BAKING OF THE HIGH PRIEST'S GRIDDLE-CAKES[4] WERE

PERFORMED WITHIN[5] [THE TEMPLE COURT], AND THEY OVERRODE THE SABBATH; THE GRINDING [OF THE CORN FOR IT] AND THE SIFTING DID NOT OVERRIDE THE SABBATH. R. AKIBA LAID DOWN THIS GENERAL RULE: ANY WORK THAT CAN BE DONE ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH DOES NOT OVERRIDE THE SABBATH, BUT THAT WHICH CANNOT BE DONE ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH OVERRIDES THE SABBATH.[6] ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS REQUIRE A VESSEL [OF MINISTRY FOR THOSE WORKS THAT ARE PERFORMED] WITHIN,[7] BUT DO NOT REQUIRE A VESSEL [OF MINISTRY FOR THOSE WORKS THAT ARE PERFORMED] OUTSIDE. THE TWO LOAVES WERE SEVEN HANDBREADTHS LONG AND FOUR WIDE AND THEIR HORNS[8] WERE FOUR FINGERBREADTHS. THE [CAKES OF THE] SHEWBREAD WERE TEN HANDBREADTHS LONG AND FIVE WIDE AND THEIR HORNS[8] WERE SEVEN FINGERBREADTHS. R. JUDAH SAYS, LEST YOU ERR [REMEMBER BUT THE WORDS] ZADAD YAHAZ.[9] BEN ZOMA SAYS, AND THOU SHALT SET UPON THE TABLE SHEW BREAD BEFORE ME CONTINUALLY:[10] 'SHEWBREAD' SIGNIFIES THAT IT SHALL HAVE ALL ITS SURFACES VISIBLE.[11] THE TABLE WAS TEN HANDBREADTHS LONG AND FIVE WIDE;[12] THE CAKES OF THE SHEWBREAD WERE TEN HANDBREADTHS LONG AND FIVE WIDE. EACH CAKE WAS PLACED LENGTHWISE ACROSS THE BREADTH OF THE TABLE, AND TWO AND A HALF HANDBREADTHS WERE TURNED UP[13] AT EITHER SIDE SO THAT ITS LENGTH FILLED THE ENTIRE BREADTH OF THE TABLE. THIS IS THE VIEW OF R. JUDAH. R. MEIR SAYS, THE TABLE WAS TWELVE HANDBREADTHS LONG AND SIX WIDE;[14] THE CAKES OF THE SHEWBREAD WERE TEN HANDBREADTHS LONG AND FIVE WIDE. EACH CAKE WAS PLACED LENGTHWISE ACROSS THE BREADTH OF THE TABLE, AND TWO HANDBREADTHS WERE TURNED UP AT EITHER SIDE; AND THERE WAS A SPACE OF TWO HANDBREADTHS BETWEEN [THE TWO SETS] SO THAT THE WIND COULD BLOW BETWEEN THEM.[15] ABBA SAUL SAYS, THERE THEY USED TO PUT THE TWO DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE PERTAINING TO THE SHEWBREAD. THEY SAID TO HIM, IS IT NOT WRITTEN, AND THOU SHALT PUT PURE FRANKINCENSE UPON ['AL] EACH ROW?[16] HE REPLIED, BUT IS IT NOT WRITTEN, AND NEXT UNTO ['AL] HIM SHALL BE THE TRIBE OF MANASSEH?[17]

THERE WERE THERE FOUR GOLDEN PROPS,[18] BRANCHED AT THE TOP, WHICH SUPPORTED THE CAKES, TWO FOR THE ONE ROW AND TWO FOR THE OTHER ROW. AND THERE WERE TWENTY-EIGHT RODS,[18] EACH [SHAPED] LIKE THE HALF OF A HOLLOW REED, FOURTEEN FOR THE ONE ROW AND FOURTEEN FOR THE OTHER ROW. NEITHER THE PLACING OF THE RODS NOR THEIR REMOVAL OVERRODE THE SABBATH, BUT [A PRIEST] USED TO ENTER ON THE DAY BEFORE THE SABBATH, DRAW OUT THE RODS, AND PLACE THEM[19] PARALLEL WITH THE LENGTH OF THE TABLE.[20] EVERY ARTICLE THAT STOOD IN THE TEMPLE WAS PLACED WITH ITS LENGTH PARALLEL WITH THE LENGTH OF THE HOUSE.[21]

GEMARA. ALL MEAL-OFFERINGS REQUIRE A VESSEL [OF MINISTRY FOR THOSE WORKS THAT ARE PERFORMED] WITHIN. Rabbi was asked, How do you know it? And he replied, Behold it is written, And he said unto me, This is the place where the priests shall boil the guilt-offering and the sin-offering, where they shall bake the meal-offering; that they bring them not forth in the outer court.[22] The meal-offering is placed alongside with the guilt-offering and the sin-offering; as the guilt-offering and the sin-offering require a vessel of ministry,[23] so the meal-offering also requires a vessel of ministry.

THE TABLE WAS TEN HANDBREADTHS LONG. R. Johanan said, According to him who says that two and a half handbreadths [of each cake] were turned up [at either side], it will be seen that the table could hallow [whatsoever was put upon it] to the height of fifteen handbreadths;[24] and according to him who says that two handbreadths were turned up [at either side] it will be seen that

the table could hallow to the height of twelve handbreadths. But there were the rods![25] — The rods were sunken in.[26] But what was the purpose [of the rods]? To prevent the bread from becoming mouldy, was it not? But as now suggested the bread would still become mouldy![27] — It was raised a little.[28] Then that little [should also be taken into account]![29] — Since in all it did not amount to a handbreadth it was of no significance. But there were the dishes [of frankincense]![29] — They were placed in the bread[30] and rose to the same height as the bread. Then there were the corners![31] — The corners were bent inward and the bread rested upon them.

---

(1) For David had been overcome by faintness by reason of his hunger, and in order to save life all laws may be superseded.

(2) As to whether or not the oven hallows whatsoever is baked in it.

(3) R. Simeon's expression clearly shows that he is referring to a tradition that he had received from his teachers.

(4) The meal-offering prepared on a griddle which was offered daily by the High priest, half of the tenth being offered in the morning and the other half in the evening. V. Lev. VI, 12-15.

(5) For the half-tenth measure by which the tenth was divided was, according to all views, a hallowed vessel, so that the flour became hallowed therein; hence it was necessary to knead it inside the Temple court.

(6) As the grinding and sifting can be done before the Sabbath they do not override the Sabbath, but the kneading, the shaping and the baking cannot be done before the Sabbath, for since the flour has already been hallowed in the half tenth measure the offering would become invalid if kept overnight; accordingly they override the Sabbath.

(7) Or: Every (work in connection with the) meal-offering that is prepared in a vessel of ministry must be performed within (the Temple court), but every work that is not prepared in a vessel of ministry may be performed outside.

(8) There is considerable doubt among the commentators as to what these horns were. According to Rashi and Bertinoro they were lumps of dough, four fingerbreadths long (in the Shewbread, seven), put on the four upper corners of the cake after the manner of the horns of the altar. For further suggestions v. Cohn J. Menachot (Mischnayot) Berlin, 1925 a.l.

(9) The consonants of these two words have the numerical values of 7, 4, 4 and 10, 5, 7, which correspond to the dimensions of the Two Loaves and the Shewbread respectively. The mnemonical words are meaningless.

(10) Ex. XXV, 30.

(11) Lit., 'it shall have faces (on all sides)'. Another interpretation, based on the reading פינים is: it shall have corners, i.e., the horns mentioned above; v. supra p. 586, n. 5.

(12) For according to R. Judah the cubit consisted of five handbreadths, and the dimensions of the table are given in the Torah as two cubits long and one wide. Cf. Ex. XXV, 23.

(13) And stood perpendicularly; these were the sides of the cakes.

(14) For the cubit according to R. Meir consisted of six handbreadths.

(15) This free circulation of air between the two rows would prevent the cakes from becoming mouldy.

(16) Lev. XXIV, 7. The Heb. עַל generally means upon; thus the frankincense was to be put upon the bread.

(17) Num. II, 20. In this verse עַל clearly denotes 'next to', 'by the side of'. Likewise, argues Abba Saul, in the case of the Shewbread עַל denotes by the side of and not upon.

(18) V. supra p. 579 and notes thereon.

(19) I.e., the rods were placed on the ground to lie parallel with the length of the table (Tosaf.).

(20) The rods were removed on the Friday, on the Saturday fresh cakes were set on the table without, however, putting the rods in their place, and in the evening after the Sabbath the rods were inserted between the cakes.

(21) I.e., east to west; e.g., the table.

(22) Ezek. XLVI, 20.

(23) For those services which are performed inside the Temple court, e.g., the cooking of the offering, which is expressly spoken of in this verse.

(24) As each cake was two and a half handbreadths high each row of six cakes rose to a height of fifteen handbreadths above the surface of the table.

(25) That were placed between the cakes; accordingly the six cakes rose to a greater height than fifteen handbreadths, for there must be added thereto five times the thickness of the rods.

(26) There were notches at the top of each cake and the rods were laid therein so that there was no intervening space between one cake and that above it.

(27) In spite of the rods, since there is no space between the cakes.

(28) The rod did not lie actually, as was assumed supra, upon the sides of the cake (v. diagram p. 580), but was raised above it, and the ends of the rod rested in the grooves of the upright props; accordingly the upper cake did not come into contact with the one below it, and the air could circulate freely between the cakes.
(29) It would make each row rise to a greater height than fifteen handbreadths.
(30) I.e., in the air-space of the top cake between the two perpendicular sides.
(31) Or 'horns', v. supra p. 586, n. 5.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 96b

But there was also the border of the table![1] — It is in accordance with the view of him who says that the border was underneath [the table].[2] But [what can be said] according to him who says that the border was above [the table]? — It slanted outwards so that the bread actually rested on the table. As was taught: R. Jose says, There were no props there at all but the border of the table supported the bread. But they said to him, The border was beneath [the table].

R. Johanan said, According to him who says that the border was beneath the table, it follows that a board which can be used on either side[3] is susceptible to uncleanness;[4] but according to him who says that the border was above the table,[5] there is still a doubt as to whether a board which can be used on either side [is susceptible to uncleanness or not].

It is evident [from the above] that the table was susceptible to uncleanness, but surely it is a wooden vessel made to rest, and a wooden vessel made to rest is not susceptible to uncleanness! For what reason? We require it to be like a sack:[6] just as a sack is movable both full and empty so everything that is movable both full and empty is susceptible to uncleanness![7] — The table, too, was movable both full and empty, in accordance with Resh Lakish's statement. For Resh Lakish said, What is the meaning of the verse, upon the clean table?[8] The inference is that it is susceptible to uncleanness. But why? It is a wooden vessel made to rest and cannot therefore contract uncleanness![9] It teaches that they used to lift it up and exhibit the Shewbread thereon to those who came up for the Festivals, saying to them, Behold the love in which you are held by God! This is in accordance with R. Joshua b. Levi; for R. Joshua b. Levi said, A great miracle was wrought in regard to the Shewbread: it was taken away as [fresh as] when it was set down, as it is written, To put hot bread in the day when it was taken away.[10]

But surely you can arrive at this[11] from the fact that it was overlaid [with gold]![12] For we have learnt:[13] If a table or a side-table[14] was damaged,[15] or was overlaid with marble,[16] yet room enough was left to set cups thereon,[17] it is still susceptible to uncleanness. R. Judah says, There must be room enough left to set portions [of food thereon]. Now if there was room enough left it is [susceptible] but if there was not room enough left it is not [susceptible].[18] And should you say that in the one case[19] the overlaying was fixed, whereas in the other it was not fixed;[20] but [it has been reported] that Resh Lakish enquired of R. Johanan, [Does it[21] apply only] to a fixed overlaying or also to an overlaying that is not fixed? And furthermore does it apply only to the case where the rims were also overlaid

---

(1) It is assumed that the border was a rim or a ledge which rose above the table; accordingly the bread would have to be placed above this ledge, and as the border was one handbreadth wide each row of bread would then reach to a height of sixteen handbreadths above the table.
(2) The border was a frame which joined together the four legs of the table. The top of the table, however, was a flat board and not attached to the frame, so that either side of the board could have been used as the table top.
(3) Lit., 'which can be turned over'. i.e., a flat board without rim or ledge on either side.
(4) For such was the top of the Sanctuary table, and that was susceptible to uncleanness, v. infra.
(5) Accordingly the table top could not have been reversed, but with its proper side up it formed a receptacle, and so it was susceptible to uncleanness.

(6) A wooden vessel in order to be susceptible to uncleanness must in the manner of its use be like a sack, for the two are mentioned together in one verse in respect of uncleanness (Lev. XI, 32).
(7) This would exclude wooden vessels not intended to be moved at all.
(8) Lev. XXIV, 6. V. supra 29a.
(9) So in MS.M., and in all the parallel passages; omitted in cur. edd.
(10) I Sam. XXI, 7. V. supra p. 287, n. 6.
(11) That the Sanctuary table was susceptible to uncleanness even though it was intended to rest in one place.
(12) This establishes it as a metal vessel, and metal vessels are susceptible to uncleanness even though made to rest, for they are not likened to a sack. (v. p. 590, n. 4).
(13) Kel. XXII, 1; Hag. 26b.
(14) דולבקי. V. Jast. s.v. דלפקי '(delphica, sub. mensa) a three-legged table used as a toilet table or a waiter, contrad. from שלחן (eating table)'.
(15) Damaged tables which can no longer be used for their original purpose are not susceptible to uncleanness.
(16) Stone vessels are not susceptible to uncleanness.
(17) I.e., part of the table was left undamaged or was not overlaid with marble, and that part could still be used for its original purpose.
(18) Thus if the entire table was damaged, or if it was entirely overlaid with marble, it is not susceptible to uncleanness; hence it is evident that we consider a vessel in regard to uncleanness according to the material of its overlaying.
(19) In the Mishnah quoted.
(20) The golden overlaying of the Sanctuary table was not fastened to it permanently but was removable, hence the table could not be regarded as a metal vessel.
(21) Sc. the teaching of the above-quoted Mishnah viz., that the material of the overlaying of a vessel is regarded for the purposes of uncleanness as the material of the vessel.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 97a

or also to the case where the rims were not overlaid? And he replied, It makes no difference whether the overlaying was fixed or the overlaying was not fixed; whether the rims were overlaid or the rims were not overlaid.[1] And should you further say that acacia wood,[2] being valuable, is not nullified [by the overlaying],[3] this would be quite in order according to Resh Lakish who said that they taught this[4] only of vessels of common wood[5] which come from overseas, but vessels of fine wood[6] are valuable and are not nullified [by the overlaying]. But what can one say according to R. Johanan who said that even vessels of fine wood are nullified [by the overlaying]? — One must therefore say that the table [of the Sanctuary] was different, for the Divine Law called it wood. For it is written, The altar was of wood, three cubits high, and the length thereof two cubits; and the corners thereof, and the length thereof, and the walls thereof were of wood; and he said unto me, This is the table that is before the Lord.[7] [The verse] begins with the altar and ends with the table! R. Johanan and R. Eleazar both said, While the Temple still stood the altar used to make atonement for a man, but now that the Temple no longer stands a man's table makes atonement for him.[8]

THERE WERE THERE FOUR GOLDEN PROPS etc. How do we know this? — R. Kattina said, For the verse says, And thou shalt make ke'arothaw, and kappothaw, and kesothaw, and menakiothaw, to cover withal.[9] Ke'arothaw are the moulds,[10] kappothaw the dishes,[11] kesothaw the props,[12] and menakiothaw the rods;[13] to cover withal: wherewith the bread was covered.[14]

Raba raised an objection. [We have learnt:] NEITHER THE PLACING OF THE RODS NOR THEIR REMOVAL OVERRODE THE SABBATH. Now if we were to hold [that the rods are enjoined] in the Torah, wherefore do they not override the Sabbath? Later, however, Raba said, What I said was not correct, for we have learnt: R. AKIBA LAID DOWN THIS GENERAL RULE: ANY WORK THAT CAN BE DONE ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH DOES NOT OVERRIDE THE SABBATH. This,[15] therefore, in all probability did not override the Sabbath. For why [were the rods required at all]? So that the bread become not mouldy. But in this short time[16] it would not

become mouldy. And so it has been taught: What was the procedure? He used to enter on the eve of the Sabbath, draw out the rods, and place them [on the ground] parallel with the length of the table. At the outgoing of the Sabbath he used to enter again, lift up the ends of one cake and insert the rods underneath it, and then lift up the ends of another cake and insert the rods underneath it. The four [middle] cakes each required three rods underneath them, the topmost cake required but two rods underneath it for there was no burden upon it, while the bottom cake required no rods at all for it stood upon the surface of the table.

We have learnt elsewhere:[17] R. Meir says, All cubit measurements in the Temple were [according to a cubit of] medium size,[18] excepting those of the golden altar, the horns, the sobeb,[19] and the base [of the outer altar][20] R. Judah says, The cubit used for the [Temple] building was of six handbreadths and that for the vessels was of five handbreadths.

R. Johanan said, Both derived their views from the same text: And these are the measures of the altar[21] by cubits — the cubit is a cubit and a handbreadth;[22]

---

(1) In all the circumstances stated the vessel is determined by the material of its overlaying.

(2) Of which the table was made; Ex. XXV, 23.

(3) And despite the overlaying of gold it is still regarded as a wooden vessel.

(4) Sc. that the overlaying is all-important and that it determines the character of the vessel.

(5) אכסלגום Meaning and etymology doubtful; according to Jast.: **, woodcarrier, common wooden vessels'. According to Tosaf. it is the name of a place.

(6) מסמם. According to Jast.: 'polished wood, prob. coral-wood'.

(7) Ezek. XLI, 22.

(8) When the poor are at his table.

(9) Ex. XXV, 29. The translation of these words: תקשותיו , and מנקיתיו in the E.VV. does not correspond with the Rabbinical interpretation which follows, hence they are left untranslated.

(10) Wherein the cakes were shaped; v. supra 94a.

(11) Wherein the frankincense was put; cf. Lev. XXIV, 7.

(12) V. supra 96a. קשותיו is thus derived from קשה, hard; for the props kept the cakes hard and firm so that they should not break.

(13) V. supra ibid. מנקיתיו is derived from נקי, clean; the rods, shaped like the half of a hollowed reed, allowed the free circulation of air between the cakes, and thus the cakes were kept clean and free from mouldiness.

(14) I.e., the rods lay over the cakes like a cover.

(15) Sc. the placing of the rods and the removal thereof.

(16) When the cakes stood without the intervening rods, i.e., between the removal of the rods on the eve of the Sabbath and the removal of the bread on the Sabbath at midday, or between the setting down of the fresh bread on the Sabbath and the insertion of the rods at the conclusion of the Sabbath.

(17) Kel. XVII, 10; 'Er. 4b; Suk. 5b.

(18) I.e., of six handbreadths.

(19) Heb. סובב: the second terrace or ledge which ran round the altar upon which the officiating priests walked.

(20) For these the standard of the cubit was five handbreadths.

(21) Sc. the outer altar, i.e., the altar of the burnt-offering.

(22) I.e., the ordinary cubit, which measured six handbreadths, was one cubit and one handbreadth by the standard of the cubit spoken of in this verse, for the latter cubit measured only five handbreadths. And all the parts of the altar mentioned in this verse were measured by a cubit of five handbreadths.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 97b

the bottom shall be a cubit, and a cubit the breadth, and the border thereof by the edge thereof round about a span;[1] and this shall be the base of the altar.[2] 'The bottom shall be a cubit' refers to the base [of the altar]; 'and a cubit the breadth' refers to the sobeb; 'and the border thereof by the edge

thereof round about a span refers to the horns;[3] 'and this shall be the base of the altar' refers to the golden altar.[4] Now R. Meir maintained that [only] this[5] was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths but all the other vessels [in the Temple] were measured by a cubit of six handbreadths; whereas R. Judah maintained that like this [cubit] shall be all the cubits for the vessels.

It was assumed that it was the height from the base to the sobeb that was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths;[6] and the verse, 'The bottom shall be a cubit and a cubit the breadth,' meant to say that [the height][7] from the base [which rose up] one cubit to [the sobeb which was] one cubit wide was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths. [Let us now consider:] The height of the altar was in all ten cubits, six [cubits] being of five handbreadths each and four of six handbreadths each. Thus the height of the altar was fifty-four handbreadths, and the half thereof was twenty-seven handbreadths. [The distance] from the [top of the] horns down to the sobeb was twenty-four handbreadths, that is, three handbreadths less than half the height of the altar.[8] And we have learnt:[9] A red line went around the altar in the middle[10] to separate between blood that must be sprinkled above and blood that must be sprinkled below. How then could it have taught in connection with the burnt-offering of a bird that [the priest] went up the ascent, passed on to the sobeb and came to the south-eastern horn, nipped off the head close by its neck and divided it asunder, and drained out the blood on the altar wall, and that if he did it even one cubit's distance below his feet,[11] it was valid? He has then applied below, to the extent of two handbreadths, blood that must be applied above![12] — It must be said, therefore, that 'the bottom shall be a cubit' refers to the rebatement[13] [of the base], 'a cubit the breadth' to the rebatement [of the sobeb], and 'the border thereof by the edge thereof round about' to the rebatement [of the horns].[14] Accordingly the height of the altar was sixty handbreadths,[15] and the half thereof was thirty handbreadths.[16] [The distance] from the [top of the] horns down to the sobeb was twenty-four handbreadths, that is, six handbreadths[17] less than half the height of the altar. And therefore we have learnt: If he did it even one cubit's distance below his feet, it was valid.[18] How have you explained it? As referring to the rebatements. But how can you explain it as referring to the rebatements? Behold we have learnt: The altar was [at its base] thirty-two cubits long and thirty-two cubits wide. It rose up one cubit and receded one cubit:[19] this formed the base; thus there were left thirty cubits by thirty.[20] According to you, however, it should be thirty cubits and two handbreadths by thirty cubits and two handbreadths![21] And further we have learnt: It rose up five cubits and receded one cubit: this formed the sobeb; thus there were left twenty-eight cubits by twenty-eight.[20] According to you, however, it should be twenty-eight cubits and four handbreadths by twenty-eight cubits and four handbreadths! And should you say that since they[22] were less than one cubit [the Tanna] purposely omitted them, but we have learnt further: The place of the horns was one cubit on every side; thus there were left twenty-six cubits by twenty-six;[20] and according to you it should be twenty-seven by twenty-seven![23] — He was not exact [in his reckoning]. But we have learnt further: The place[24] on which the feet of the priests trod was one cubit on every side; thus there were left twenty-four cubits by twenty-four, the place for the altar fire.[20] According to you, however, it should be twenty-five by twenty-five! Should you say also here that he was not exact, but it is written, And the altar hearth shall be twelve cubits long by twelve broad, square.[25] Now you might say that it was only twelve cubits by twelve; but when it also says, In the four quarters thereof,[25] it teaches that one must measure from the middle twelve cubits in every direction![26] And should you say that originally[27] six [of the thirty-two cubits] were cubits of five handbreadths,[28] then the Temple court must have had more space, and we have learnt: The Temple court was in all a hundred and eighty-seven cubits long and a hundred and thirty-five cubits wide. From east to west it was a hundred and eighty-seven cubits: the place where the feet of the Israelites trod[29] was eleven cubits; the place where the feet of the priests trod[30] was eleven cubits; the altar was thirty-two cubits; between the porch[31] and the altar was twenty-two cubits; the Sanctuary was a hundred cubits, and eleven cubits behind the Holy of Holies![32] — You must therefore say that 'the bottom shall be a cubit' refers to the height [of the base], 'a cubit the breadth' to the rebatement [of the sobeb], and 'the border thereof by the edge thereof round about' refers to the height[33] [of the horns], but [as to the space taken up by the horns]

(1) I.e., half a cubit.
(2) Ezek. XLIII, 13.
(3) These were blocks measuring one cubit each side which were placed upon the four corners of the altar. The measurement of a span stated in this verse in regard to the horns is explained as referring to the distance from the middle of each surface in every direction, i.e., the four quarters of every surface each measured a span by a span, therefore the whole of the surface was a cubit-square.
(4) I.e., the golden altar was also measured by the cubit of five handbreadths.
(5) Sc. the golden altar, which was placed in the category of Temple vessels; on the other hand the outer altar was regarded as a Temple building.
(6) Whereas the other parts of the altar were measured by a cubit of six handbreadths. The various parts of the altar and their measurements will be easily gathered from the adjoining diagram which represents one side of the altar. (See drawing). The numbers in the figure represent cubits: a=the base; b = wall of the sobeb; c = the sobeb; d = place for the altar fire, מערכה; e = the horns.
(7) Which was six cubits.
(8) In other words the sobeb was three handbreadths above the middle line of the altar.
(9) Mid. III, 1.
(10) I.e., twenty-seven handbreadths above the ground.
(11) I.e., he bent down low and drained out the blood of the offering against the wall of the sobeb upon which he stood.
(12) The blood of the burnt-offering of a bird must be applied above the red line, but by draining out the blood against the wall beneath his feet a cubit's distance down he has reached two handbreadths (taking the cubit to be five handbreadths) below the red line.
(13) Lit., 'the drawing in'. The cubit of five handbreadths spoken of in this verse was used only for measuring the depth or width of each ledge or platform round the altar.
(14) I.e., the space taken up by the horns upon the altar surface.
(15) For the measurements of the other parts of the altar, save those parts mentioned in this verse, were by the cubit of six handbreadths.
(16) At which height from the ground ran the red line round the sides of the altar.
(17) Or one cubit.
(18) Since the draining of the blood was still performed in the upper part of the altar above the red line.
(19) On every side.
(20) Mid. III, 1.
(21) Since the rebatement or width of each ledge was measured by a cubit of five handbreadths.
(22) The four additional handbreadths.
(23) For the handbreadths that were not reckoned now amount to one whole cubit!
(24) On the top surface, beyond the horns, upon the altar.
(25) Ezek. XLIII, 16.
(26) I.e., each quarter of the top surface of the altar must measure twelve cubits by twelve, therefore the whole top surface must be twenty-four by twenty-four. And as this is the teaching of the verse it cannot be said that the measurement is not exact!
(27) At the construction of the altar.
(28) I.e., the last three cubits of each side of the base were of five handbreadths each, so that six of these cubits equalled five cubits of six handbreadths each; accordingly the length of each side was in reality thirty-one cubits.
(29) The court of the Israelites, at the entrance of the Temple court.
(30) The court of the priests.
(31) Heb. אולם, the entrance to the היכל, the Sanctuary.
(32) Lit., 'the house of the mercy seat'; v. Mid. V, 1.
(33) So MS.M. and Sh. Mek., and such is the interpretation of Rashi. It is omitted in cur. edd.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 98a

it is immaterial whether the one or the other [cubit was used].[1] Accordingly the height of the altar

was fifty-eight handbreadths,[2] and the half thereof was twenty-nine handbreadths. [The distance] from the [top of the] horns down to the sobeb was twenty-three handbreadths, that is, six handbreadths less than half the height of the altar. And therefore we have learnt: 'If he did it even one cubit's distance below his feet, it was valid'. This may be proved too, for it is written, The bottom shall be a cubit, and a cubit the breadth.[3] This is conclusive.

How much is a cubit of medium size? — R. Johanan said, Six handbreadths. R. Jose b. Abin said, We have also learnt the same [in our Mishnah]: R. MEIR SAYS, THE TABLE WAS TWELVE HANDBREADTHS LONG AND SIX WIDE.[4]

It follows that there was a cubit larger than this![5] — There was, as we have learnt:[6] There were two cubits[7] in the Palace of Shushan,[8] one at the north-eastern corner and the other at the south-eastern corner. That at the north-eastern corner was longer than the cubit of Moses[9] by half a fingerbreadth, and that at the south-eastern corner was longer than the other by half a fingerbreadth; thus it was one fingerbreadth longer than the cubit of Moses. And why did they set up a large cubit[10] and a small one?[11] So that the workmen might receive [contracts of work] according to the measure of the smaller cubit and deliver [the work] according to the measure of the larger cubit, thereby avoiding any possible guilt of sacrilege.[12] And why two?[13] — One was for [work in] gold and silver[14] and the other was for building.[15]

We have learnt elsewhere: The eastern gate on which was portrayed the palace of Shushan.[16] What was the reason for this? — R. Hisda and R. Isaac b. Abdimi [offered different opinions]. One said, So that they be ever mindful whence they came;[17] the other said, So that the fear of the dominant power be ever before them.[18]

R. Jannai said, The fear of the dominant power[19] should ever be before you, as it is written, And all these thy servants shall come down unto me, and bow dawn unto me saying;[20] but he did not say so of [the king] himself.[21] R. Johanan derives it from the following verse: And the hand of the Lord was on Elijah; and he girded up his loins, and ran before Ahab to the entrance of Jezreel.[22]

And the leaf thereof for healing.[23] R. Hisda and R. Isaac b. Abdimi [each interpreted this verse]. One said, To loosen the mouth above;[24] the other said, To loosen the mouth below.[25] It has been [likewise] reported: Hezekiah said, To loosen the mouth of the dumb; Bar Kappara said, To loosen the mouth of barren women.

Our Rabbis taught: Had [Scripture] said, And thou shalt take fine flour and bake twelve cakes thereof . . . And thou shalt set them in two rows,[26] and not added, Six [in a row],[26] I would have said that one row may consist of four cakes and the other of eight; [Scripture] therefore said, Six [in a row]. Furthermore, had [Scripture] said, 'In two rows, six in a row', and it had not stated, 'Twelve', I would have said that there were to be three rows each of six cakes;[27] [Scripture] therefore said, 'Twelve'. And further, had [Scripture] said, 'Twelve', and also, 'In rows', but not, 'In two rows', nor, 'Six in a row', I would have said that there were to be three rows each of four cakes; [Scripture] therefore said, 'In two rows' and 'Six in a row'. Hence without these three expressions we should not have known [the proper practice]. And what was it? [The priest] used to set them in two rows each of six cakes. If he set one row of four and another of eight, he has not fulfilled the obligation. If he set two rows each of seven cakes, the top cake [of each row], says Rabbi, is regarded as though it was not. But does not the verse say, And thou shalt put upon ['al] each row pure frankincense?[28] — R. Hisda said to R. Hamnuna (others say, R. Hamnuna said to R. Hisda): Rabbi consistently holds the view that 'al means 'by the side of'. As has been taught: Rabbi says, In the verse, And thou shalt put 'al each row pure frankincense, the preposition 'al has the sense of 'by the side of'. You say it has the sense of 'by the side of', but perhaps it is not so but rather it means actually upon it! When it says, And thou shalt place the veil as a screen 'al the ark,[29] you may learn from it that 'al [generally]

has the sense of ‘by the side of’.

EVERY ARTICLE THAT STOOD IN THE TEMPLE etc. Our Rabbis taught: Every article that stood in the Temple was placed with its length parallel with the length of the house, excepting the ark whose length was parallel with the breadth of the house.[30] So was it placed and so were its staves placed. What can this mean?[31] — It means as follows: So was it placed for so were its staves placed.[32] And whence do we know this[31] of the staves? — From the following [Baraitha] which was taught: And the staves were so long,[33] I might have thought that they did not reach the curtain;[34] the text therefore further states, [That the ends of the staves] were seen [from the holy place].[33] But if I had the verse, [That the ends of the staves] were seen, only to go by I might have assumed that they tore through the curtain and protruded outside; the text therefore states, But they could not be seen without.[33] How then [are we to understand the verse]?

---

(1) I.e., whether the cubit was of five or of six handbreadths. Since the rebatement or width of the ledge of the base was measured by a cubit of six handbreadths and that of the middle ledge or sobeb by a cubit of five handbreadths, the altar space left by the horns would be twenty-six cubits and two handbreadths (or four handbreadths, according as one takes each side of the horn as one cubit of six handbreadths or of five respectively); and these extra handbreadths are not taken into account by the Tanna of the Mishnah.

(2) For the height of the several parts of the altar, with the exception of the one cubit the height of the base and the one cubit the height of the horns, was described by cubits of six handbreadths.

(3) Ezek. XLIII, 13. The structure of this verse is significant; in the opening part ‘cubit’ follows the article mentioned whereas in the latter part ‘cubit’ precedes it. The significance thereof is that in each case ‘cubit’ refers to a different dimension, in the former case to the height and in the latter to the width.

(4) And the table is described in the Torah (Ex. XXV, 23) as being two cubits long and one cubit wide. Now since R. Meir has taught supra p. 593 that all cubit measurements in the Temple were according to a cubit of medium size, it follows that the cubit of six handbreadths was the medium sized one.

(5) For the cubit of six handbreadths was only the medium sized one. Where do we find a larger, cubit in use?

(6) Kel. XVII, 9.

(7) Two cubit sticks were deposited there as standards.

(8) A chamber built above the eastern gate of the Temple; v. infra and Mid. I, 3.

(9) Which was six handbreadths.

(10) Sc. the two cubits deposited in the Palace of Shushan.

(11) Sc. the cubit of Moses. Why did they not adopt the cubit of Moses as the standard cubit for all purposes?

(12) I.e., benefiting from that which belongs to the Temple; cf. Lev. V, 15. By returning the completed work according to a larger measure than that which they had contracted to do they precluded the possibility of profiting from the Temple.

(13) Why have two measures each larger than the cubit of Moses?

(14) As this work was costly it was unfair to increase the standard cubit by more than half a fingerbreadth.

(15) For building work the standard cubit was increased by one whole fingerbreadth.

(16) Mid. I, 3.

(17) From the exile in Persia, and so would offer thanks to God at all times for their deliverance.

(18) It served to them as a constant reminder that they were still under Persian rule.

(19) Lit., ‘kingship’.

(20) Ex. XI, 8.

(21) Moses out of respect for the king did not say to him, ‘Thou shalt come unto me and bow down to me’, although he knew that that would eventually be the case.

(22) I Kings XVIII, 46. Out of respect for royalty the prophet Elijah acted as the king's runner and accompanied him on his journey.

(23) Ezek. XLVII, 12.

(24) I.e., to make the dumb speak. The interpretation is a play upon the word לתרופה, ‘for healing’, which is taken as a compound of להתיר פה ‘for loosening the mouth’.

(25) A euphemism for the womb.

(26) Lev. XXIV, 5, 6.

(27) The expression ‘six in a row’, following immediately after the two rows already stated, would be interpreted as referring to a third row of six cakes. There is a variant text found in MS.M., also given by Rashi, which reads: There was to be a third row of three cakes; i.e., only the two rows shall be of six cakes each, but other additional rows may be of less than six cakes.
(28) Lev. XXIV, 7. The preposition עַל translated ‘upon’, implies that the dish of frankincense must actually be upon the row of six cakes, i.e., nothing shall intervene between the dish of frankincense and the row proper.
(29) Ex. XL, 3. The veil was clearly put up as a screen before the ark, accordingly עַל cannot have the meaning of ‘upon’. From this verse Rabbi establishes his view that ‘al generally means ‘by the side of’.
(30) I.e., north to south.
(31) The staves actually pointed in the directions of east and west.
(32) Since the staves pointed eastward and westward and protruded at right angles to the length of the ark, it follows that the ark stood lengthwise from north to south.
(33) I Kings VIII, 8.
(34) Sc. the curtain that hung over the entrance to the Holy of Holies which was on the east side.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 98b

They pressed against the curtain and bulged out as the two breasts of a woman, as it is said, My beloved is unto me as a bundle of myrrh, that lieth betwixt my breasts.[1] But whence do we know that the staves lay along the breadth of the ark? Perhaps they lay along the length of the ark? — Rab Judah answered, Because in the space of one cubit and a half two men could not stand.[2] And whence do we know that four persons carried it?[3] — Because it is written, And the Kohathites[4] [which are at least] two, the bearers of the sanctuary[4] again two,[5] set forward.[4]

Our Rabbis taught: King Solomon made ten tables, as it is written, He made also ten tables and placed them in the Temple, five on the right side and five on the left.[6] If you were to say that five were on the right side of the [Temple] entrance[7] and five on the left side of the entrance, then we should have tables placed on the south side [of the Temple], but the Torah says, And thou shalt put the table on the north side.[8] You must therefore say that [the table] of Moses stood in the middle with five [tables] to the right of it and five to the left of it.[9]

Our Rabbis taught: King Solomon also made ten candlesticks, as it is written, And he made the ten candlesticks of gold according to the ordinance concerning them; and he set them in the Temple, five on the right hand and five on the left.[10] If you were to say that five were on the right side of the [Temple] entrance and five on the left side, we should then have candlesticks set on the north side [of the Temple], but the Torah says, And the candlestick over against the table on the side of the tabernacle towards the south.[11] You must therefore say that [the candlestick] of Moses stood in the middle with five [candlesticks] to the right of it and five to the left of it.

One [Baraitha] states that [the tables] stood in the inner half of the Sanctuary, whilst another [Baraitha] states that they stood in the inner third of the Sanctuary! — This, however, presents no difficulty, for the one [Baraitha][12] includes the Holy of Holies in the term ‘Sanctuary’, whilst the other[13] does not include the Holy of Holies in the term ‘Sanctuary’.[14]

Our Rabbis taught: [The tables] were placed [lengthwise] from east to west. So Rabbi. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon says, From north to south. What is Rabbi's reason? — He derives it from the candlestick: as the candlestick stood [with its branches] towards east and west, so these stood from east to west. But whence do we know this of the candlestick itself? — Since of the western lamp[15] the verse says, Aaron shall order it . . . before the Lord,[16] it follows that all the others were not before the Lord; now if one were to assume [that the candlestick stood with its branches] towards north and south, all the lamps would then be before the Lord.[17] And what is the reason for the view of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon? — He derives it from the ark: as the ark stood [lengthwise in the

direction of] north and south, so these also stood [lengthwise] from north to south. And why does not Rabbi derive it from the ark? — One may infer [an object that stood] outside[18] from [another that stood] outside, but one may not infer [that which stood] outside from [that which stood] inside.[19] And why does not R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon derive it from the candlestick? — He maintains that even the candlestick stood [with its branches extending] towards north and south. But is it not written, Aaron and his sons shall order it . . . [before the Lord]?[20] — They were all made to face [the middle lamp].[21] For it has been taught:[22] The seven lamps shall give light in front of the candlestick;[23] this teaches that they were made to face the middle lamp. R. Nathan said, This shows that the middle one is specially prized.[24]

It is quite clear, according to him who said [that the tables stood lengthwise] from east to west, to see how the ten [tables][25] were placed in the twenty cubits;[26] but according to him who said [that they stood lengthwise] from north to south, how could the ten tables be placed in twenty cubits?[27] Furthermore,[28] how could the priests enter [the Holy of Holies]?[29] Furthermore, we would then have five tables on the south side![30] And further, where did the table of Moses stand?[31] — But according to your argument [this question could] also [be raised] against him who said [that they stood lengthwise] from east to west: Where did the table of Moses stand?[32] But in fact [there is no difficulty] for you have assumed, have you not, that they stood in one row? [In reality, however,] they stood in two rows.[33]

---

(1) Cant. I, 13. As the staves bulged in the curtain they obviously pointed eastward.

(2) As the ark was one cubit and a half wide if, as suggested, the staves lay along the length of the ark, there would then have been only the space of one cubit and a half between the staves, and within this space two men could not have walked side by side carrying the ark.

(3) I.e., that two Levites walking side by side carried the ark in front and two behind. Perhaps only two persons carried it, one carrying the two ends of the staves on one side, and the other the two ends of the staves on the other side.

(4) Num. X, 21.

(5) Thus there were four Levites that carried the ark.

(6) II Chron. IV, 8.

(7) The entrance to the Temple was in the middle of the east side.

(8) Ex. XXVI, 35.

(9) They all stood, however, on the north side.

(10) II Chron. IV, 7.

(11) Ex. XXVI, 35.

(12) The latter.

(13) The former.

(14) The Sanctuary (lit., ‘house’) including the Holy of Holies was sixty cubits long, the first twenty cubits being taken up by the Holy of Holies and in the space of the next twenty cubits stood the tables. Now these latter twenty cubits were half the Sanctuary space (if one excludes from this term the Holy of Holies) or a third of the Sanctuary space (if one includes in that term the Holy of Holies).

(15) I.e., the second lamp from the eastern end.

(16) Ex. XXVII, 21; Lev. XXIV, 3.

(17) So that no one lamp could be said to be looking westwards any more than the others. Accordingly it must be concluded that the candlestick stood with its branches extended towards east and west.

(18) The Holy of Holies.

(19) The ark was within the Holy of Holies but the candlestick and the tables were outside in the Sanctuary.

(20) Which shows that only one lamp, ‘it’, was before the Lord, but if it is maintained that the candlestick stood with its branches extending to the north and to the south all the lamps alike would be before the Lord.

(21) Whilst the middle lamp alone faced the Holy of Holies.

(22) Meg. 21b.

(23) Num. VIII, 2.

(24) On Mondays, Thursdays and Sabbath afternoon, at least ten verses of the portion prescribed for the following

Sabbath were read by three persons; and as 'the middle was specially prized' the second reader was privileged to read four verses whilst the other two read three verses each. V. also Tosaf. s.v. שאמצעי.

(25) Each table being two cubits long and one cubit wide.

(26) I.e., the twenty cubits furthest from the entrance of the Sanctuary. It is assumed, for the present, that the ten tables were placed head to head in one long line, thus forming one table measuring twenty cubits by one cubit. Now although it is impossible to place lengthwise an object twenty cubits long in a space exactly twenty cubits long or wide, since there was more space available in the Sanctuary it was of small consequence if the table protruded a little beyond the twenty cubits allotted to it.

(27) For the Sanctuary was twenty cubits wide and the tables were placed parallel with the width of the Sanctuary.

(28) Assuming even that the tables would just fit in the width of the Sanctuary.

(29) I.e., the High Priest on the Day of Atonement. The tables formed a barrier across the entire width of the Sanctuary.

(30) In contravention of the Biblical ordinance. Cf. Ex. XXVI, 35.

(31) Which stood, according to the Baraitha quoted above p. 601, between the other tables. There was thus insufficient room for all eleven tables.

(32) If it was among the other tables then one table must have stood completely in the front half of the Sanctuary!

(33) Each row consisting of five tables and measuring ten cubits by one cubit. The table of Moses stood by itself between the two rows.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 99a

Then according to him who said [that they stood lengthwise] from north to south it is quite in order,[1] but according to him who said that they stood lengthwise from east to west [there is a difficulty]. Let us consider, how far away was the table[2] from the [north] wall? Two cubits and a half;[3] then there was one cubit [the width of the table] itself, two cubits and a half the space between the tables,[4] one cubit [the width of the table] itself,[5] again two cubits and a half the space between the tables,[6] and one cubit [the width of the table] itself, [in all ten cubits and a half]; thus the tables had encroached to the extent of half a cubit upon the south side [of the Sanctuary]! — You have assumed, have you not, that the table of Moses stood between the two rows of tables? But it was not so, it actually stood at the head of the two rows of tables,[7] whilst the latter stood lower down like pupils sitting before their master.

Our Rabbis taught: Solomon made ten tables; they set [the Shewbread], however, only on that made by Moses, as it is written, And the table whereon the Shewbread was.[8] Also Solomon made ten candlesticks; they lit, however, only that of Moses, as it is written, And the candlestick of gold with the lamps thereof, to burn every evening.[9] R. Eleazar b. Shammua' says, On all the tables[10] they set [the Shewbread], as it is written, And the tables whereon was the shewbread;[11] and they lit all the candlesticks, as it is written, And the candlesticks with their lamps, that they should burn according to the ordinance before the Sanctuary, of pure gold.[12] R. Jose son of R. Judah says, They set [the Shewbread] only on that of Moses; but how do I explain the verse which says, 'And the tables whereon was the Shewbread'?[11] These are the three tables that were in the Temple:[13] two stood inside the porch at the entrance of the House, the one of silver[14] and the other of gold. On the table of silver they laid the Shewbread when it was brought in, and on the table of gold they laid the Shewbread when it was brought out, since what is holy we must raise [in honour] but not bring down. And within [the Sanctuary] was a table of gold whereon the Shewbread lay continually.

Whence is it inferred that we may not bring down [what is holy]? — Rabbi said, From the verse, And Moses reared up the tabernacle, and laid its sockets, and set up the boards thereof, and put in the bars thereof, and reared up its pillars.[15] And whence is it inferred that we must raise up [in honour what is holy]? — R. Aha b. Jacob said, From the verse, Even the fire-pans of these men who have sinned at the cost of their lives, and let them be made beaten plates for a covering of the altar — for they are become holy, because they were offered before the Lord — that they may be a sign unto the children of Israel.[16] At first they were but accessories of the altar and now they are part of the altar

itself.

Which thou didst break, and thou shalt put them in the ark.[17] R. Joseph learnt: This teaches us that both the tablets and the fragments of the tablets were deposited in the ark. Hence [we learn that] a scholar who has forgotten his learning through no fault of his[18] must not be treated with disrespect.[19]

(Mnemonic: Suppression, misdeed, forgets.)[20] Resh Lakish said: There are times

---

(1) For the tables were almost completely on the north side of the Sanctuary, overstepping but slightly the middle line.

(2) Sc. the row of tables nearest the north wall.

(3) This space provided sufficient room for two persons to walk side by side, for the priests who attended to the Shewbread walked around the tables in pairs.

(4) I.e., between the north row of tables and the table of Moses.

(5) Sc. the table of Moses.

(6) I.e., between the table of Moses and the south row of tables.

(7) And was thus nearest to the Holy of Holies. Moreover, as the ground of the Temple sloped downwards from west to east, the table of Moses, being nearest the west side, was indeed on a higher elevation than the other tables.

(8) I Kings VII, 48. Only one table is mentioned for the Shewbread.

(9) II Chron. XIII, 11. Thus only one candlestick was burning every evening.

(10) I.e., sometimes on one table and sometimes on another.

(11) Ibid. IV, 19. This verse speaks of many tables used for the Shewbread.

(12) Ibid. 20.

(13) That were used in connection with the Shewbread. V. next Mishnah, infra p. 607.

(14) According to the next Mishnah it was of marble, but it had a bright appearance like silver. V. however, Tosaf. infra 99b s.v. אחד.

(15) Ex. XL, 18. Moses himself completed the erection of the Tabernacle, for since he had begun it it would have been a degradation had he allowed others to complete it. Aliter: the verse opens with the expression 'reared up' and concludes also with this same expression, thus signifying that what is holy must be 'reared up' and kept exalted and not brought down.

(16) Num. XVII, 3 (E. VV. XVI, 38).

(17) Deut. X, 2.

(18) Lit., 'by reason of his misfortune'; i.e., through old age, sickness or trouble, but not through wilful neglect.

(19) Since even the broken pieces of the tablets were also treated with sanctity and were placed in the ark.

(20) These words form the subject matter of the following three teachings of Resh Lakish respectively.

when the suppression of the Torah may be the foundation of the Torah,[1] for it is written, 'Which thou didst break': The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Moses, 'Thou didst well to break'![2]

Resh Lakish also said, A scholar who has committed a misdeed must not be reproached[3] publicly, for it is written, Therefore shalt thou stumble in the day, and the prophet also shall stumble with thee in the night,[4] that is to say, keep it dark,[5] like night.

Resh Lakish further said,[6] He who forgets one word of his study transgresses a negative precept, for it is written, [Only] take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things.[7] This being in accordance with the rule laid down by R. Abin in the name of R. Ila'a; for R. Abin said in the name of R. Ila'a, Wherever there occur in Holy Writ the expressions 'take heed',[8] 'lest', or 'do not', they are negative precepts. Rabina said, [He transgresses two negative precepts for] 'take heed' and 'lest' are two negative precepts. R. Nahman b. Isaac said, [He transgresses] three [negative precepts], for it is written, '[Only] take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things'. One might suppose that this is so even when he forgets it through no fault of his; the text

therefore states, 'And lest they depart from thy heart':[7] Scripture thus speaks only of him who of set purpose puts them away from his heart. R. Dosethai son of R. Jannai said, One might further suppose that this is so even when his study has been too hard for him; the text therefore states, Only.[9]

R. Johanan and R. Eleazar both said, The Torah was given in forty days and the soul is formed in forty days:[10] whosoever keeps the Torah his soul is kept, and whosoever does not keep the Torah his soul is not kept. A Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael taught: It is like the case of a man who entrusted a swallow to the care of his servant and said to him, 'Do you think that if you suffer it to perish I will take from you an issar[11] for its value? [No,] I will take your soul from you'.

MISHNAH. THERE WERE TWO TABLES INSIDE THE PORCH AT THE ENTRANCE OF THE HOUSE, THE ONE OF MARBLE[12] AND THE OTHER OF GOLD. ON THE TABLE OF MARBLE THEY LAID THE SHEWBREAD WHEN IT WAS BROUGHT IN, AND ON THE TABLE OF GOLD THEY LAID THE SHEWBREAD WHEN IT WAS BROUGHT OUT, SINCE WHAT IS HOLY WE MUST RAISE [IN HONOUR] BUT NOT BRING DOWN. AND WITHIN [THE SANCTUARY] WAS A TABLE OF GOLD WHEREON THE SHEWBREAD LAY CONTINUALLY. FOUR PRIESTS ENTERED, TWO BEARING THE TWO ROWS [OF THE SHEWBREAD] IN THEIR HANDS AND TWO BEARING THE TWO DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] IN THEIR HANDS; AND FOUR WENT IN BEFORE THEM, TWO TO TAKE AWAY THE TWO ROWS [OF THE SHEWBREAD] AND TWO TO TAKE AWAY THE TWO DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE]. THOSE WHO BROUGHT THEM IN STOOD AT THE NORTH SIDE WITH THEIR FACES TO THE SOUTH, AND THOSE WHO TOOK THEM AWAY STOOD AT THE SOUTH SIDE WITH THEIR FACES TO THE NORTH.[13] THESE WITHDREW [THE OLD] AND THE OTHERS LAID DOWN [THE NEW], THE HANDBREADTH OF THE ONE BEING BY THE SIDE OF THE HANDBREADTH OF THE OTHER,[14] FOR IT IS WRITTEN, BEFORE ME CONTINUALLY.[15] R. JOSE SAYS, EVEN IF THESE [FIRST] TOOK AWAY [THE OLD] AND THE OTHERS LAID DOWN [THE NEW LATER ON], THIS TOO FULFILS THE REQUIREMENT OF CONTINUALLY'. THEY WENT AND LAID [THE OLD BREAD] ON THE TABLE OF GOLD THAT WAS IN THE PORCH. THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] WERE THEN BURNT AND THE CAKES WERE DISTRIBUTED AMONG THE PRIESTS.[16] IF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT FELL ON A SABBATH THE CAKES WERE DISTRIBUTED IN THE EVENING.[17] IF IT FELL ON A FRIDAY THE HE-GOAT OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT[18] WAS CONSUMED IN THE EVENING.[19] THE BABYLONIAN [PRIESTS] USED TO EAT IT RAW FOR THEY WERE NOT FASTIDIOUS.[20]

GEMARA: It was taught: R. Jose says, Even if the old [Shewbread] was taken away in the morning and the new was set down in the evening there is no harm. How then am I to explain the verse, 'Before me continually'? [It teaches that] the table should not remain overnight without bread.

R. Ammi said, From these words of R. Jose[21] we learn that even though a man learns but one chapter in the morning and one chapter in the evening he has thereby fulfilled the precept of 'This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth'.[22]

R. Johanan said in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, Even though a man but reads the Shema'[23] morning and evening he has thereby fulfilled the precept of '[This book of the law] shall not depart'. It is forbidden, however, to say this in the presence of 'amme ha-arez.[24] But Raba said, It is a meritorious act to say it in the presence of amme ha-arez.[25]

Ben Damah the son of R. Ishmael's sister once asked R. Ishmael, May one such as I who have studied the whole of the Torah learn Greek wisdom?[26] He thereupon read to him the following verse, This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night.[27] Go then and find a time that is neither day nor night and learn then Greek wisdom.

This, however, is at variance with the view of R. Samuel b. Nahmani. For R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Jonathan, This verse is neither duty nor command but a blessing. For when the Holy One, blessed be He, saw that the words of the Torah were most precious to Joshua, as it is written, His minister Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man, departed not out of the tent,[28] He said to him, 'Joshua, since the words of the Torah are so precious to thee, [I assure thee,] 'this book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth'!

A Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael taught: The words of the Torah should not be unto thee as a debt,[29] neither art thou at liberty to desist from it.[30]

Hezekiah said, What is the meaning of the verse, Yea, He hath allured thee out of the mouth of straits into a broad place, where there is no straitness?[31] Come and see that the manner of the Holy One, blessed be He, is not like that [of men] of flesh and blood. A man of flesh and blood allures another out of the ways of life into the ways of death;[32] but the Holy One, blessed be He, allures man out of the ways of death into the ways of life,[33] as it is written, 'Yea, He hath allured thee out of the mouth of straits', that is, out of Gehenna, whose mouth is narrow so that its smoke is stored up

---

(1) The interruption of the study of the Torah for the performance of a religious act, e.g., to attend a funeral, is sometimes the fulfilment of the Torah and brings with it a reward (Rashi).

(2) God thus expressed His approval of Moses' action. There is here a play upon the words אשר שברת and יישר (ljf) ששברת.

(3) In the par. passage M.K. 17a the reading is 'placed under the ban'.

(4) Hos. IV, 5.

(5) Lit., 'cover it up'.

(6) Cf. Aboth IV, 9 (10).

(7) Deut. IV, 9.

(8) Or 'observe', or 'keep'. These expressions are the various meanings of the Heb. root שמר.

(9) A term limiting the application of the rule to special cases.

(10) I.e., forty days after conception the soul is implanted in the embryo. In MS.M.: 'the soul is given in forty days'.

(11) V. Glos.

(12) V. supra p. 605 n. 7.

(13) The priests thus stood facing each other separated only by the breadth of the table, for the table stood lengthwise from east to west.

(14) I.e., the taking away of the old bread and the placing of the new were almost simultaneous.

(15) Ex. XXV, 30. The Shewbread shall be before the Lord continually and at no time shall the table be without the bread.

(16) The cakes were shared out equally among the outgoing division of priests and the ingoing division, and were to be eaten during that day (i.e., on the Sabbath) and the night until midnight.

(17) I.e., at the conclusion of the Day of Atonement, and they could be eaten only during that night until midnight, for under no circumstances was the time for the eating extended.

(18) Num. XXIX, 11. This was the only offering (sc. the Musaf-offering) brought on the Day of Atonement whose flesh was consumed by the priests.

(19) After the fast and only until midnight. It was obviously eaten raw as it could not be cooked on the Sabbath.

(20) Lit., 'their minds (i.e. physical constitutions) were fine'.

(21) Who ruled that if the old Shewbread was on the table for some time in the morning and the new for some time in the evening, that can be said to be 'continually'.

(22) Jos. I, 8.

(23) The passage commencing 'Hear, O Israel' (Deut. VI, 4ff).

(24) Plur. 'of 'am ha-arez, v. Glos. Such a pronouncement might deter the common people from educating their children in the study of the Torah, seeing that the Scriptural precept is fulfilled by the twice daily recital of the Shema'.

(25) For they would argue thus: if merely for the recital of the Shema' twice daily the reward is offered: 'Then thou shalt

make thy ways prosperous and then thou shalt have good success' (Jos. ibid.), how great shall be the reward for those that devote their whole time to the study of the Torah!

(26) Probably the study of Greek philosophy. V. supra 64b p. 381, where an imprecation is pronounced against those that learn Greek wisdom. V. Tosaf. l.c, s.v. ארור.

(27) Jos. ibid.

(28) Ex. XXXIII, 11.

(29) Which must be paid off, one's whole desire being to discharge the debt so as to be free from it.

(30) Cf. Ab. II, 16.

(31) Job. XXXVI, 16.

(32) Cf. Deut. XIII, 7 where the same expression is used of enticement into idolatry.

(33) I.e. — to the Torah which delivers from the fire of Gehenna.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 100a

within it.[1] And lest you say that as its mouth is narrow so the whole [of Gehenna] is narrow, the text therefore states, Deep and large.[2] And lest you say that it is not made ready for a king,[3] the text therefore states, Yea, for the king it is prepared.[2] And lest you say that there is no wood in it, the text therefore states, The pile thereof is fire and much wood.[2] And lest you say that this[4] is the sole reward [of the Torah], the text therefore states, And that which is set on thy table is full of fatness.[5]

IF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT FELL ON A SABBATH etc. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan, They were not Babylonians but Alexandrians, but because [the Palestinians] hated the Babylonians they called [the Alexandrians] by the name of Babylonians.[6] It was likewise taught: R. Jose says, They were not Babylonians but Alexandrians, but because [the Palestinians] hated the Babylonians they called [the Alexandrians] by the name of Babylonians. Said to him R. Judah, May your mind be at ease for you have set mine at ease.[7]

MISHNAH. IF [THE PRIEST] SET THE SHEWBREAD ON THE SABBATH AND THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE DAY AFTER THE SABBATH, AND BURNT THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE [NEXT] SABBATH, IT IS NOT VALID,[8] AND ONE IS NOT LIABLE THEREBY FOR PIGGUL,[9] NOTHAR,[10] OR UNCLEANNESS.[10] IF HE SET THE BREAD AND THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE SABBATH AND BURNT THE DISHES OF FRANKINCENSE ON THE DAY AFTER THE SABBATH, IT IS NOT VALID, AND ONE IS NOT LIABLE THEREBY FOR PIGGUL, NOTHAR, OR UNCLEANNESS. IF HE SET THE BREAD AND THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE DAY AFTER THE SABBATH AND BURNT THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE [NEXT] SABBATH, IT IS NOT VALID.[11] WHAT SHOULD HE DO? HE SHOULD LEAVE IT UNTIL THE FOLLOWING SABBATH,[12] FOR EVEN IF IT REMAINS MANY DAYS ON THE TABLE THERE IS NO HARM.

GEMARA. We have learnt elsewhere:[13] The officer said to them, 'Go forth and see if the time for slaughtering[14] has arrived' — If it had arrived he[15] that saw it called out, 'It is daylight',[16] Mattithiah b. Samuel[17] said, [He that saw it called out,] 'The whole east is alight'. 'As far as Hebron?'[18] and he answered, 'Yes'. And why was all this[19] necessary? Because once when the light of the moon arose they thought that the east was already alight and slaughtered the daily offering, and they had to take it away to the place of burning. They[20] led the High Priest down to the place of immersion. This was the rule in the Temple: whosoever covered his feet[21] required an immersion, and whosoever made water required sanctification of hands and feet.[22]

The father of R. Abin learnt:[23] Not only this[24] but also the burnt-offering of a bird whose head was nipped off at night and the meal-offering from which the handful was taken at night must be taken away to the place of burning. This is quite right with regard to the burnt-offering of a bird

since [what is done] cannot be undone, but with regard to the meal-offering surely he can put back the handful in its place and take it again when it is day! — He learnt it and he himself also gave the reason for it, namely, that vessels of ministry hallow [what is put in them] even outside the proper time.[25]

An objection was raised: Whatsoever is offered up by day[26] is hallowed by day, and whatsoever is offered up by night[27] is hallowed both by day and by night.[28] 'Whatsoever is offered up by day is hallowed by day', that is to say, by day only and not by night![29] — It does not become hallowed [by night] so as to be permitted to be offered up, but it does become hallowed so that it can now become invalid.[30]

R. Zera raised an objection: IF HE SET THE BREAD AND THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE DAY AFTER THE SABBATH AND BURNT THE DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE] ON THE [NEXT] SABBATH, IT IS NOT VALID. WHAT SHOULD HE DO? HE SHOULD LEAVE IT UNTIL THE FOLLOWING SABBATH, FOR EVEN IF IT REMAINS MANY DAYS ON THE TABLE THERE IS NO HARM. Now if you accept the view that vessels of ministry can hallow even outside the proper time, then it should become hallowed and also invalidated![31] — Rabbah said, He who raised the objection, raised a valid one, but the father of R. Abin was quoting a Baraitha;[32] and we must say therefore that [the Tanna of that Baraitha] is of the opinion that the night is not considered 'out of time',[33] whereas the day is considered 'out of time'.[34] But after all

---

(1) In order that the wicked be tormented there with fire and smoke.

(2) Isa. XXX, 33. The reference in the verse is to Gehenna.

(3) I.e., a disciple who once devoted himself to the study of the Torah but has now forsaken it.

(4) Deliverance from the fires of Gehenna, without further reward.

(5) Job XXXVI, 16.

(6) Using the name Babylonians as a term of abuse.

(7) R. Judah was of Babylonian descent and therefore welcomed this interpretation of his colleague whereby his fellow-countrymen were cleared from the charge of gluttony.

(8) Since the frankincense had not been left for a full week, from Sabbath to Sabbath, on the table. Moreover it cannot be left until the next Sabbath (i.e., for thirteen days), for the bread would become invalid after the first Sabbath, since it had been set on the table at the proper time.

(9) If during the burning of the frankincense the priest intended to eat of the bread outside its prescribed time, it does not become piggul ('that which is refused or rejected'), and whosoever eats of it does not incur the penalty of kareth (v. Glos.), for the burning of the frankincense (i.e., the mattir, v. Glos.) was not in order.

(10) Likewise the penalty of kareth is not incurred on the ground of nothar, i.e., for eating the bread after the time prescribed for its eating has elapsed, or uncleanness, i.e., for eating the bread whilst in a state of uncleanness, for the bread was at no time rendered permitted to be eaten.

(11) For both the bread and the frankincense must remain on the table from one Sabbath to another Sabbath.

(12) For thirteen days in all. As neither the bread nor the frankincense is hallowed until the incidence of the first Sabbath, it may be left until the second Sabbath.

(13) Tam. III, 2; Yoma 27b, 28a.

(14) Sc. the daily morning sacrifice.

(15) He that went up on the roof to watch for the first light of the morning.

(16) ברקאי, morning brightness, from ברק, lightning, shining light.

(17) He was one of the Temple officers, v. Shek. V, 1.

(18) Called out those that were down below in the Temple.

(19) To go up on the roof and keep watch for the first light of day.

(20) This part of the Mishnah continues the account of the service on the Day of Atonement.

(21) A euphemism for 'relieving oneself'.

(22) By washing them in the laver that was in the Temple; for further notes, v. Yoma, Sonc. ed., p. 131.

(23) This entire passage is also found in Yoma 29a.
(24) That the daily offering if slaughtered at night is to be burnt.
(25) And once the handful has been taken and put into a vessel of ministry it may not be put back and mixed with the remainder of the meal-offering.
(26) All animal-offerings.
(27) E.g. drink-offerings.
(28) The text adopted here is in accord with Sh. Mek. and several MSS.; Cur. edd. insert 'and whatsoever is offered up during the night is hallowed by night, and whatsoever is offered up both by day and by night is hallowed both by day and by night'.
(29) Thus proving that vessels of ministry hallow only in the proper time.
(30) If, e.g., it was touched by a person lacking the atonement offering for the completion of his purification, or it was taken out of the Temple precincts, or it was kept overnight. Accordingly it cannot be put back with the remainder of the meal-offering.
(31) The bread and frankincense should be hallowed by the table even when set thereon on a Sunday, and therefore after a full week, i.e., after midnight of the next Sunday, they should become invalid. How then can it be suggested that it be left for thirteen days?
(32) So that a way must he found to reconcile the present argument with it.
(33) For with regard to holy things the night following the day is included in, and is part of, the day, accordingly vessels of ministry can hallow by night as well as by day, save that the offering up may not be performed by night.
(34) That which is a day too soon or a day too late is certainly out of time, and the vessel of ministry cannot hallow it. In our Mishnah, therefore, where the bread and frankincense are set on the table six days too soon, they certainly cannot be hallowed then by the table. Only when the Sabbath arrives do they become hallowed and so may be kept for a full week thereafter.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 100b

when Sabbath eve[1] approaches let it then become hallowed and also invalidated![2] — Raba[3] said, We must assume that he had removed it before then.[4] Mar Zutra, or as some say, R. Ashi said, You may even assume that he had not removed it before then, since, however, he had set it down not in accordance with its prescribed rite[5] it is as though a monkey had set it.[6]

MISHNAH. THE TWO LOAVES WERE EATEN NEVER EARLIER THAN ON THE SECOND DAY[7] AND NEVER LATER THAN ON THE THIRD DAY. HOW IS THIS EXPLAINED? [NORMALLY] THEY WERE BAKED ON THE DAY BEFORE THE FESTIVAL[8] AND EATEN ON THE FESTIVAL, THAT IS, ON THE SECOND DAY. IF THE FESTIVAL FELL ON THE DAY AFTER THE SABBATH,[9] THEY WOULD BE EATEN ON THE THIRD DAY. THE SHEWBREAD WAS EATEN NEVER EARLIER THAN ON THE NINTH DAY AND NEVER LATER THAN ON THE ELEVENTH DAY. HOW IS THIS EXPLAINED? [NORMALLY] IT WAS BAKED ON THE DAY BEFORE THE SABBATH AND EATEN ON THE SABBATH [OF THE FOLLOWING WEEK], THAT IS ON THE NINTH DAY. IF A FESTIVAL FELL ON THE DAY BEFORE THE SABBATH,[10] IT WOULD THEN BE EATEN ON THE TENTH DAY. IF THE TWO DAYS OF THE NEW YEAR [FELL BEFORE THE SABBATH],[11] IT WOULD THEN BE EATEN ON THE ELEVENTH DAY. [THE BAKING] OVERRIDES NEITHER THE SABBATH NOR THE FESTIVAL. R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAYS IN THE NAME OF R. SIMEON, SON OF THE DEPUTY [HIGH PRIEST], IT OVERRIDES THE FESTIVAL BUT NOT THE FAST-DAY.[12]

GEMARA. Rabina said, According to him who rules that offerings in fulfilment of a vow and freewill-offerings may not be offered on a Festival,[13] you should not say that Biblically they are allowed [to be offered] but the Rabbis forbade them only as a precautionary measure lest one defer [those offerings until the Festival],[14] but even Biblically they are not allowed [to be offered]; for the Two Loaves are obligatory for that day,[15] so that there is no reason to apprehend lest one defer [them

until the Festival],[16] yet [our Mishnah] states: [THE BAKING] OVERRIDES NEITHER THE SABBATH NOR THE FESTIVAL.

CHAPTER XII

MISHNAH. IF MEAL-OFFERINGS AND DRINK-OFFERINGS BECAME UNCLEAN BEFORE THEY WERE HALLOWED IN A VESSEL [OF MINISTRY]. THEY MAY BE REDEEMED;[17] IF [THEY BECAME UNCLEAN] AFTER THEY WERE HALLOWED IN A VESSEL, THEY MAY NOT BE REDEEMED. BIRD-OFFERINGS, THE WOOD, THE FRANKINCENSE, AND THE VESSELS OF MINISTRY,[18] MAY NOT BE REDEEMED, FOR THE RULE OF REDEMPTION APPLIES ONLY TO [OFFERINGS OF] CATTLE.

GEMARA. Samuel said, Even though they[19] are clean they may be redeemed, for so long as they have not been hallowed in a vessel of ministry they are holy only as to their value, and whatsoever is holy as to its value may be redeemed. But have we not learnt [in our Mishnah] BECAME UNCLEAN? — The rule is the same even though they were not unclean, but because the Tanna wished to state the next clause, AFTER THEY WERE HALLOWED IN A VESSEL THEY MAY NOT BE REDEEMED, in which case even though they were unclean they still may not be redeemed, he therefore stated in the first clause, BECAME UNCLEAN.

IF [THEY BECAME UNCLEAN] AFTER THEY WERE HALLOWED IN A VESSEL, THEY MAY NOT BE REDEEMED.[20] But this is obvious, for they are holy in themselves! — It was necessary to be stated, for I might have argued that since what is blemished is described as unclean, then surely what is unclean should be like that which is blemished; and therefore as that which has become blemished may be redeemed even though it was holy in itself, so this too may be redeemed; we are therefore taught that the Divine Law did not describe what is blemished as unclean in that sense,[21]

---

(1) Lit., 'the night of the twilight (of the Sabbath eve)', i.e. Friday night.

(2) Since the night is considered 'in time' as on the day itself, then the bread and the frankincense should become hallowed on the Friday night, and after seven full days, i.e., on the Sabbath morning after the second Friday night, the bread should become invalid. According to our Mishnah, however, the bread may be eaten the whole of the second Sabbath day until midnight!

(3) In MS.M. and in the parallel passage in Yoma: 'Rabina'.

(4) The priest had removed the bread and the frankincense on the Friday just before the Sabbath set in and had replaced it at its proper time on the Sabbath.

(5) For it is out of time, being set down six days too soon.

(6) Hence the table will not hallow it as soon as the Sabbath eve approaches neither will the Sabbath day itself hallow it, but the priest will have to enter on the morrow, remove it and replace it anew, and only then will the table hallow it. Where, however, the handful was taken from the meal-offering at night and put into a vessel of ministry, since night is not considered 'out of time', the vessel will hallow it; v. Yoma (Sonc. ed.) p. 138 and notes.

(7) After the baking.

(8) The Feast of Weeks or Pentecost.

(9) The Two Loaves would then be baked on the Friday, since the baking does not override the Sabbath.

(10) The Shewbread would then be baked before the Festival, on Thursday.

(11) It would then be baked on Wednesday. The Festival of the New Year was generally kept two days, even in Palestine. V. R.H. 30b.

(12) The Day of Atonement. Where the Day of Atonement fell on a Friday the Shewbread was then baked on a Thursday.

(13) V. Bez. 20b.

(14) One would thus be accumulating work specially for the Festival; moreover the owner may be prevented by some unforeseen circumstance from offering them on the Festival and will then have failed in the fulfilment of his obligations.

(15) Sc. the Feast of Weeks.

(16) For they can in no wise be brought before the prescribed day.

(17) For an offering so long as it has not been hallowed in a vessel of ministry is holy only for its value, קדושת דמים and may be redeemed; once it has been hallowed in a vessel of ministry it becomes holy in itself, קדושת הגוף and may not be redeemed.

(18) So all MS.S. Cur. edd. add: After they have become unclean.

(19) Sc. meal-offerings and drink-offerings.

(20) So according to MS.M., Sh. Mek. and Z.K. This is a new passage introduced by a separate Mishnah heading.

(21) I.e., unclean after having been hallowed in a vessel of ministry.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 101a

for we do not find any case in which what has been hallowed in a vessel of ministry may be redeemed.[1]

Where do we find what is blemished described as unclean? — It has been taught: And if it be any unclean beast, of which they may not bring an offering unto the Lord:[2] this verse speaks of blemished animals, that they shall be redeemed. You say it speaks of blemished animals, that they shall be redeemed; perhaps it is not so, but actually it speaks of an unclean beast. When the verse says, And if it be of an unclean beast, then he shall redeem it according to thy valuation,[3] the unclean beast is already spoken of; what then am I to make of the verse, 'And if it be any unclean beast'? The verse clearly speaks of blemished animals, that they shall be redeemed. I might suppose that they may be redeemed even though they have but a passing blemish; the text therefore states, 'Of which they may not bring an offering unto the Lord', [referring clearly to] such animals as may at no time be brought as an offering unto the Lord, but one must exclude from this verse animals which may not be brought to-day but which may be brought to-morrow.[4]

R. Huna b. Manoah raised an objection: BIRD-OFFERINGS, THE WOOD, THE FRANKINCENSE, AND THE VESSELS OF MINISTRY MAY NOT BE REDEEMED, FOR THE RULE OF REDEMPTION APPLIES ONLY TO [OFFERINGS OF] CATTLE. Now this is quite right with regard to bird-offerings, for they are holy in themselves, and the rule [of redemption] applies only to [offerings of] cattle; but why may not the wood,[5] the frankincense[5] and the vessels of ministry[6] be redeemed? It must be because the others[7] if still clean may not be redeemed,[8] and these[9] even though unclean are regarded as clean. For[10] wood and frankincense are no foodstuffs but are placed in the category of foodstuffs only by reason of sacred esteem.[11] Accordingly wood, so long as it has not been cut up into chips.[12] is not predisposed [to uncleanness]; and frankincense, so long as it has not been hallowed in a vessel of ministry, is similarly not predisposed [to uncleanness]; and as regards vessels of ministry, since they can be made clean by immersion in a mikweh,[13] [they are not regarded as unclean]! — No, I still maintain that the others even though clean may be redeemed, but these [may not be redeemed even when unclean] because they are scarce.[14] I grant you that frankincense and vessels of ministry are scarce, but surely wood is not scarce! — Even wood is scarce, in view of a Master's ruling that wood in which a worm is found is unfit for the altar.[15]

R. Papa said, Had Samuel heard of the following [Baraitha] which was taught: 'If a man consecrated unblemished animals for the Temple treasury, they may be redeemed only for the altar,[16] since what is fit for the altar can never be released from the altar',[17] he would have retracted [his statement].[18] But it is not so; [in fact] he had heard of [that Baraitha] and yet did not retract his statement. For did you not say above that because they[19] were scarce they may not be redeemed? Then in this case too, since blemishes which disqualify cattle are of frequent occurrence, for even a skin over the eye disqualifies, they[20] are undoubtedly scarce.

R. Kahana said, [If they[21] became] unclean they may be redeemed, but [if they are] clean they

may not be redeemed. And so said R. Oshaia, [If they became] unclean they may be redeemed, [but if they are] clean they may not be redeemed. Some there are who say that R. Oshaia said, Even though [they are] clean they may be redeemed. R. Eleazar says. All [meal-offerings] may be redeemed if [they have become] unclean, and if [they are] clean they may not be redeemed, excepting the tenth part of an ephah of the sinner's meal-offering,[22] since the Torah has stated [in the one case] from his sin[23] and [in the other] for his sin.[24]

R. Oshaia said, I have heard that if a meal-offering was made piggul[25] it does not, according to R. Simeon,[26] convey fooduncleanness. For it has been taught:[27] 'Orlah,[28] diverse kinds of the vineyard,[29]

---

(1) For even an animal-offering, once it has been hallowed by a vessel of ministry, i.e., slaughtered, can in no wise be redeemed.

(2) Lev. XXVII, 11.

(3) Ibid. 27.

(4) When the blemish will have passed away.

(5) Which became unclean before it was hallowed in a vessel of ministry.

(6) Which became unclean.

(7) Meal-offerings and drink-offerings.

(8) Thus in conflict with Samuel's statement supra p. 617.

(9) Wood, frankincense and vessels of ministry.

(10) This sentence is omitted in MS.M. and other MSS., and is also deleted by Sh. Mek.

(11) The honour in which sacred things are held makes them fit to contract uncleanness even though according to ordinary standards they cannot contract uncleanness. V. Pes. 35a; Hul. 36b.

(12) And so fit to be used on the altar.

(13) V. Glos.

(14) And if they could be redeemed there might not be left sufficient for the Temple requirements.

(15) Supra 85b.

(16) I.e., they are to be sold for an offering.

(17) Cur. edd. add here: 'For though they are consecrated for their value only they may not be redeemed, since they are clean'. This is an obvious gloss, and is not found in MS.M. nor in other MSS. and is deleted by Sh. Mek.

(18) That meal-offerings and drink-offerings may be redeemed even though they are still clean; v. supra p. 617.

(19) Wood fit for the altar, frankincense, and vessels of ministry.

(20) Animals free from all blemishes and so fit for the altar.

(21) Meal-offerings and drink-offerings.

(22) This may be redeemed even though still clean. According to R. Gershom: it may not be redeemed at all even though unclean.

(23) Lev. V, 6, 10.

(24) Ibid. 13. For the offences enumerated in Lev. V, 1-4 a rich man must bring for a sin-offering a she-lamb or a she-goat, a poor man two doves, and one in extreme poverty a meal-offering. But it is to be observed that concerning the first two Scripture uses the expression, וכפר עליו הכהן מחטאתו And the priest shall make atonement for him from his sin, whilst concerning the latter Scripture says, וכפר עליו הכהן על חטאתו And the priest shall make atonement for him for his sin. From these variations of expression the Rabbis derived the law that if a rich man sinned and set apart money for his animal-offering and then became poor, he has only to bring doves or a meal-offering from a part of the money set aside (i.e., מחטאתו from the money set apart for his sin) and the remainder he may retain for himself. And on the other hand, if a poor man sinned and set apart money for his meal-offering and then became rich, he must add to the money set aside (i.e., על חטאתו for, in addition to, the money set apart for his sin), and bring the offering prescribed for a rich man, or if he brought a tenth of flour for his meal-offering, he must redeem it and add money to it in order to acquire a bird-offering or an animal-offering. Thus we see that this meal-offering is redeemed even though clean.

(25) E.g., while taking out the handful the priest expressed the intention of burning the handful or of eating the remainder outside the prescribed time.

(26) Who holds that whatsoever is forbidden for any kind of use cannot convey food-uncleanness.
(27) So MS.M.; cur. edd.: 'We have learnt'. It is not found, however, in the Mishnah, but in Tosef. 'Uk. III and Bek. 9b.
(28) V. Glos. This and all the others enumerated are forbidden for any kind of use.
(29) V. Deut. XXII, 9.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 101b

an ox condemned to be stoned,[1] the heifer whose neck was to be broken,[2] the birds of the leper,[3] the firstling of an ass,[4] and meat cooked in milk[5] — all these convey food-uncleanness.[6] R. Simeon says, All these do not convey food-uncleanness. R. Simeon, however, agrees that meat cooked in milk conveys food-uncleanness, for there was a time when it was permitted.[7] And R. Assi had said in the name of R. Johanan, What is the reason for R. Simeon's view? [Because it is written], All food therein which may be eaten;[8] [therefore], food which you may give others[9] to eat is termed food,[10] but food which you may not give others to eat[11] is not termed food. And the meal-offering which was made piggul is also a food which you may not give others to eat.[12] If that is so,[13] then meat cooked in milk [should convey food-uncleanness] by virtue of the fact that it is a food which you may give others to eat![14] For it has been taught:[15] R. Simeon b. Judah says in the name of R. Simeon, Meat cooked in milk is forbidden to be eaten but is permitted for use, for it is written, For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk;[16] whilst elsewhere it is written, And ye shall be holy men unto Me; therefore ye shall not eat any flesh that is torn of beasts in the field; [ye shall cast it to the dogs].[17] Just as there it is forbidden to be eaten but is permitted for use,[18] so here too it is forbidden to be eaten but is permitted for use! — He gave one reason and yet another. For one thing it[19] is a food which you may give others to eat,[20] and besides even for [the Israelite] himself there was a time when it was permitted.[21]

An objection was raised [from the following]: R. Simeon says, There is nothar[22] which conveys food-uncleanness and there is also nothar which does not convey food-uncleanness. Thus if [the flesh of the offering] had remained overnight before the sprinkling of the blood, it does not convey food-uncleanness;[23] but if [it had remained overnight] after the sprinkling of the blood,[24] it conveys food-uncleanness. And an offering that had been made piggul, be it of the most holy or of the less holy offerings, does not convey food-uncleanness. But a meal-offering that had been made piggul conveys food-uncleanness![25] — This is no difficulty, for in the one case there was a time when it had been permitted,[26] whilst in the other[27] there was no time when it had been permitted. How is it that there was no time when it had been permitted? — Where [the grain] had been consecrated [for a meal-offering] while it was still growing. But one could have redeemed it![28] This of course presents no difficulty according to that version which gives R. Oshaia's view thus: If they became unclean they may be redeemed, but if they are clean they may not be redeemed. But according to the other version which gives as his view: Even though they are clean they may be redeemed, [then the question will be asked here,] one could have redeemed it! — [That is so but] the fact is that it had not been redeemed. But if one so desired one could have redeemed it, and we have heard R. Simeon say that whatsoever stands to be redeemed is as though it were redeemed. For it was taught:[29] The [Red] Cow[30] conveys food-uncleanness, since there was a time when it was permitted [to be eaten]. And Resh Lakish observed that R. Simeon used to say that the Red Cow could be redeemed even on its woodpile![31] — There is no comparison at all. The Red Cow can rightly be regarded as ready to be redeemed, for if another cow finer than this one is obtainable, it is a meritorious act to redeem it; but as regards meal-offerings, is there any meritorious act to redeem [what has been consecrated for a meal-offering]?[32]

But in the case where [a portion of the sacrifice] had remained overnight before the sprinkling [of the blood], there was a duty to sprinkle the blood, and if one so desired one could have sprinkled it, nevertheless the [Baraitha] states that it does not convey food-uncleanness![33] — We must assume that there was no time left during the day for the sprinkling [of the blood].[34] Then what would be the

position where there was sufficient time left in the day [for the sprinkling]? It would convey food-uncleanness! If so, instead of teaching, 'If [it remained overnight] after the sprinkling [of the blood] it conveys food-uncleanness', [the Tanna] should have drawn a distinction in the very case itself[35] in the following terms: This[36] applies only where no time was left during the day [for the sprinkling of the blood], but if there was sufficient time left in the day [for the sprinkling] it conveys food-uncleanness![37] — That is just what [the Tanna] meant to teach: If [the portion of the sacrifice] had remained overnight before [the blood] was ready for the sprinkling,[38] it does not convey food-uncleanness; but if after [the blood] was ready for the sprinkling, it conveys food-uncleanness.[39] But in the case where an offering, either of the most holy or of the less holy kind, had been made piggul, there was a duty to sprinkle [the blood in the proper manner],[40]

---

(1) V. Ex. XXI, 28. The ox had been slaughtered after it had been condemned to be stoned for killing a human being.

(2) V. Deut. XXI, 1ff. The heifer was slaughtered after it had been brought down to the rough valley, and as soon as it was brought down there it became forbidden for all purposes.

(3) Which had been slaughtered. V. Lev. XIV, 4.

(4) Which had been slaughtered for a gentile but was not quite dead yet; v. Hul. 117b, Sonc. ed., p. 648, n. 5. The firstling of an ass is before redemption forbidden for all purposes. V. Ex. XXXIV, 20.

(5) It is assumed for the present that this is also forbidden for all purposes. V. infra.

(6) If they had been rendered unclean, e.g. by a reptile, they can convey uncleanness to other foodstuffs by contact.

(7) For before the meat had been cooked in the milk, although it had been left to soak therein, both the meat and the milk were permitted to be eaten.

(8) Lev. XI, 34.

(9) Sc. gentiles.

(10) And conveys food-uncleanness.

(11) And what is forbidden for all uses may not be given away even to gentiles.

(12) For it must be burnt.

(13) That R. Simeon derives his view from the exposition of the verse quoted, and therefore what is permitted for use conveys food-uncleanness.

(14) I.e., according to R. Simeon.

(15) V. Hul. 116a.

(16) Deut. XIV, 21.

(17) Ex. XXII, 30.

(18) Since it may be cast to the dogs. And as it is one's duty to provide for one's animals this is accounted as a benefit.

(19) Sc. meat cooked in milk.

(20) And for that reason alone it conveys food-uncleanness.

(21) V. supra p. 621, n. 10. On the other hand, the other forbidden things enumerated were at no time permitted to be eaten, since a living animal is deemed to be forbidden until it has been ritually slaughtered.

(22) I.e., 'that which remained'; the portion of a sacrifice that had not been eaten or sacrificed upon the altar within the time prescribed. It may not be eaten or put to any kind of use, but must be burnt.

(23) In this case the flesh of the sacrifice had never been permitted to be eaten, hence it is not regarded as a foodstuff.

(24) Accordingly the flesh was permitted to be eaten the same day after the sprinkling of the blood until midnight.

(25) This last ruling is contrary to R. Oshaia's ruling supra p. 620.

(26) The flour of the meal-offering had been permitted for food before it had been consecrated for the meal-offering, hence even though it is now piggul it still conveys food-uncleanness. This is the case dealt with by the Baraitha quoted.

(27) That dealt with by R. Oshaia.

(28) Accordingly there would have been a time when it was permitted for food.

(29) V. Hul., Sonc. ed., pp. 455-6.

(30) Even though it is forbidden for all purposes.

(31) I.e., even after it had been slaughtered upon the specially erected woodpile and is ready for burning it may be redeemed if a finer animal is obtainable.

(32) Of course not. Therefore it is not regarded as already redeemed.

(33) Obviously we do not accept the principle that whatever is in the condition ready to be sprinkled is considered as

already sprinkled.

(34) I.e., the sacrifice was slaughtered almost at sunset, so that the blood could not possibly have been sprinkled in the proper time; accordingly the flesh was never permitted as food.

(35) Viz., where it had remained overnight before the sprinkling.

(36) That the sacrificial portion which remained overnight does not convey food-uncleanness.

(37) And it goes without saying that if it remained overnight after the sprinkling it conveys food-uncleanness.

(38) I.e., there was no time left in the day for the sprinkling.

(39) As there was time left in the day for the sprinkling it is regarded as already sprinkled; accordingly the flesh is considered as having been in the permitted state, and therefore conveys food-uncleanness.

(40) I.e., free from any intention that makes the offering piggul.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 102a

and if one so desired one could have sprinkled it properly, nevertheless [the Baraitha] states that it does not convey food-uncleanness. Now presumably the piggul-intention was expressed during the sprinkling![1] — No, the piggul-intention was expressed during the slaughtering.[2] Then what would be his ruling where the piggul-intention was expressed during the sprinkling? It would, as suggested, convey food-uncleanness. If so, instead of teaching 'A meal-offering that had been made piggul conveys food-uncleanness, [the Tanna] should have drawn a distinction in [the case of the animal-offering] itself in these terms: This[3] applies only where the piggul-intention was expressed during the slaughtering, but if the piggul-intention was expressed during the sprinkling it conveys food-uncleanness! It was necessary [for the Tanna] to teach the case of the meal-offering that had been made piggul; for notwithstanding that the piggul-intention was expressed at the time of the taking of the handful, and the taking of the handful in the meal-offering corresponds to the slaughtering [in the animal-offering],[4] nevertheless the meal-offering conveys food-uncleanness, since there was a time when it was permitted in the beginning.[5]

R. Ashi said, I stated this argument before R. Nahman [and he said to me,] You may even say that the expression, 'if it had remained overnight [before the sprinkling]' shall be taken in the ordinary sense;[6] and, moreover, you may say that the piggul-intention was expressed during the sprinkling,[7] [and there is no difficulty at all],[8] for whilst we accept the principle 'If he so desired he could have redeemed it',[9] we do not accept the principle 'If he so desired he could have sprinkled it'.[10]

An objection was raised [from the following]:[11] R. Joshua laid down this general rule: Whatsoever had a period of permissibility to the priests is not subject to the law of sacrilege,[12] and whatsoever had no period of permissibility to the priests is subject to the law of sacrilege. What is that which had a period of permissibility to the priests? That which remained overnight or became unclean or was taken out [of the Sanctuary].[13] And what is that which had no period of permissibility to the priests? Offerings that were slaughtered [while the intention was expressed of eating of the flesh thereof] outside the proper time or outside the proper place, or whose blood was received or sprinkled by those that were unfit.[14] It says here in the first part: 'That which remained overnight or became unclean or was taken out'. Now this means, does it not, that it actually remained overnight,[15] and [yet it is considered as having had a period of permissibility to the priests by virtue of the fact that] here if one so desired one could have sprinkled the blood,[16] and [therefore] it states that it is not subject to the law of sacrilege? — No, it means that it is ready [to become disqualified] if taken out or made unclean.[17] But what would be the position where it had actually remained overnight?[15] It would be subject to the law of sacrilege, would it not?[18] Then instead of saying, 'Whatsoever had a period of permissibility to the priests' and 'Whatsoever had no period of permissibility to the priests' [the Tanna] should have said, 'Whatsoever had been permissible to the priests is not subject to the law of sacrilege, and whatsoever had not been permissible to the priests is subject to the law of sacrilege![19] — The fact is, answered R. Ashi, that one cannot point out a contradiction between the ruling concerning the law of sacrilege and that concerning uncleanness. The law of sacrilege applies

only to that which is holy and not to that which is not holy;[20] therefore once the holiness has departed[21] how can it revert? On the other hand, food-uncleanness applies only to that which is a foodstuff and not to that which is not a foodstuff; therefore where the blood has been sprinkled [the flesh of the offering] has thereby become a foodstuff and so conveys food-uncleanness, but where the blood has not been sprinkled[22] [the flesh of the offering] has not become a foodstuff and so does not convey food-uncleanness.[23]

An objection was raised [from the following]:[24] If a man brought a suspensive guilt-offering[25] and it became known to him that he had not sinned, if the animal was not yet slaughtered it may go forth and pasture among the flock.[26] This is the opinion of R. Meir. The Sages say

---

(1) Before the sprinkling, however, the offering was still valid, and the blood was then ready to be sprinkled in the proper manner; the flesh therefore should convey food-uncleanness. As the Tanna does not rule so we are forced to the conclusion that whatever is ready for sprinkling is not considered as already sprinkled.

(2) So that there was never a time when the offering was in a permitted state.

(3) That an offering which had been made piggul does not convey food-uncleanness

(4) Cf. supra 13b. And it has been stated that where the piggul-intention was expressed during the slaughtering the flesh does not convey food-uncleanness.

(5) Before it was consecrated.

(6) Not as suggested above that 'before the sprinkling' meant that there was no time during the day for the sprinkling and 'after the sprinkling' that there was time in the day for the sprinkling, but the former expression means that the sprinkling had not actually taken place and the latter that it had actually taken place.

(7) Nevertheless the flesh of the offering does not convey food-uncleanness.

(8) In the apparent contradiction between the views of R. Simeon; for with regard to the Red Cow he applies the principle 'Whatsoever stands to be redeemed is considered as redeemed', yet with regard to the offering conveying food-uncleanness he does not apply the similar principle 'Whatsoever stands to be sprinkled is considered as sprinkled'.

(9) For the redemption can be accomplished by word of mouth, and therefore even though not yet redeemed it is considered as already redeemed.

(10) For so long as the act of sprinkling has not been performed, the fact that it can be sprinkled if so desired dos not cause it to be regarded as already sprinkled.

(11) Me'il. 2a.

(12) I.e., the misappropriation of the property of the Temple, for which a guilt-offering is prescribed. Cf. Lev. V, 15f. That which had at some time been permitted to the priests, even though it is now no longer permitted, is not regarded as 'the holy things of the Lord' (ibid.), and the law of sacrilege does not apply to it.

(13) In these three cases the flesh had been permissible at some time, i.e., before it had been kept overnight or before it had become unclean or before it had been taken out.

(14) V. Zeb. 15b. In these cases the flesh of the offering had at no time been permissible since the offering was never valid.

(15) I.e., both the flesh and the blood of the offering had remained overnight, for the blood had not yet been sprinkled.

(16) And whatsoever is ready to be sprinkled is considered as already sprinkled; thus contrary to R. Nahman and R. Ashi.

(17) I.e., the blood has already been sprinkled, so that the flesh is perfectly valid now but may yet be rendered invalid if taken outside the Sanctuary or made unclean. This is Rashi's first interpretation, according to which the words וראויה ללין are to be omitted from the text. They are deleted by Sh. Mek. V., however, Rashi's second interpretation and Tosaf. s.v. לא.

(18) Since we do not accept the principle that whatsoever is ready to be sprinkled is considered as already sprinkled.

(19) The expression 'a period of permissibility' signifies a potential permissibility; i.e., there was the possibility of the offering becoming permissible if only the blood had been sprinkled, though in fact the blood had not been sprinkled and so the flesh had not become permissible. Since, however, it is now assumed that the blood had actually been sprinkled, so that the flesh had in fact become permissible to the priests, the Tanna should have used the expression, 'Whatsoever had been permissible'. This last expression does not preclude the fact that the flesh is now no longer permissible to the priests for it has remained overnight; accordingly the difficulty raised by Tosaf. is disposed of. This interpretation

follows the suggestion of R. Samuel Strashun, namely, that the question in the Gemara involves merely the omission of the word שעת from the rule stated by the Tanna.

(20) Lit., 'is on account of the holiness or non-holiness (of the offering)'.

(21) As soon as the blood is ready to be sprinkled the holiness of the flesh of the offering is gone, since the principle is well-established that whatsoever is ready to be sprinkled is considered as already sprinkled. Cf. B.K. 76b.

(22) Even though the blood was ready to be sprinkled.

(23) The text of this last sentence in cur. edd. is profuse and redundant; the reading adopted is that of MS.M. and Sh. Mek.

(24) Ker. 23b.

(25) Heb. אשם תלוי. The guilt-offering brought by a person who is in doubt whether he has committed an act which must be atoned for by a sin-offering. This sacrifice is therefore merely suspensive until the doubt will be settled and the person will know whether he must bring a sin-offering or not.

(26) The animal is deemed to be non-holy and may join the flock.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 102b

, It must be left to pasture until it becomes blemished, when it shall be sold and its money spent on a freewill-offering. R. Eliezer says, It should be offered, for if it was not offered for this sin it can be taken as offered for some other sin.[1] If it became known to him [that he had not sinned] only after it was slaughtered, the blood must be poured out and the flesh burnt.[2] If the blood had already been sprinkled, the flesh may be eaten.[3] R. Jose says, Even if the blood was still in the basin, it should be sprinkled and the flesh eaten. And Raba had said that R. Jose adopted the principle stated by R. Simeon that whatsoever stands to be sprinkled is considered as already sprinkled![4] — Is that [indeed] the reason [for R. Jose's view]? [No]. In the West[5] it was said in the name of R. Jose b. Hanina that this is the reason for R. Jose's view: Vessels of ministry hallow what is invalid[6] so that it may be offered up in the first instance.

Said R. Ashi to R. Kahana: Since R. Simeon holds that whatsoever is ready to be sprinkled is considered as already sprinkled, then similarly [he holds that] whatsoever is ready to be burnt is considered as already burnt, consequently why should nothar[7] and the Red Cow convey food-uncleanness? They are but ashes,[8] are they not? — He replied, Sacred esteem renders them fit [to convey uncleanness]. Thereupon Rabina said to R. Ashi, I grant you that sacred esteem can have the effect of rendering the object itself invalid, but can it have the effect of rendering the object unclean so that it should transmit uncleanness up to the first and second degrees?[9] [For in that case] you could solve the question raised by Resh Lakish:[10] [If] the dry portion of a meal-offering[11] [becomes unclean], does it transmit uncleanness up to the first and second degrees or not? — Resh Lakish's question was [whether it was so] by the law of the Torah '[12] whereas we are speaking of [the uncleanness imposed] by the Rabbis.[13]

MISHNAH. IF A MAN SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF [TO BRING A MEAL-OFFERING PREPARED] ON A GRIDDLE', AND HE BROUGHT ONE PREPARED IN A PAN, OR 'A MEAL-OFFERING PREPARED IN A PAN', AND HE BROUGHT ONE PREPARED ON A GRIDDLE, WHAT HE HAS BROUGHT HE HAS BROUGHT,[14] BUT HE HAS NOT DISCHARGED THE OBLIGATION OF HIS VOW. BUT [IF HE SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF] TO BRING THIS [MEAL] AS A MEAL-OFFERING PREPARED ON A GRIDDLE', AND HE BROUGHT IT PREPARED IN A PAN; OR AS A MEAL-OFFERING PREPARED IN A PAN', AND HE BROUGHT IT PREPARED ON A GRIDDLE, IT IS INVALID.[15] IF HE SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING TWO TENTHS IN ONE VESSEL, AND HE BROUGHT THEM IN TWO VESSELS, OR IN TWO VESSELS', AND HE BROUGHT THEM IN ONE VESSEL, WHAT HE HAS BROUGHT HE HAS BROUGHT, BUT HE HAS NOT DISCHARGED THE OBLIGATION OF HIS VOW. BUT [IF HE SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING] THESE [TWO TENTHS] IN ONE VESSEL', AND HE BROUGHT THEM IN TWO VESSELS,

OR IN TWO VESSELS', AND HE BROUGHT THEM IN ONE VESSEL, THEY ARE INVALID.[16] IF HE SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING TWO TENTHS IN ONE VESSEL' AND HE BROUGHT THEM IN TWO VESSELS, AND WHEN THEY SAID TO HIM, THOU DIDST VOW TO BRING THEM IN ONE VESSEL', HE STILL OFFERED THEM IN TWO VESSELS, THEY ARE INVALID;[17] BUT IF HE THEREUPON OFFERED THEM IN ONE VESSEL THEY ARE VALID. IF HE SAID I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING TWO TENTHS IN TWO VESSELS', AND HE BROUGHT THEM IN ONE VESSEL, AND WHEN THEY SAID TO HIM, 'THOU DIDST VOW TO BRING THEM IN TWO VESSELS', HE THEREUPON OFFERED THEM IN TWO VESSELS THEY ARE VALID; BUT IF HE STILL KEPT THEM IN ONE VESSEL, THEY ARE RECKONED AS TWO MEAL-OFFERINGS WHICH HAVE BEEN MIXED.[18]

GEMARA. All the cases indeed had to be stated. For if the Tanna had only taught us the first cases[19] we should have said that the reason [why he has not fulfilled his obligation] was that he had promised a meal-offering prepared on a griddle and brought one prepared in a pan, but in the other cases,[20] where both[21] were meal-offerings prepared on a griddle or both were meal-offerings prepared in a pan, we should have said that he has even discharged the obligation of his vow; [hence those other cases were necessary to be stated]. And if he had only stated those cases we should have said that the reason for the ruling was that he had divided up the meal-offering, but in the former cases, where he had not divided up the meal-offering, we should have said that it was not so; therefore all the cases were necessary [to be stated].

Our Rabbis taught: What he has brought he has brought, but he has not discharged the obligation of his vow. R. Simeon says, He has even discharged the obligation of his vow.

TO BRING THIS [MEAL] AS A MEAL-OFFERING PREPARED ON A GRIDDLE. But it has been taught: The vessels of ministry have not hallowed them![22] — Abaye answered, They have not hallowed them to that extent that they may be offered [upon the altar], but they have hallowed them to the extent that they can become invalid.[23]

Abaye further said, This[24] has been taught

---

(1) For R. Eliezer has already stated his view that a man may offer a suspensive guilt-offering every day. V. Ker. 25a.

(2) For it is now manifest that what was slaughtered was not an offering but an unconsecrated animal, and as it was slaughtered in the Temple court it must be destroyed.

(3) For at the time of the sprinkling this man required atonement and the offering was a valid offering, consequently its flesh may be eaten.

(4) We thus see that by this principle the flesh of the offering is deemed to be a foodstuff so that it may be eaten by the priests as soon as the blood was ready for sprinkling; but this is contrary to R. Ashi's contention.

(5) Palestine.

(6) Not what is actually invalid, but, as in the case in question, where the offering turned out to be unnecessary.

(7) V. Glos.

(8) For they are destined to be burnt.

(9) And the expression 'conveys food-uncleanness' obviously means that it transmits the uncleanness to another object, the latter becoming unclean in the second degree.

(10) V. Hul. 36a, Sonc. ed. p. 194ff; and Pes. 20a.

(11) I.e., that part of the meal-offering which was not moistened by the oil and so was not rendered susceptible to uncleanness in the usual manner by moistening by a liquid but only by sacred esteem.

(12) I.e., whether that which was deemed a foodstuff or that which was made susceptible to uncleanness only by sacred esteem, and which subsequently suffered uncleanness, can by the law of the Torah transmit the uncleanness to another foodstuff, so that if the latter were consecrated meat it would have to be burnt.

(13) The ruling that nothar and the Red Cow convey food-uncleanness is therefore only Rabbinic, and one would not

burn consecrated meat on account of such uncleanness.
(14) And it is regarded as a freewill meal-offering.
(15) Since the flour was designated for one meal-offering it may not be used for another.
(16) For where the meal-offering was brought in two vessels instead of in a single vessel, two handfuls are taken from the meal-offering instead of one, and moreover in each vessel the flour is less than the amount promised. And where it was brought in one vessel instead of in two vessels, only one handful is taken therefrom instead of two, and moreover the flour in this vessel is too much, for there should be in it one tenth and not two.
(17) In this case the offerings cannot be regarded as freewill-offerings seeing that when his attention was drawn to the terms of his vow he did not reply that what he was offering was a freewill-offering and not in fulfilment of his vow.
(18) And if each tenth is distinct so that the handful can still be taken from each by itself, they are valid. V. supra 23a. In the earlier case of this Mishnah, where he said, 'Let two tenths be brought in two vessels', and he brought them in one vessel, it must be assumed that the two tenths were so much mixed together that the handful could not have been taken from each by itself, and therefore they are invalid.
(19) Where a man promised to bring a meal-offering prepared on a griddle, and he brought one prepared in a pan, or vice versa.
(20) Where he promised to bring a meal-offering in one vessel and he brought it in two, or vice versa.
(21) Sc. what he had promised and what he had actually brought.
(22) The vessels in which the meal-offerings are put when brought to the Temple do not hallow the offerings, accordingly the meal-offering which had wrongfully been put into a pan could be transferred to a griddle, why then is it invalid?
(23) If they are taken out of the vessels assigned to them.
(24) That where a man vowed to bring this flour as a meal-offering prepared on a griddle and he brought it as a meal-offering prepared in a pan it is invalid.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 103a

only in the case where he determined [the kind of vessel] at the time of his vowing, but [where he determined the kind of vessel] at the time of his setting it apart,[1] it is not [invalid]; [for Scripture says,] According as thou hast vowed,[2] and not 'according as thou hast set apart'.

This has also been stated: R. Aha b. Hanina said in the name of R. Assi who said it in the name of R. Johanan, This has been taught only in the case where he determined the kind of vessel at the time of his vowing, but [where he determined the kind of vessel] at the time of his setting it apart, it is not [invalid]; [for Scripture says,] 'According as thou hast vowed', and not 'according as thou hast set apart'.

MISHNAH. IF A MAN SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL-OFFERING OF BARLEY', HE MUST BRING ONE OF WHEAT;[3] IF 'OF COARSE MEAL', HE MUST BRING IT OF FINE FLOUR; IF 'WITHOUT OIL AND WITHOUT FRANKINCENSE', HE MUST NEVERTHELESS BRING IT WITH OIL AND FRANKINCENSE; IF 'HALF A TENTH, HE MUST BRING A WHOLE TENTH; IF A TENTH AND A HALF', HE MUST BRING TWO. R. SIMEON DECLARES HIM EXEMPT, BECAUSE HE DID NOT MAKE HIS OFFERING IN THE MANNER IN WHICH PEOPLE USUALLY MAKE THEIR OFFERINGS.

GEMARA. But why is this? Here is a vow and also its annulment![4] — The view [expressed in our Mishnah], said Hezekiah, Is that of Beth Shammai who maintain that one must always regard the first words [of a man's statement as binding].[5] For we have learnt: [If a man said,] 'I will be a Nazirite [and abstain] from dried figs and pressed figs', Beth Shammai say, He becomes a Nazirite [in the ordinary sense];[6] but Beth Hillel say, He does not become a Nazirite.[7] R. Johanan said, You may even say that it is the view of Beth Hillel too, for [we assume that] the man added,' Had I but known that one may not vow a meal-offering in this manner, I should not have vowed in this manner but in that'.

Hezekiah said, This[8] was taught only in the case where he said a meal-offering of barley', but where he said 'a meal-offering of lentils', he has not [to bring a meal-offering of wheat]. But let us consider: Hezekiah explained our Mishnah according to the view of Beth Shammai, did he not? But since Beth Shammai maintain that one must always regard the first words [of a man's statement] as binding then surely it is immaterial whether he said 'of barley' or 'of lentils'! — He abandoned that view.[9] But why did he abandon it? — Raba said, Because our Mishnah was to him difficult to understand. Why does it state 'a meal-offering of barley' and not 'of lentils'?[10] Obviously it is because of the man's error; now in regard to barley a man may err[11] but surely not in regard to lentils.[12]

R. Johanan, however, said, Even [if he said] 'of lentils',[13] But consider: R. Johanan explained our Mishnah in accordance with the view of Beth Hillel, did he not? And Beth Hillel's view is based upon the man's error; now [I grant you that] a man may err in regard to barley, but surely he would not err in regard to lentils![14] — He[15] said so only as the result of Hezekiah's argument. [For he reasoned with him thus:] Why did you abandon your view? Because our Mishnah does not state 'of lentils'. But it may be that [that was so obvious that] it was not even necessary to be stated! Thus not only where he said 'of lentils',in which case it can only be said that he is revoking his vow,[16] do we hold that we must adopt the first words [of his statement]; but even where he said 'of barley', in which case it might be said that he has erred,[17] we still say that we must adopt the first words [of his statement].

---

(1) The man vowed to bring a meal-offering but did not specify the kind of vessel in which it was to be prepared, and only later when setting apart the flour for his meal-offering he mentioned the vessel in which it was to be prepared. If then he actually prepares it in a vessel different from that mentioned by him previously, it is still valid.

(2) Deut. XXIII, 24.

(3) Since all freewill meal-offerings must be brought of wheaten fine flour, to which oil and frankincense must be added. Cf. Lev. II, 1.

(4) For by the additional words 'of barley' he obviously meant to annul his expressed vow, since every one knows that only wheat may be offered as a meal-offering and not barley.

(5) Therefore as soon as he said, 'I take upon myself to bring a meal-offering', that constituted a binding vow, and his subsequent words 'of barley' cannot nullify the effect of his opening words.

(6) And he must abstain from wine and grapes. Cf. Num. VI, 1ff.

(7) Supra 81b; Nazir 9a.

(8) That he must bring a meal-offering of wheat.

(9) That our Mishnah represents the view of Beth Shammai. He accordingly accepts the explanation of R. Johanan.

(10) For according to Beth Shammai's view that a man is bound by his first words, then even though he added 'of lentils' he should also be liable to bring a meal-offering of wheat. The fact that our Mishnah implies a distinction between barley and lentils proves that Beth Shammai's view is not upheld.

(11) He genuinely believed that he may bring a meal-offering of barley, since there are in fact meal-offerings of barley, e.g., the meal-offering of jealousy (cf. Num. V, 15). His intention, however, was to bring a proper meal-offering, and therefore in place of the meal-offering of barley he must bring one of wheat.

(12) By adding 'of lentils' he obviously intended to revoke his promise, accordingly he is exempt, since we do not accept the view that a man is bound by his first words.

(13) He must bring a meal-offering of wheat.

(14) V. p. 633, n. 7.

(15) R. Johanan, in affirming that the ruling is applicable even though he said 'of lentils'.

(16) For no man would be so mistaken as to believe that he may bring a meal-offering of lentils, obviously then he is retracting his vow, and this he cannot do since he is already bound by his first words.

(17) For he believed that he could bring a meal-offering of barley. He therefore only intended a meal-offering of barley and since this cannot be brought he should be exempt entirely.

Ze'iri said, This[1] applies only where he said 'a meal-offering', but where he did not say 'a meal-offering'[2] it is not so.[3]

R. Nahman was once sitting and reciting the above statement [of Ze'iri]. Thereupon Raba raised the following objections against R. Nahman: IF 'OF COARSE MEAL', HE MUST BRING IT OF FINE FLOUR. Is it not the case that he did not say 'a meal-offering'? — No, he actually said 'a meal-offering'. IF 'WITHOUT OIL AND WITHOUT FRANKINCENSE', HE MUST NEVERTHELESS BRING IT WITH OIL AND FRANKINCENSE. Is it not the case that he did not say 'a meal-offering'? No, he actually said 'a meal-offering'. IF 'HALF A TENTH', HE MUST BRING A WHOLE TENTH. Is it not the case that he did not say 'a meal-offering'? — No, he actually said 'a meal-offering'. If so, consider the next clause: IF 'A TENTH AND A HALF', HE MUST BRING TWO. But as soon as he said a meal-offering [of a tenth]' he immediately was bound to bring a tenth, and when he added 'and a half' it is of no account![4] — The case must be that he said, 'I take upon myself to bring a meal-offering of half a tenth and a tenth'; for as soon as he said 'a meal-offering' he immediately was bound to bring a tenth, when he added 'half a tenth' it was of no account, and when he finally said 'a tenth' he became bound to bring another tenth. If so, what can be the reason for the last statement: R. SIMEON DECLARES HIM EXEMPT, BECAUSE HE DID NOT MAKE HIS OFFERING IN THE MANNER IN WHICH PEOPLE USUALLY MAKE THEIR OFFERINGS?[5] — Raba answered, R. Simeon stated this according to the view of R. Jose who maintained that a man is bound by his last words too.[6]

MISHNAH. A MAN MAY OFFER A MEAL-OFFERING CONSISTING OF SIXTY TENTHS AND BRING THEM IN ONE VESSEL IF[7] A MAN SAID, I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER SIXTY TENTHS', HE MAY BRING THEM IN ONE VESSEL. BUT IF HE SAID, I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER SIXTY-ONE TENTHS', HE MUST BRING SIXTY IN ONE VESSEL AND THE ONE IN ANOTHER VESSEL; FOR SINCE THE CONGREGATION BRING ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE FEAST [OF TABERNACLES] WHEN IT FALLS ON A SABBATH SIXTY-ONE TENTHS [AS A MEAL-OFFERING],[8] IT IS ENOUGH FOR AN INDIVIDUAL THAT [HIS MEAL-OFFERING] BE LESS BY ONE TENTH THAN THAT OF THE CONGREGATION. R. SIMEON SAID, BUT SOME OF THESE [SIXTY-ONE TENTHS] ARE FOR THE BULLOCKS AND SOME FOR THE LAMBS, AND THEY MAY NOT BE MIXED ONE WITH THE OTHER![9] BUT THE FACT IS THAT UP TO SIXTY TENTHS THEY CAN BE MINGLED [IN ONE VESSEL].[10] THEY SAID TO HIM, CAN SIXTY BE MINGLED [IN ONE VESSEL] AND NOT SIXTY-ONE? HE ANSWERED, SO IT IS WITH ALL THE MEASURES PRESCRIBED BY THE SAGES: A MAN MAY IMMERSE HIMSELF IN FORTY SEAHS[11] OF WATER, BUT HE MAY NOT IMMERSE HIMSELF IN FORTY SE'AHS LESS ONE KORTOB.[11]

GEMARA. This question was asked before[12] R. Judah b. Ila'i: How do we know that if a man said, 'I take upon myself to offer Sixty-one tenths', he must bring sixty in one vessel and the one in another vessel? R. Judah b. Ila'i, the chief speaker on all occasions,[13] opened the discussion and said, Since we find that the congregation bring on the first day of the Feast [of Tabernacles] when it falls on a Sabbath sixty-one tenths, it is enough for an individual that [his meal-offering] be less by one tenth than that of the congregation. R. Simeon said to him, But some of these [sixty-one tenths] are for the bullocks and the rams and some for the lambs, with some the mixture is thick and with some it is thin,[14] some are mingled in the morning and some in the evening,[15] and they may not be mixed one with the other! Thereupon [R. Judah] said to him, You explain it. He replied, It is written, And every meal-offering mingled with oil or dry:[16] thus the Torah says, Bring a meal-offering that can be mingled [in one vessel]. To this he objected saying, Can sixty be mingled [in one vessel] and not sixty-one? He replied, So it is with all the measures prescribed by the Sages: a man may immerse himself in forty se'ahs [of water], but he may not immerse himself in forty se'ahs less one kortob; an

egg's bulk of food can convey food-uncleanness, but an egg's bulk of food less one sesame seed cannot convey food-uncleanness; [a cloth that is] three handbreadths square is susceptible to midras-uncleanness,[17] but [that which is] three handbreadths square less one thread is not susceptible to midras-uncleanness. But what of it if they cannot be mingled? Have we not learnt:[18] If he did not mingle it it is valid? — R. Zera answered, Wherever mingling is possible the mingling is not indispensable, but wherever mingling is not possible[19] the mingling is indispensable.

R. Bibi said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi, Once a mule belonging to the house of Rabbi died, and the Sages measured the blood that flowed out therefrom [to ascertain whether there was] a quarter-log.[20] R. Isaac b. Bisna raised an objection from the following: R. Joshua and R. Joshua b. Bathyra testified that the blood of carcasses was clean. Moreover R. Joshua b. Bathyra related that it once happened that wild asses were speared in the royal square for the lions, and the Festival pilgrims had to wade up to their knees in blood, and nothing was said to them about it! He[21] remained silent. Thereupon R. Zerika said to him, Why does not the Master give an answer? He replied, How can I answer? Behold R. Hanin has said, It is written, And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee:[22] this refers to one who buys grain from year to year;[23] and thou shalt fear night and day:[22] this refers to one who buys grain from week to week;[24] and shalt have no assurance of thy life:[25] this refers to one who has to rely upon the bread dealer.[26]

---

(1) The ruling that we adopt the first words of a man's statement.

(2) But said, 'I take upon myself of barley'. Aliter: He said, 'I take upon myself a meal-offering-of (מנחת) barley'. In this case the word מנחת cannot stand by itself.

(3) But he is entirely exempt.

(4) Consequently he should only bring one tenth and not two.

(5) Since it is assumed that a man is bound by his first words, and this man in his opening words had made an offering in the proper manner.

(6) A man's whole statement must be considered, and as he said 'a half tenth and a tenth' it is undoubtedly an unusual offering and he is therefore entirely exempt. This view of R. Jose is to be found in Tem. 25b.

(7) This sentence is omitted in MS.M. and is deleted by Sh. Mek.

(8) On this day were offered (cf. Num. XXIX, 12ff) thirteen bullocks, each requiring three tenths of flour as a meal-offering, two rams, each requiring two tenths, and fourteen lambs, each requiring one tenth; thus 39 + 4 + 14 tenths 57. In addition there were two further tenths for the two lambs of the daily offering, and two more for the two lambs of the Sabbath Additional offering; thus making a total of 61.

(9) For the quantity of oil for the tenths varied; each tenth that accompanied the bullock or the ram required two logs of oil, hence the mixture was thick, whereas the tenth that was brought with each lamb required three logs of oil, thus making a thin mixture. Accordingly the sixty-one tenths were not all put in one vessel.

(10) With one log of oil, which according to R. Eliezer b. Jacob (supra 88a) is the amount prescribed for any number of tenths up to sixty. The Mishnah here accepts the view of R. Eliezer b. Jacob. But even according to the Rabbis it will be admitted that sixty tenths with a corresponding number of logs of oil cannot well be mingled together in one vessel (v. Rashi supra 18b s.v. ששים ואחד).

(11) V. Glos.

(12) Lit., 'above'.

(13) A title given to R. Judah, also in Ber. 63b and Shab. 33b.

(14) V. supra n. 1.

(15) For not all the sixty-one tenths were offered at one time, since these included the tenth offered with the daily offering in the morning and that offered in the evening.

(16) Lev. VII, 10.

(17) V. Glos.

(18) Supra 18a.

(19) E.g., sixty-one tenths in one vessel with one log of oil.

(20) For a quarter-log of blood (which, it is estimated, when congealed is equal to an olive's bulk) of a carcass conveys uncleanness like the carcass itself; cf. 'Ed. V, 1; VIII, 1.

(21) R. Bibi.
(22) Deut. XXVIII, 66.
(23) I.e., who has no fields of his own to cultivate but must purchase his provisions yearly.
(24) Lit., 'from Sabbath eve to Sabbath eve'.
(25) Deut. XXVIII, 66.
(26) For his daily needs.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 104a

And I[1] have to rely upon the bread dealer. How does the matter stand?[2] — R. Joseph answered, R. Judah was the Master [in regard to all matters of religious law] in the house of the Nasi,[3] and it was he that gave the above decision,[4] and it was in accordance with the law that he reported. For we have learnt:[5] R. Judah reports six instances of lenient rulings by Beth Shammai and stringent rulings by Beth Hillel.[6] Beth Shammai pronounce the blood of a carcass clean; but Beth Hillel pronounce it unclean. R. Jose son of R. Judah said, Even when Beth Hillel pronounced it unclean they said so only in respect of a quarter-log of blood, since it can congeal and amount to an olive's bulk.[7]

MISHNAH. ONE MAY NOT OFFER ONE [LOG], TWO, OR FIVE [LOGS],[8] BUT ONE MAY OFFER THREE, FOUR, SIX,[9] OR ANYTHING ABOVE SIX.[10]

GEMARA. The question was asked: Is the wine of the drinkofferings indivisible or not?[11] In what circumstances [does the question arise]? Where, e.g., a man brought five [logs of wine]. If you say that the wine of the drink-offerings is not indivisible, then four logs can be drawn off and offered, since that is the proper quantity for a ram, and the remaining log would be for a freewill-offering;[12] but if you say that it is indivisible, then these five logs may not be offered until the quantity is made up.[13] How is it then?

Abaye said, Come and hear: There were six [money chests] for freewill-offerings.[14] And to the question, What did they represent? the reply was given, They represented the surplus[15] of the sin-offering, the surplus of the guilt-offering, the surplus of the guilt-offering of the Nazirite, the surplus of the guilt-offering of the leper, the surplus of the bird-offerings, and the surplus of the sinner's meal-offering. Now if it were so,[16] then another money chest should have been prepared for the surplus of the drink-offerings? — Those[17] served only for freewill-offerings of the community,[18] whereas these[19] were quite frequent, and therefore the surplus of the drink-offerings of one man could be joined to that of another and could in this way be offered.[20]

Raba said, Come and hear: Home-born:[21] this teaches us that a man may offer wine for a drink-offering.[22] How much [must he bring]? Three logs. Whence do we know that if he desired to bring more he may do so? Because the text states, Shall be.[23] We might suppose that he may bring less, the text therefore states, After this manner.[24] Now what is meant by 'bring more'? Shall I say [it means the bringing of] four or six logs? But why are three logs admitted? [Surely] because that quantity is proper for a lamb! Then similarly four and six logs are proper for a ram and a bullock respectively?[25] Hence it must mean [the bringing of] five logs,[26] thus proving that the wine for the drink-offerings is not indivisible. This indeed proves it.

R. Ashi said, But we have not learnt so [in our Mishnah]! [For it states]: ONE MAY NOT OFFER ONE [LOG], TWO, OR FIVE [LOGS], BUT ONE MAY OFFER THREE, FOUR, SIX, OR ANYTHING ABOVE SIX. Now here five is stated alongside with two, therefore as two can under no circumstances be admitted for drink-offerings, so five cannot be admitted at all? — This does not necessarily follow; each follows its own rule.[27]

Abaye said, If you are able to prove that the wine of the drink-offerings is not indivisible, then it is

not indivisible.[28] But if you prove that it is indivisible, then I am clear as to the law with regard to any number of logs up to ten,[29] but about eleven

---

(1) Lit., 'that man'. R. Bibi was in straitened circumstances and had difficulties in obtaining a living, consequently his mind was not at ease to concentrate on the question raised.

(2) Is a quarter-log of blood of a carcass unclean or not?

(3) Sc. Rabbi, in whose house the above incident about the mule occurred. Chronologically it is very difficult to accept that R. Judah b. Ila'i held a position in the household of R. Judah the prince (or Rabbi). V. however Tosaf. s.v. מוריינא.

(4) To measure the blood so as to ascertain whether there was a quarter-log or not.

(5) 'Ed. V, 1; Shab. 77a.

(6) This is exceptional, for generally the school of Hillel follow the more lenient ruling.

(7) Which is the minimum quantity of carcass (נבילה) that conveys uncleanness.

(8) Of wine as a drink-offering. One may offer only such quantities as conform with the quantities prescribed for one or several of the specific animal-offerings, and these are: six logs for each bullock, four for each ram, and three for each lamb. Nowhere is such a quantity as one log, or two, or five prescribed.

(9) Corresponding to the wine-offering of a lamb, a ram, and a bullock respectively.

(10) Thus seven logs could be applied for the drink-offerings of one ram and one lamb, eight for two rams, nine for one bullock and one lamb, and so on.

(11) Where a certain quantity of wine is offered, is it to be regarded as one whole so that it must be offered together as one drink-offering, or may it be divided up and some taken for one offering and the remainder applied in any manner available for it?

(12) The remaining log would either be sold and the money obtained put into the chest of freewill-offerings or it would be added to two more logs and used as the drink-offering of the daily offering.

(13) I.e., he must bring another log so as to make up six logs, the quantity prescribed for a bullock.

(14) V. Shek. VI, 5, and infra 107b.

(15) I.e., if a certain sum of money had been set apart for an animal-offering and the price fell, the surplus money was put into a money chest and eventually was expended on burnt-offerings for the community. The offerings enumerated were each in some aspect different from the others, hence the surplus of each was kept in a separate chest.

(16) That the wine of the drink-offerings was not indivisible, and therefore in the case in question four logs, the quantity prescribed for a ram, could be drawn off and offered, and the remaining log would be for a freewill-offering.

(17) The surplus in each of the six cases enumerated.

(18) For the surplus money cannot be used for its original purpose.

(19) The surplus of the drink-offerings.

(20) For drink-offerings were offered at all times, even unaccompanied by an animal-sacrifice; accordingly the surplus of several offerings of wine could be combined and offered. There was therefore no need for a special chest in which to collect the surplus of each drink-offering.

(21) Num. XV, 13; with reference to the drink-offerings.

(22) Even though it is unaccompanied by an animal-offering.

(23) Ibid. XXVIII, 14: Half a hin of wine shall be for a bullock. The expression 'shall be' is superfluous and therefore serves to include a larger quantity than that prescribed. The reference might also be to Num. XV, 15.

(24) Ibid. 13.

(25) And surely no verse is required to include these quantities.

(26) And this quantity is expressly included by the verse. As to the procedure, four logs, the quantity prescribed for a ram, would be offered and the fifth would be a surplus.

(27) Two logs, admittedly, cannot under any circumstances be offered, but five may be offered in the manner already described, namely, four logs, being the drink-offering of a ram, are offered, and the remaining log is kept for a freewill-offering. Our Mishnah disallows the offering of five logs only in the first instance, for it is not proper to bring at the outset such a quantity as must inevitably lead to a surplus.

(28) Therefore any quantity above two logs may be offered.

(29) Thus offerings of one, two, or five logs may not be brought, but any other quantity, up to and including ten, may. V. supra p. 638, n. 13.

I am in doubt. How am I to regard it? Shall I say that the man intended to offer the drink-offerings of two bullocks,[1] and therefore these may not be offered until this quantity has been made up? Or [shall I rather say that] 'he intended to bring the drink-offerings of two rams and one lamb? [In other words, the question is:] Do we say that he meant to bring the drink-offerings corresponding to two quantities of one kind and one of the other or not?[2] The question remains unsolved.

MISHNAH. ONE MAY OFFER WINE[3] BUT NOT OIL. THIS IS THE OPINION OF R. AKIBA. BUT R. TARFON SAYS, ONE MAY ALSO OFFER OIL.[4] R. TARFON SAID, AS WE FIND THAT WINE WHICH IS OFFERED AS AN OBLIGATION[5] MAY BE OFFERED AS A FREEWILL-OFFERING,[6] SO OIL WHICH IS OFFERED AS AN OBLIGATION MAY BE OFFERED AS A FREEWILL-OFFERING. R. AKIBA SAID TO HIM, NO, IF YOU SAY SO OF WINE IT IS BECAUSE IT IS OFFERED BY ITSELF EVEN WHEN OFFERED AS AN OBLIGATION;[7] CAN YOU SAY THE SAME OF OIL WHICH IS NOT OFFERED BY ITSELF WHEN OFFERED AS AN OBLIGATION?[7] TWO [MEN] MAY NOT JOINTLY OFFER ONE TENTH; BUT THEY MAY JOINTLY OFFER A BURNT-OFFERING OR A PEACE-OFFERING, AND OF BIRDS EVEN A SINGLE BIRD.

GEMARA. Raba said, From the opinions of both we may infer that a man may offer every day the meal-offerings of the drink-offerings.[8] But is not this obvious? [No,] for I might have thought that in regard to the freewill meal-offering the Divine Law has specified but five kinds of meal-offerings[9] and no more; we are therefore taught that that is so only where [the kind of the meal-offering] was not expressed,[10] but where it was expressly stated[11] then it was so stated.

TWO [MEN] MAY NOT JOINTLY OFFER [ONE TENTH]. What is the reason? Shall I say because there is written, Bringeth?[12] But with the burnt-offering too there is written, Bringeth![13] But you will say that the reason this is so with the burnt-offering[14] is that there is written, Your burnt-offerings;[15] then with the meal-offering too there is written, And your meal-offerings![15] — The reason is that there is written in connection with [the meal-offering] the word 'soul'.[16] And so too it was taught in a Baraitha: Rabbi says, It is written, [Whosoever he be of the house of Israel] that bringeth his offering, whether it be any of their vows, or any of their freewill-offerings, which they bring unto the Lord:[17] thus every offering may be brought jointly, and the verse excluded only the meal-offering in connection with which the expression 'soul' is used.

R. Isaac said, Why is the meal-offering distinguished in that the expression 'soul' is used therewith? Because the Holy One, blessed be He, said, 'Who is it that usually brings a meal-offering? It is the poor man. I account it as though he had offered his own soul to Me'.

R. Isaac said, Why is the meal-offering distinguished in that five kinds of oil dishes[18] are stated in connection with it? This can be likened to the case of a human king for whom his friend had prepared a feast. As the king knew that [his friend] was poor, he said to him, 'prepare it[19] for me in five kinds of dishes so that I will derive pleasure from you'.

C H A P T E R X I I I

MISHNAH. [IF A MAN SAID], 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING A TENTH', HE MUST BRING ONE [TENTH]; IF 'TENTHS', HE MUST BRING TWO [TENTHS]. [IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED [A CERTAIN NUMBER OF TENTHS] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT NUMBER I SPECIFIED', HE MUST BRING SIXTY TENTHS[20] [IF HE SAID,] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL-OFFERING', HE MAY BRING WHICHEVER KIND HE CHOOSES.[21] R.

JUDAH SAYS, HE MUST BRING A MEAL-OFFERING OF FINE FLOUR, FOR THAT IS THE PRINCIPAL MEAL-OFFERING. [IF HE SAID] A MEAL-OFFERING' OR 'A KIND OF MEAL-OFFERING', HE MUST BRING ONE [OF ANY KIND]; IF 'MEAL-OFFERINGS' OR A KIND OF MEAL-OFFERINGS', HE MUST BRING TWO [OF ANY ONE KIND]; [IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED [A CERTAIN KIND], BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT KIND I SPECIFIED', HE MUST BRING THE FIVE KINDS [IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED A MEAL-OFFERING OF [A CERTAIN NUMBER OF] TENTHS[22] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT NUMBER I SPECIFIED, HE MUST BRING SIXTY TENTHS. BUT RABBI SAYS, HE MUST BRING MEAL-OFFERINGS [OF EVERY NUMBER] OF TENTHS FROM ONE TO SIXTY.[23] GEMARA. This[24] is obvious! — It was necessary to state the next clause: IF 'TENTHS', HE MUST BRING TWO [TENTHS]. But this too is obvious, for the minimum of 'tenths' is two! — It was necessary to state the following clause: [IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED [A CERTAIN NUMBER OF TENTHS] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT NUMBER I SPECIFIED', HE MUST BRING SIXTY TENTHS.[25] Whose view is taught here? Said Hezekiah: It is not that of Rabbi, for Rabbi has said, HE MUST BRING MEAL-OFFERINGS [OF EVERY NUMBER] OF TENTHS FROM ONE TO SIXTY. R. Johanan said, You may even say that it sets forth the view of Rabbi, but [we must assume that] the man said, 'I specified [a certain number of] tenths but I had not determined them for one vessel', in which case he must bring sixty tenths in sixty vessels.[26]

[IF HE SAID.] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING A MEAL-OFFERING', HE MAY BRING WHICHEVER KIND HE CHOOSES, etc. A Tanna taught: It is because Holy Writ stated it first.[27] In that case, if a man said, 'I take upon myself to bring a burnt-offering'. he should have to bring a bullock,[28] since Holy Writ stated that

---

(1) I.e., twelve logs.

(2) For the quantity is odd and unusual. V. Tosaf. 104a s.v. עד

(3) By itself, without it being accompanied by a meal-offering of flour and oil. As for the manner in which wine was offered, v. Zeb. 91b.

(4) A handful of the oil was taken and burnt upon the altar and the remainder was eaten by the priests.

(5) Viz., as the drink-offering which accompanied most animal-offerings.

(6) V. the exposition from the term 'home-born' supra p. 640.

(7) For the wine of the drink-offering was not mixed with anything, whereas the oil was mingled with the fine flour.

(8) I.e., the meal-offering of fine flour mingled with oil and the offering of wine, which accompany most animal-offerings, may be brought at any time as an entire and separate offering even without an animal-offering. The dispute between R. Akiba and R. Tarfon refers only to the offering of oil by itself, but certainly not to the offering of oil which is part of the meal-offering of the drink-offerings.

(9) In Lev. II, the following five kinds of meal-offerings are described: (i) the meal-offering of fine flour, (ii) the meal-offering prepared on a griddle, (iii) the meal-offering prepared in a pan, (iv) the meal-offering baked in the oven and made into cakes, and (v) that baked in the oven and made into wafers.

(10) Thus where a man pledged himself to bring a meal-offering without specifying the kind he was to bring he is bound to bring one of the five kinds described in the Torah.

(11) That he is offering the meal-offering of the drink-offerings.

(12) Lev. II, 1. The verb used is in the singular, signifying that the offering shall be brought by an individual and not by two persons jointly.

(13) Ibid. I, 3.

(14) That it may be brought jointly.

(15) Num. XXIX, 39. Here the plural pronominal suffix is used.

(16) Lev. II, 1. Heb. נפש. The term usually found with sacrifices is אדם or איש, man.

(17) Ibid. XXII, 18.

(18) Each of the five kinds of meal-offerings, v. supra p. 642, n. 2, is prepared with oil.

(19) Sc. the little that you possess.

(20) For this is the maximum size of the meal-offering of an individual; and therefore even if that which he promised

was less it matters nought, for when bringing this quantity he should stipulate that what is over and above the amount he promised shall be reckoned as a freewill meal-offering.

(21) Of the five kinds of meal-offerings described in Lev. II. V. supra p. 642, n. 2.

(22) To be brought in one vessel.

(23) Since he had specified a certain number of tenths to be brought in one vessel it would not meet the case, according to Rabbi, were he to bring the maximum quantity, namely sixty tenths, in one vessel, for Rabbi is of the opinion that once a certain number of tenths have been determined for one vessel that vessel may contain neither more nor less than the number specified. Accordingly the only possible solution is to bring sixty meal-offerings, each containing a different number of tenths; in this way he will certainly have brought the meal-offering he specified.

(24) The first clause of the Mishnah.

(25) This is the correct interpretation of the text, following MS.M. and Z.K. In cur. edd. the clause: [IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED etc.' is erroneously placed — as a fresh quotation from our Mishnah introducing a new passage.

(26) Bringing one tenth in each vessel. For the only doubt here is as to the number of tenths, since he left the matter open whether he would bring them in one or more vessels; whereas in the last clause of our Mishnah the doubt is as to the correct number of tenths to be brought in one vessel.

(27) For this reason is the meal-offering of fine flour described by R. Judah as the principal meal-offering.

(28) Which is contrary to the law, v. infra.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 105a

first; and if 'of the flock', he should have to bring a lamb[1] since Holy Writ stated that first; and if 'of the birds', he should have to bring turtle-doves,[2] since Holy Writ stated them first. Wherefore then have we learnt: [If a man said,] 'I take upon myself to bring a burnt-offering', he should bring a lamb; but R. Eleazar b. Azariah says, [He may bring] a turtledove or a young pigeon?[3] And R. Judah does not differ there! — We must therefore say that it is accounted the principal meal-offering because it has no descriptive name.[4] But the Tanna gave as the reason 'Because Holy Writ stated it first'! — This is what he meant to say. Which is the meal-offering described as 'the principal one' by virtue of the fact that it has no descriptive name? It is that which Holy Writ stated first.[5] But this is obvious, for [R. Judah] expressly mentioned the meal-offering of fine flour! — It is merely stated as a mnemonical sign.[6]

[IF HE SAID,] 'A MEAL-OFFERING' OR 'A KIND OF MEAL-OFFERING' etc. R. Papa raised the following question. What if he said 'kinds of meal-offering'? [Shall I say that] since he said 'kinds!.[7] he obviously meant two, and the term 'meal-offering' [is generic], since all meal-offerings are referred to as 'meal-offering', as it is written, And this is the law of the meal-offering?[8] Or [shall I rather say that] since he said 'meal-offering'[9] he meant only one meal-offering, and by the expression 'kinds of meal-offering' he meant to imply, 'Of the kinds of meal-offering I take upon myself [to bring] one meal-offering'? — Come and hear: [IF HE SAID,] 'A MEAL-OFFERING' OR 'A KIND OF MEAL-OFFERING', HE MUST BRING ONE [OF ANY KIND]. It follows, however, that [if he said] 'kinds of meal-offering' he would have to bring two! — Read the next clause: IF MEAL-OFFERINGS' OR 'A KIND OF MEAL-OFFERINGS', HE MUST BRING TWO. It follows, however, that [if he said] 'kinds of meal-offering' he would have to bring only one! The truth is that we cannot decide from here.

Come and hear: [If he said,] 'I take upon myself to bring a kind of meal-offerings', he must bring two meal-offerings of the same kind. It follows, however, that [if he said] 'kinds of mealoffering' he would only have to bring one! — Perhaps the inference is this: [if he said] 'kinds of meal-offering', he must bring two meal-offerings of two kinds. But it has been taught otherwise: [If he said,] 'I take upon myself to bring a kind of meal-offerings', he must bring two meal-offerings of the same kind. But if he said, 'I take upon myself to bring kinds of meal-offerings', he must bring two meal-offerings of two kinds. If follows from this, that [if he said] 'kinds of meal-offering' he would have to bring only one! — Perhaps that [Baraitha] represents the view of R. Simeon who ruled that

one may bring it[10] the half in cakes and the half in wafers; accordingly the expression 'kinds of meal-offering' refers to that meal-offering which may be of two kinds. According to the Rabbis, however, who ruled that one may not bring it the half in cakes and the half in wafers, he would then have to bring two meal-offerings of two kinds.[11]

[IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED [A CERTAIN KIND] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT KIND I SPECIFIED'. HE MUST BRING THE FIVE KINDS. Who is the Tanna that taught this?[12] — R. Jeremiah said, It is not R. Simeon; for according to R. Simeon who stated that he may bring it the half in cakes and the half in wafers,[13] even though R. Judah's view were accepted, that all meal-offerings consisted of ten cakes each,[14] he would have to bring fourteen meal-offerings because of the doubt.[15] Abaye said. You may even say that it is R. Simeon. for we have heard R. Simeon express the view that one may bring an offering and make conditions about it.[16] For it has been taught:[17] R. Simeon says. On the following day[18] he brings his guilt-offering and a log [of oil]

---

(1) And not a goat.

(2) And not young pigeons.

(3) Infra 107a.

(4) The meal-offering of fine flour is invariably referred to as 'the meal-offering', whereas the others have a descriptive name attached to them, as the meal-offering prepared on a griddle, or in a pan, or baked in the oven.

(5) Namely, the meal-offering of fine flour.

(6) The Tanna of the Baraitha gave us a further help as an aid to the memory in order to remember that the principal meal-offering is the meal-offering of fine flour.

(7) In the plural.

(8) Lev. VI, 7.

(9) In the singular.

(10) Sc. the meal-offering baked in the oven; v. supra 63a.

(11) For the fulfilment of the expression 'kinds of meal-offering'.

(12) That because of the doubt he must bring the five kinds of meal-offerings.

(13) I.e., the meal-offering baked in the oven must consist of ten pieces, but it may be made up partly of cakes and partly of wafers. v. supra 63a.

(14) As opposed to R. Meir's view that all meal-offerings must consist of twelve pieces each. V. supra 76a.

(15) For he would have to bring the eleven possible variations of the baked meal-offering, viz., ten cakes and no wafers, nine cakes and one wafer, eight cakes and two wafers, seven cakes and three wafers... no cakes and ten wafers, plus the three other kinds of meal-offering, a total of fourteen meal-offerings. According to R. Meir there are thirteen variations of the baked meal-offering, beginning with twelve cakes and no wafers, and so the total would be sixteen.

(16) And therefore, in the case of our Mishnah, he would only have to bring one baked meal-offering of ten cakes and one of ten wafers (in addition, of course, to the other three kinds of meal-offering) and declare, 'If I had specified to bring it all in cakes, or all in wafers, then let the cakes or the wafers be offered in fulfilment of my vow and the others be a freewill-offering; and if I had specified to bring it partly in cakes and partly in wafers, then let that number of each kind which I had specified be offered in fulfilment of my vow and the rest be offered as a freewill-offering'.

(17) Tosef. Neziruth VI. The case dealt with is that of a Nazirite who was in doubt whether he was rendered unclean or not and also whether he was still a confirmed leper or not; and the Tanna of the Baraitha rules that he may eat consecrated food after sixty days. V. Tosaf s.v. למחרת.

(18) After sixty days have elapsed. Cf. Naz. 59b.

with it and says. 'If I was a leper, then this is my guilt-offering and this the log of oil for it; but if not, let this be a freewill peace-offering'. And that guilt-offering must be slaughtered on the north side,[1] its blood must be applied upon the thumb and the great toe,[2] it requires the laying on of hands,[3] and drink-offerings,[3] and the waving of the breast and the thigh,[3] and it may be eaten by the males of the priesthood during that day and the following night [until midnight].[4] And[5] although the Master in

[the Tractate] 'The Slaughtering of Consecrated Animals'[6] has explained that 'R. Simeon permitted a man to bring an offering and make conditions about it in the first instance only where there was no other possible way of making the man fit,[7] but in all the other cases[8] he permitted it only where it had actually been done but not in the first instance', that distinction applies only to peace-offerings, since [the effect of the conditions expressed is] to reduce the time allowed for the eating,[9] and so consecrated food is rendered invalid [before its time]; but in the case of meal-offerings[10] he would permit it even in the first instance.

R. Papa said to Abaye, But according to R. Simeon who said that he may bring it the half in cakes and the half in wafers, he is then bringing one tenth out of two tenths and one log out of two logs![11] — [He replied,] We have heard R. Simeon express the view that if a man brought one tenth out of two tenths and one log out of two logs he has fulfilled his obligation.[12] But how does he take out the handful?[13] — He [takes one handful from the cakes and another from the wafers and] makes the following conditions and says. 'If I had specified [a meal-offering] of cakes only or of wafers only, then the handful I have taken from the cakes should serve the cakes and the handful I took from the wafers should serve the wafers;[14] but if I had specified [originally a meal-offering] the half in cakes and the half in wafers, then the handful I have taken from the cakes should serve half for the cakes and half for the wafers, and the handful I have taken from the wafers should also serve half for the wafers and half for the cakes'. But surely he must take one handful from the cakes

---

(1) Like the guilt-offering, which is a most holy offering.

(2) Like the guilt-offering of the leper.

(3) Like the peace-offering. The special rites peculiar to the guilt-offering as well as those peculiar to the peace-offering must be observed with this offering, as it is not known which it is.

(4) Like the guilt-offering.

(5) This sentence, as has already been pointed out by Sh. Mek., is an insertion of the Saboraim.

(6) This is the Talmudic title of Tractate Zebahim. V. Zeb. 76b.

(7) To eat consecrated meat; as in the case of the Nazirite who was in doubt as to his leprosy.

(8) As the case mentioned in Zeb. l.c. where a guilt-offering was confused with peace-offerings.

(9) Guilt-offerings may be eaten only on the day of the offering and the night following, whereas peace-offerings may be eaten during two days and one night. Where therefore a guilt-offering was confused with peace-offerings and each animal is taken and offered according to the restrictions of the two kinds of offerings, the flesh thereof would only be eaten during the shorter period and what was left over would be burnt perhaps unnecessarily.

(10) For all meal-offerings are alike in that they must be eaten the same day and the night following.

(11) For if this man's original vow was to bring a specified number of cakes and a specified number of wafers, his obligation would be, fulfilled only by combining the required number of cakes from the meal-offering of ten cakes with the required number of wafers from the meal-offering of ten wafers; and as each meal-offering consisted of one tenth of flour and one log of oil, he would thus be making up one offering from two offerings; and this is not allowed.

(12) I.e., if a man, in duty bound to bring one tenth of flour and one log of oil as a meal-offering, brought two tenths in separate vessels and two logs in separate vessels, and took the half from one and the half from the other, he has thereby fulfilled his obligation.

(13) From the meal-offering that is made up partly of cakes and partly of wafers, since in fact the cakes and the wafers are separate meal-offerings.

(14) One being in fulfilment of his vow and the other a freewill meal-offering.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 106a

and the wafers [mixed together].[1] whereas here he takes the handful from the cakes for the wafers and from the wafers for the cakes! — We have heard R. Simeon say that if when taking the handful there came into his hand only one of the two kinds he has fulfilled his obligation.[2] But what [is to be done] with the residue of the oil; for if he had originally specified [a meal-offering] the half in cakes and the half in wafers, the residue of the oil would be put into the cakes, but if he had originally

specified [a meal-offering of] wafers the residue of the oil would be consumed by the priests?[3] — The opinion of R. Simeon son of Judah is followed. For R. Simeon son of Judah said in the name of R. Simeon.[3] He anoints them[4] in the form of the Greek letter Chi,[5] and the residue of the oil is consumed by the priests.[6]

R. Kahana said to R. Ashi, But should not the doubt include also the meal-offering offered with the drink-offerings;[7] for Raba has said, A man may offer every day the meal-offerings of the drink-offerings [which accompany animal-offerings]? — The doubt includes only that meal-offering (mnemonic: individual, by itself, frankincense, log, handful) which is brought by an individual but not that[8] which is brought by the community. The doubt includes only that which is brought by itself but not that[8] which is brought to accompany the animal-offering. The doubt includes only that which requires frankincense but not that[8] which does not require frankincense. The doubt includes only that which requires but one log of oil but not that[8] which requires three logs. The doubt includes only that from which the handful is taken but not that[8] from which the handful is not taken.

[IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED A MEAL-OFFERING [OF A CERTAIN NUMBER] OF TENTHS'. Our Rabbis taught: [If a man said,] 'I specified a meal-offering of [a certain number of] tenths and I determined them for one vessel,[9] but I do not know what number I specified', he must bring a meal-offering of sixty tenths. This is the opinion of the Sages. But Rabbi says, He must bring meal-offerings of [every number of] tenths from one to sixty, that is, one thousand eight hundred and thirty [tenths].[10] [If he said,] 'I specified [a certain number of tenths of a certain kind] but I do not know what kind I specified or what number I specified', he must bring the five kinds of meal-offering each consisting of sixty tenths, that is, three hundred tenths. This is the opinion of the Sages. But Rabbi says, He must bring the five kinds of meal-offering, and of each kind every number of tenths from one to sixty, that is, nine thousand one hundred and fifty [tenths].[11]

What is the issue between them? — R. Hisda said, They differ as to whether or not it is permitted to bring unconsecrated food into the Sanctuary;[12] Rabbi holds that it is forbidden to bring unconsecrated food into the Sanctuary,[13] while the Sages hold that it is permitted.[14] Raba said. All hold that it is forbidden to bring unconsecrated food into the Sanctuary, but they differ as to whether or not it is permitted to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill-offering; the Sages holding that it is permitted to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill-offering,[15] while Rabbi holds that it is forbidden.

Abaye said to Rabba, According to the Sages who hold that it is permitted to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill- offering, should not two handfuls be taken therefrom?[16] — [He replied.] First one handful is taken and then another. But he would be taking the handful from the offering of obligation for the freewill-offering and from the freewill-offering for the offering of obligation! — He leaves it to the mind of the priest and says, 'What the priest's hand takes up the first time[17] shall be [the handful] for the offering of obligation, and what it takes up the second time[18] shall be for the freewill-offering.'

But how are [the handfuls] to be burnt? If he burns the handful of the freewill-offering first, then how may he thereafter burn the handful of the offering of obligation; perhaps the entire meal-offering was his offering of obligation, consequently the remainder [of the meal-offering] has diminished [between the taking of the handful[19] and the burning thereof].[20] and a Master has stated[21] that if the remainder had diminished between the taking of the handful and the burning thereof the handful may not be burnt on behalf of it? And if he burns the handful of the offering of obligation first, then how may he thereafter burn the handful of the freewill-offering;

---

(1) Where the meal-offering consists partly of cakes and partly of wafers the two kinds must be broken into pieces and mixed together and the handful taken from the mixture. V. supra 63b.

(2) Even though he took the handful from one kind in respect of the other kind.
(3) V. supra 75a.
(4) Sc. the wafers, in the offering consisting partly of cakes and partly of wafers.
(5) V. supra p. 445, n. 2.
(6) So that in either case the residue of oil is consumed by the priests.
(7) Accordingly where a man has forgotten the kind of meal-offering he offered he should because of the doubt also bring this meal-offering as a sixth kind.
(8) Sc. the meal-offering with the drink-offerings.
(9) V. supra p. 645, n. 3.
(10) This being the sum of the numbers from one to sixty.
(11) 1830 X 5 = 9150.
(12) But all agree that it is forbidden to mix together (i.e., bring in one vessel) the meal-offering that is brought as an obligation with the meal-offering that is brought as a freewill-offering.
(13) He therefore cannot bring sixty tenths in one vessel and declare that the quantity corresponding to the amount he specified shall be in fulfilment of his vow and the rest shall remain unconsecrated, since it is forbidden to bring unconsecrated food into the Sanctuary; neither can he say that the rest shall be a freewill-offering, since it is forbidden to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill-offering. The only solution, according to Rabbi, is to bring in sixty vessels meal-offerings of every number of tenths from one to sixty, and declare that the vessel which contains the quantity he specified shall be in fulfilment of his vow and all that which is in the other vessels shall be freewill-offerings.
(14) He therefore brings sixty tenths in one vessel and declares that what is over and above the amount he specified shall remain unconsecrated.
(15) He therefore brings sixty tenths in one vessel and declares that what is over and above the amount he specified shall be a freewill-offering.
(16) One for the offering of obligation and one for the freewill-offering.
(17) Lit., ‘now’.
(18) Lit., ‘at the end’.
(19) Sc. the first handful, which represents the offering of obligation.
(20) For one handful, that representing the freewill-offering, has already been burnt.
(21) Supra 8a, 9a.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 106b

perhaps the entire meal-offering was his offering of obligation, and any offering a portion of which had been put on the fire of the altar is subject to the prohibition ye shall not burn?[1] — R. Judah son of R. Simeon b. Pazzi replied, It[2] is burnt as wood, in accordance with a ruling of R. Eliezer. For it was taught: R. Eliezer says, [It is written,] They shall not come up for a sweet savour on the altar;[3] thus ‘for a sweet savour you may not bring it[4] up, but you may bring it up as wood.

R. Aha the son of Raba said to R. Ashi, Perhaps all hold that it is permitted to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill-offering, but they differ over R. Eliezer's ruling: the Sages accepting R. Eliezer's ruling[5] while Rabbi does not accept R. Eliezer's ruling![6] — He replied. If one could say that according to Rabbi it is permitted to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill-offering, and that Rabbi does not accept R. Eliezer's ruling, then he could bring sixty tenths in one vessel and one tenth in another vessel, bring the two into contact,[7] and take the handful from each.[8]

Raba said, All hold that it is permitted to mix the offering of obligation with the freewill-offering, moreover all accept R. Eliezer's ruling, but they differ on the same principles as those which underlie the dispute between R. Eliezer b. Jacob and the Rabbis. For we have learnt:[9] Even a meal-offering of sixty tenths required sixty logs [of oil]. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says. Even a meal-offering of sixty tenths required but one log [of oil], for it is written, For a meal-offering even a log of oil.[10] The Sages hold the same view as the Rabbis who[11] say that sixty logs are required for sixty tenths, one log for each tenth,[12] while Rabbi holds the same view as R. Eliezer b. Jacob who says that only one log is

required. and therefore[13] we do not know whether to regard [the sixty tenths] as one meal-offering for which one log is sufficient or as two meal-offerings for which two logs are necessary.

R. Ashi said, They differ in the case of [one who vowed to bring] a small animal and brought a large one. The Sages hold that [one who vowed to bring] a small animal and brought a large one has fulfilled his obligation.[14] while Rabbi holds that he has not fulfilled his obligation. But they have already differed in this matter, for we have learnt: [If he said] 'a small animal' and he brought a large one, he has fulfilled his obligation; but Rabbi says, He has not fulfilled his obligation![15] — Both disputes were necessary For if the dispute had only been stated here, I should have said that only here do the Sages say [that by bringing a larger offering he has fulfilled his obligation] since in either case[16] only one handful [is offered], but in the other case, since there are more sacrificial portions [in a larger animal]. I might say that they agree with Rabbi [that he has not thereby fulfilled his obligation]. And if the dispute had only been stated there, I should have said that only there does Rabbi say [that he has not fulfilled his obligation, since there are more sacrificial portions], but in this case I might say that he agrees with the Sages; therefore [both disputes] were necessary.

(Mnemonic: Wood, Gold, Wine, Burnt-offering, Thank-offering, Ox.)[17] MISHNAH. [IF A MAN SAID,] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER [PIECES OF] WOOD', HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN TWO LOGS. IF 'FRANKINCENSE', HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A HANDFUL. THE HANDFUL IS SPECIFIED IN FIVE CASES: IF A MAN SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO BRING FRANKINCENSE'. HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A HANDFUL. IF HE OFFERED A MEAL-OFFERING HE MUST BRING A HANDFUL OF FRANKINCENSE WITH IT. IF A MAN OFFERED UP THE HANDFUL OUTSIDE [THE TEMPLE COURT] HE IS LIABLE.[18] THE TWO DISHES [OF FRANKINCENSE][19] REQUIRE TWO HANDFULS.

[IF A MAN SAID.] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER GOLD', HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A GOLDEN DENAR;[20] IF SILVER', HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A SILVER DENAR; IF 'COPPER'. HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN [THE VALUE OF] A SILVER MA'AH.[20] [IF HE SAID.] 'I SPECIFIED [HOW MUCH I WOULD BRING] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT I SPECIFIED'. HE MUST BRING SO MUCH UNTIL HE SAYS. 'I CERTAINLY DID NOT INTEND TO GIVE SO MUCH!'

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: Offering:[21] this signifies that one may offer wood as a freewill-offering. And how much must it be? Two logs. For so it is written, And we cast lots for the offering of wood.[22] Rabbi says, The wood-offering is included under the term 'offering'. and therefore requires salt and also requires to be brought near [the altar].[23] Raba said, According to Rabbi's view the handful must be taken from the wood-offering.[24] R. Papa said, According to Rabbi's view the wood-offering requires other wood.[25]

IF 'FRANKINCENSE', HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A HANDFUL. How do we know this? — Because it is written, And he shall take up therefrom his handful of the fine flour of the meal-offering and of the oil thereof, and all the frankincense.[26] The frankincense is thus compared with the taking up of the meal-offering: as the taking up of the meal-offering was a handful so the frankincense must consist of a handful.

Our Rabbis taught: [If a man said,] 'I take upon myself [to bring an offering] for the altar', he must bring frankincense, for nothing is offered entirely upon the altar but frankincense. [If he said,] 'I specified an offering for the altar but I do not know what it was I specified', he must bring of everything that is offered entirely upon the altar.[27] Is there nothing else?[28] But what about the burnt-offering? — There is the skin thereof which belongs to the priests. And what about the burnt-offering of a bird? — There are

(1) Lev. II, 11. Once the prescribed portion of an offering has been duly offered upon the altar, the rest of that offering may not be burnt on the altar. How then may the second handful be burnt upon the altar?
(2) Sc. the second handful, that representing the freewill-offering.
(3) Lev. II, 12.
(4) Sc. the remainder of the offering from which a portion has been taken and already burnt.
(5) Accordingly sixty tenths are brought in one vessel, and when the second handful is about to be burnt, having already burnt the first handful, he declares, 'If this vessel also contains a freewill-offering then this handful is rightly being burnt on its behalf, but if the contents of the vessel are entirely the meal-offering of obligation then this handful is being burnt merely as wood and not as an offering.'
(6) He cannot therefore bring sixty tenths in one vessel, since he could not burn the second handful, for he might be transgressing the prohibition of ye shall not burn.
(7) I.e., he should bring the two vessels near to each other so that the flour of the one should actually mix with the flour of the other.
(8) Accordingly he would first take the handful from the larger vessel containing the sixty tenths, and declare, 'If I specified all these tenths for my meal-offering, then this is the handful for it; but if not, let this handful serve for the number of tenths specified for my meal-offering'. Then he would take the handful from the smaller vessel containing the single tenth and declare that it shall serve for the freewill meal-offering of the smaller vessel and also for the remaining tenths of the first vessel; and this would be quite in order, since the two vessels are in contact. As this solution is not put forward by Rabbi it must be that he is of the opinion that it is forbidden to mix in one vessel the meal-offering of obligation with the freewill-offering.
(9) Supra 88a.
(10) Lev. XIV, 21.
(11) In the cited Mishnah.
(12) He therefore brings sixty tenths with sixty logs and declares that as many tenths as make up his original vow, with the corresponding number of logs of oil, shall serve in fulfilment of his vow, and the remainder shall he a freewill meal-offering.
(13) If sixty tenths are brought in one vessel.
(14) And the same is the case where a man brings more tenths than he had vowed for his meal-offering.
(15) Supra 107b.
(16) Whether the meal-offering is large or small.
(17) A list of the six Mishnahs that follow (according to the division of the Mishnahs in the separate editions of the Mishnah) each commencing with the same formula: 'I take upon myself to offer .
(18) To the penalty of kareth (v. Glos.). This ruling is apparently in accord with R. Eliezer's view that liability is incurred only if the entire handful of the meal-offering is offered outside; v. Zeb. 109b. Tosaf, however suggest that the handful spoken of here is not the handful of flour of the meal-offering but one of the handfuls of the two dishes of frankincense, and the ruling here is intended to refute R. Eliezer's view who maintains (Zeb. 110a) that liability is incurred only if the two handfuls of the frankincense were offered outside. Accordingly the expression 'handful' in this connection does not exclude an olive's bulk but signifies anything less than the two handfuls. V. Tosaf. s.v. המעלה.
(19) That were set on the table with the Shewbread.
(20) V. Glos.
(21) Lev. II, 1.
(22) Neh. X, 35.
(23) Like the meal-offering it must be brought to the south-western corner of the altar.
(24) The wood must be cut up into small thin strips and a handful taken and burnt upon the altar.
(25) As with every offering wood from the Temple store is taken in order to burn this wood-offering.
(26) Lev. VI, 8.
(27) He must bring, therefore, an offering of frankincense, a burnt-offering of cattle, a burnt-offering of birds, a wine-offering, and the meal-offering that is offered with the drink-offerings, for all these can in a less strict sense be described as offered entirely upon the altar; v. infra. The fact that this man specified an offering for the altar, and did not merely say 'for the altar', which would have implied frankincense alone, proves that in this case 'for the altar' is to be interpreted less strictly and therefore includes the above offerings.
(28) That is offered entirely upon the altar.

the crop and the feathers.[1] And what about the drink-offerings? — They flow down into the pits.[1] And what about the meal-offering that is offered with the drink-offerings? — Since there is the ordinary meal-offering which is eaten by the priests. It is therefore not definite.[2]

[IF A MAN SAID,] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER GOLD', HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A GOLDEN DENAR. Perhaps he meant a bar [of gold]! — R. Eleazar said, [We must suppose that] he said [gold] coin. Perhaps he meant small gold coins! — R. Papa said, Small gold coin is not usually made.

IF 'SILVER', HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN A SILVER DENAR. Perhaps he meant a bar [of silver]! — R. Eleazar said, [We must suppose that] he said [silver] coin. Then perhaps he meant small silver coin! — R. Shesheth said, It must be that in this place small silver coin was not current.

IF 'COPPER', HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN THE VALUE OF A SILVER MA'AH. It was taught: R. Eliezer b. Jacob said, He must bring not less than a small copper hook. What is it fit for?[3] — Abaye said, With it one could trim the wicks and cleanse the lamps.

Of iron it was taught: Others say, He must bring not less than a 'scarecrow'.[4] And how much is that? — R. Joseph said, One cubit square. Some report it thus: He must bring not less than one cubit square. What is it fit for? — R. Joseph said, For a scarecrow.

MISHNAH. [IF A MAN SAID,] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER WINE', HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN THREE LOG.[5] IF 'OIL', HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN ONE LOG;[6] BUT RABBI SAYS, NOT LESS THAN THREE LOGS.[7] [IF HE SAID,] I SPECIFIED [HOW MUCH I WOULD OFFER] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT QUANTITY I SPECIFIED', HE MUST BRING THAT QUANTITY WHICH IS THE MOST THAT IS BROUGHT ON ANY ONE DAY.[8] GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: Home-born:[9] this teaches us that a man may offer wine as a freewill-offering. How much [must he bring]? Three logs. Whence do we know that if he desired to bring more he may do so? Because the text states, Shall be.[10] We might suppose that he may bring less, the text therefore states, After this manner.[9]

IF 'OIL'. HE MUST BRING NOT LESS THAN ONE LOG; BUT RABBI SAYS, NOT LESS THAN THREE LOGS. On what principle do they differ? — The scholars suggested to R. Papa. They differ as to whether we say, 'Deduce from it and again from it'. Or 'Deduce from it and establish it in its own place'.[11] The Rabbis[12] are of the opinion that we say, 'Deduce from it and again from it'. Thus ['deduce from it']: as one may offer a meal-offering as a freewill-offering, so one may offer oil; and 'again from it': as the meal-offering needs but one log [of oil], so the offering of oil needs but one log. Rabbi, however, is of the opinion that we say, 'Deduce from it and establish it in its own place'. Thus: as one may offer a meal-offering as a freewill-offering, so one may offer oil as a freewill-offering; and 'establish it in its own place': it shall be like the drink-offerings [of wine]: as the drink-offerings [of wine] require three logs, so the offering of oil requires three logs. Thereupon R. Papa said to them, If Rabbi derived it from the meal-offering [he would certainly have said that the minimum quantity was one log], for all are of the opinion that we say 'Deduce from it and again from it'. The fact is, however, that Rabbi derived it from the expression 'Home-born'.[13] R. Huna son of R. Nathan said to R. Papa. How can you say so?[14] Behold it has been taught: Offering:[15] this teaches us that a man may offer oil as a freewilloffering. And how much [must he bring]? Three logs. Now whom have you heard say, Three logs. It is only Rabbi; and yet he derives it from the expression 'offering'! — He replied, If it was taught, it was taught.[16]

[IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED [HOW MUCH I WOULD OFFER] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT QUANTITY I SPECIFIED', HE MUST BRING THAT QUANTITY WHICH IS THE MOST THAT IS BROUGHT ON ANY ONE DAY. A Tanna taught: Like the first day of the Feast [of Tabernacles] when it falls on a Sabbath.[17]

MISHNAH. [IF A MAN SAID,] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER A BURNT-OFFERING,[18] HE MUST BRING A LAMB.[19] R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH SAID, [HE MAY BRING] A TURTLE-DOVE OR A YOUNG PIGEON. [IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED A BEAST OF THE HERD[20] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT IT WAS I SPECIFIED', HE MUST BRING A BULL AND A BULL CALF. [IF HE SAID, 'I SPECIFIED] A BEAST OF THE CATTLE[21] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT IT WAS I SPECIFIED', HE MUST BRING A BULL, A BULL CALF, A RAM, A HE-GOAT, A HE-KID. AND A HE-LAMB. [IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED [SOME KIND] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT IT WAS I SPECIFIED',

---

(1) For notes v. supra p. 443. nn. 6 and 7.

(2) To say that the meal-offering is an offering entirely for the altar.

(3) In the Temple.

(4) Lit., 'keeping off the ravens'. An iron sheet studded with spikes that was placed on the Temple roof to prevent birds perching there. V. Mid. IV, 6. According to Aruch: an iron figure placed on the roof to scare the birds away. V. Tosaf. s.v. כליה.

(5) This being the smallest quantity of wine prescribed in the drink-offerings that accompanied the animal-offering. viz., three logs for a lamb.

(6) The minimum quantity of oil prescribed for a meal-offering.

(7) This being the minimum prescribed in meal-offerings that are offered with the drink-offerings.

(8) V: Gemara.

(9) Num. XV, 13; stated with reference to the drink-offerings.

(10) Ibid. 15.

(11) V. supra p. 368, n. 1.

(12) The first Tanna of our Mishnah.

(13) Ibid. 13. And just as it was deduced from this expression that wine may be offered by itself as a freewill-offering. Rabbi also derives therefrom that oil may similarly be offered as a freewill-offering. Accordingly wine and oil are to be on a par, and as wine requires a minimum of three logs so it is with oil too.

(14) That Rabbi derives the rule that oil may be offered as a freewill-offering from the drink-offerings and not from the meal-offering.

(15) Lev. II, 1; stated with reference to the freewill meal-offering.

(16) 'I admit then that I am wrong.'

(17) On this day were offered thirteen bullocks, two rams, and eighteen lambs, v. Num. XXIX, 12ff; and as for each bullock were required six logs of wine and of oil, for each ram four logs; and for each lamb three logs, the total number of logs of wine, and similarly of oil, offered on this day was 140.

(18) Which must be a male animal.

(19) This is the least expensive animal that can be offered as a burnt-offering.

(20) בקר

(21) בהמה.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 107b

HE MUST ADD TO THESE A TURTLE-DOVE AND A YOUNG PIGEON.

[IF A MAN SAID,] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER A THANK-OFFERING OR A PEACE-OFFERING',[1] HE MUST BRING A LAMB.[IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED A BEAST OF THE HERD BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT IT WAS I SPECIFIED', HE MUST BRING A BULL AND A COW, A BULL CALF AND A HEIFER. [IF HE SAID, I SPECIFIED] A BEAST OF THE

CATTLE BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT IT WAS I SPECIFIED', HE MUST BRING A BULL AND A COW, A BULL CALF AND A HEIFER. A RAM AND A EWE, A HE-GOAT AND A SHE-GOAT, A HE-KID AND A SHE-KID, A HE-LAMB AND A EWE-LAMB.

[IF A MAN SAID,] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER AN OX. HE MUST BRING ONE WITH ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS TO THE VALUE OF A MANEH;[2] IF 'A CALF', HE MUST BRING ONE WITH ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS TO THE VALUE OF FIVE SELA'S; IF 'A RAM', HE MUST BRING ONE WITH ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS TO THE VALUE OF TWO SELA'S;[2] IF 'A LAMB', HE MUST BRING ONE WITH ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS TO THE VALUE OF ONE SELA'. IF HE SAID 'AN OX VALUED AT ONE MANEH', HE MUST BRING ONE WORTH A MANEH APART FROM ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS; IF A CALF VALUED AT FIVE SELA'S'. HE MUST BRING ONE WORTH FIVE SELA'S APART FROM ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS; IF 'A RAM VALUED AT TWO SELA'S', HE MUST BRING ONE WORTH TWO SELA'S APART FROM ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS; AND IF A LAMB VALUED AT ONE SELA',' HE MUST BRING ONE WORTH ONE SELA' APART FROM ITS DRINK-OFFERINGS. [IF HE SAID, 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER] AN OX VALUED AT A MANEH', AND HE BROUGHT TWO TOGETHER WORTH A MANEH, HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. EVEN IF ONE WAS WORTH A MANEH LESS ONE DENAR AND THE OTHER ALSO WAS WORTH A MANEH LESS ONE DENAR. [IF HE SAID] 'A BLACK ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A WHITE ONE, OR A WHITE ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A BLACK ONE, OR 'A LARGE ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A SMALL ONE, HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. [IF HE SAID] 'A SMALL ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A LARGE ONE, HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION; BUT RABBI SAYS, HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION.

GEMARA. They[3] do not differ, for each rules according to the custom of his place.[4]

Our Rabbis taught: [If a man said,] 'I take upon myself to offer a burnt-offering valued at a sela' for the altar', he must bring a lamb, for there is nothing else valued at a sela' offered upon the altar save a lamb. [If he said,] 'I specified [an offering valued at a sela'] but I do not know what it was I specified', he must bring every kind of offering valued at a sela' that is offered upon the altar.[5]

[IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED A BEAST OF THE HERD BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT IT WAS I SPECIFIED', HE MUST BRING A BULL AND A BULL CALF. But why? Let him bring a bull, for in any event [that should fulfil his obligation]![6] — This represents Rabbi's view, who maintains that [if a man offered to bring] a small animal and he brought a large one he has not fulfilled his obligation. If it is Rabbi's view here, then read the following clauses: [IF HE SAID, I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER] AN OX VALUED AT A MANEH', AND HE BROUGHT TWO TOGETHER WORTH A MANEH, HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. EVEN IF ONE WAS WORTH A MANEH LESS ONE DENAR AND THE OTHER ALSO WAS WORTH A MANEH LESS ONE DENAR. [IF HE SAID] 'A BLACK ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A WHITE ONE, OR 'A WHITE ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A BLACK ONE, OR 'A LARGE ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A SMALL ONE, HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. [IF HE SAID] 'A SMALL ONE' AND HE BROUGHT A LARGE ONE, HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION; BUT RABBI SAYS, HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. It will then be that the first and last clauses represent Rabbi's view while the middle clauses represent the view of the Rabbis! — That is so, the first and last clauses represent Rabbi's view while the middle clauses represent the view of the Rabbis; and [the Tanna of the Mishnah] wished to tell us that this ruling [in the first part of the Mishnah] is really a matter of dispute between Rabbi and the Rabbis.[7]

We have learnt elsewhere:[8] There were six [money chests] for freewill-offerings.[9] What did they represent?[10] (Mnemonic: K.N.Z.P.Sh.'A.)[11] — Hezekiah said, They represented the six priestly groups;[12] and the Sages installed [six money chests] so that they should be at peace with each

other.[13] R. Johanan said, Because of the abundant offerings [the Sages] installed [six] money chests so that the money became not mouldy.[14] Ze'iri said, They served for the offerings of a bull, a calf, a ram, a lamb, a kid and a goat;[15] this[16] being in accord with Rabbi who said that if a man offered to bring a small animal and he brought a large one he has not fulfilled his obligation. Bar Padda said, They served for the moneys of] bullocks,[17] rams,[18]

---

(1) Which may be either a male or female animal.

(2) One maneh =25 sela's; one sela' = 4 denars. The prices mentioned for the various beasts are traditional, though there is a Biblical indication that the ram was to be worth two sela's in Lev. V, 15.

(3) R. Eleazar b. Azariah and the first Tanna.

(4) Both agree that the cheapest should be offered, but in the place where the first Tanna lived lambs were cheaper than pigeons, whereas in the town where R. Eleazar b. Azariah lived the reverse was the case.

(5) The fact that this man specified the offering and did not merely say 'an offering valued at a sela' for the altar' proves that he believed that others besides a lamb were included in the last expression. He must therefore bring a lamb, a meal-offering, and frankincense, each valued at a sela'.

(6) For even if he offered to bring a bull calf, the offering of a bull which is larger would surely fulfil his obligation!

(7) According to the Sages the offering of a bull alone in the first clause would suffice.

(8) Shek. VI, 5. V. supra 104a.

(9) There were in all thirteen money chests (שופרות, horn-shaped chests) in the Temple, seven bearing inscriptions indicating the kind of money that was to be put in them, while six were allocated for money for freewill-offerings. These were offered as burnt-offerings on behalf of the community and the skins fell to the priests.

(10) Why were six necessary for the purpose?

(11) So Sh. Mek. and Dik. Sof. a.l. These are the characteristic letters of the teachers who propose answers to this question.

(12) The priests were divided into twenty-four divisions (משמרות), each division serving in the Temple for one full week every half year. The division was sub-divided into six families or groups (בתי אבות). and each group was in service on one day in the week. On the Sabbath the whole division was called upon to do the service.

(13) For each priestly group there was a separate money chest for freewill-offering; so that whenever the altar was idle and the occasion thus arose for offering burnt-offerings, the money would be taken from that chest allotted to the group in service on that day, and the skins of the animals offered would be shared among the priests of that group. In this way altercation and strife between the priestly groups would be avoided.

(14) Which would be the case if all the money were to be placed in one chest.

(15) The money for these offerings was put into separate chests. E.g., if a man undertook to offer a bull for a burnt-offering, he would bring a maneh (this being the price of a bull, v. our Mishnah) and put it into the chest that bore the inscription 'bull'; the priests would then come and take the money from that chest, purchase a bull, and offer it.

(16) The need for six chests.

(17) If a bullock which had been set aside for a sin-offering of the community had been lost and another had been offered in its place, and afterwards it was found, it was left to pasture until it contracted a physical blemish when it was sold. The money so obtained was put into a chest specially set aside for this purpose.

(18) The money obtained on selling the ram of the guilt-offering for theft of for sacrilege when it was no longer required for that purpose (as in the circumstances described in the prec. n.) was put into a second chest.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 108a

lambs,[1] goats,[2] surplus moneys,[3] and the ma'ah.[4] They all do not agree with Hezekiah's answer, because there is no reason to apprehend any strife, since each [priestly group] served on its own day.[5] Neither do they agree with R. Johanan's answer, because there is no fear of the money becoming mouldy. Nor do they agree with Ze'iri's answer, because they do not wish to interpret it in accordance with the view of an individual.[6] Nor do they agree with Bar Padda's answer, [for why have a separate chest for] surplus moneys? Were not all the other moneys surplus moneys?[7] Moreover the ma'ahs went in the shekel [chamber]![8] For it was taught: Where did the surcharge go? Into the shekel [chamber]. So R. Meir. R. Eleazar says, Into the freewill-offering [chests]. Samuel

said, They served for the surplus[9] of the sin-offering, the surplus of the guilt-offering,[10] the surplus of the guilt-offering of the Nazirite, the surplus of the guilt-offering of the leper,[11] the surplus of the sinner's meal-offering,[12] and the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering.[13] R. Oshaia said, They served for the surplus of the sin-offering, the surplus of the guilt-offering, the surplus of the guilt-offering of the Nazirite, the surplus of the guilt-offering of the leper, the surplus of the bird-offerings, and the surplus of the sinner's meal-offering.[14] Why does not Samuel accept R. Oshaia's answer? — Bird-offerings have already been stated.[15] [Can it then be suggested that] R. Oshaia learnt that Mishnah and did not include bird-offerings? But we know that R. Oshaia learnt it and included bird-offerings! — One [chest] was for [the money for] the bird-offerings[16] and the other for the surplus money of the bird-offerings. And why does not R. Oshaia accept Samuel's answer? — Because he agrees with him who says that the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering must be left to rot. For it was taught: The surplus of the meal-offering was for freewill-offerings, and the surplus of the meal-offering was left to rot. What does this mean? — R. Hisda said, It means this: The surplus of the sinner's meal-offering was for freewill-offerings, and the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering was left to rot. Rabbah said, Even the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering was for freewill-offerings, but [the Baraitha teaches that] the surplus of the cakes of the thank-offering was left to rot.

There is also the following dispute [on the matter]: As for the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering. R. Johanan said, It was to go for freewill-offerings. R. Eleazar said, It was to be left to rot. An objection was raised: [We have learnt:] The surplus of [money set aside for] shekels is free for common use, but the surplus of [money set aside for] the tenth of an ephah, and the surplus of [money set aside for] the bird-offerings of men who had an issue, for the bird-offerings of women who had an issue, for the bird-offerings of women after childbirth, or for sin-offerings or guilt-offerings-their surplus is for freewill-offerings.[17] This refers, does it not, to the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering? — No, it refers to the surplus of the sinner's meal-offering.[18]

R. Nahman b. R. Isaac said, The most reasonable view is that of him who holds that the surplus of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering was left to rot. For it was taught: [It is written,] He shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put any frankincense thereon; for it is a sin-offering.[19] R. Judah said, 'It' is called a sin-offering, but no other[20] is called a sin-offering; this teaches us that the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering is not called a sin-offering and that it requires frankincense. Now since it is not called a sin-offering the surplus thereof must be left to rot.

MISHNAH. [IF A MAN SAID,] 'THIS OX SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING', AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH,[21] HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING TWO WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. [IF HE SAID,] 'THESE TWO OXEN SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING', AND THEY SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING ONE OX WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. BUT RABBI FORBIDS IT.[22] [IF HE SAID,] 'THIS RAM SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING, AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING A LAMB WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. [IF HE SAID,] 'THIS LAMB SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING'. AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING A RAM WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. BUT RABBI FORBIDS IT.

---

(1) The money obtained for the lamb which had originally been set aside for the guilt-offering of a Nazirite or of a leper was put into a third chest and not confused with the money obtained from the guilt-offerings that was placed in the second chest, for the latter guilt-offerings were brought in order to obtain atonement whilst the former were brought in order to render the person fit.

(2) Sc. the he-goats offered as sin-offerings on behalf of the community on the Festivals. The money obtained for these

he-goats (in the circumstances described supra n. 1) was put into a fourth chest.
(3) Where a sum of money had been set aside for any of the offerings mentioned and the price of animals fell, the surplus money was put into a fifth chest set there for this purpose.
(4) A small silver coin, equal to the sixth part of a zuz or denar. This was the amount of surcharge (Heb. קולבון) which every Israelite had to add to his annual half-shekel contribution to the Temple as compensation to the Temple treasury for any loss incurred in exchanging the half-shekels into other coinage. These ma'ahs were put into a sixth chest and the money was expended on free-will burnt-offerings on behalf of the community.
(5) Hence one chest would have sufficed. And if on any day the altar was idle the priests serving on that day would draw money from the chest for burnt-offerings and benefit from the skins. This could equally happen to any priestly group on any day, so that there are no grounds for quarrels.
(6) Sc. Rabbi. According to the Sages the money for all offerings could be put into one chest and the priests would spend it on bullocks for burnt-offerings.
(7) V. supra nn. 1 to 4. All these come under the heading of surplus money.
(8) In accordance with the view of R. Meir, and not into the chest of freewill-offerings.
(9) Arising when money had been set aside for a particular offering and the price thereof fell.
(10) Sc. the guilt-offering for theft and the guilt-offering for sacrilege. These required a separate chest and could not be mixed with the moneys of other guilt-offerings, for the former were rams brought for atonement whilst the latter were lambs brought in order to render the person fit.
(11) The surplus money of the guilt-offering of the leper could not be mixed with that of the guilt-offering of the Nazirite, for the offering rites of the former differed greatly from the latter. The former offering required the application of its blood on the right thumb and right great toe of the leper whereas the latter did not; the former required drink-offerings whereas the latter did not, moreover the former rendered the leper clean to enter the camp, whereas the latter rendered the Nazirite fit to resume his Nazirite vow.
(12) This was exceptional, for the surplus of all other meal-offerings was used by the offerer for another meal-offering and was not used for communal freewill-offerings.
(13) Which the High Priest offered daily, half of it in the morning and half in the evening; v. Lev. VI, 13.
(14) V. Supra 104a.
(15) Among the seven chests reserved for special purposes was one whereon was inscribed 'Bird-offerings'. V. Shek. VI, 5.
(16) Into this chest those who but needed an offering for the completion of their purification put their money for bird-offerings, and when evening came they could eat consecrated food, resting assured that the priests had of a certainty offered their bird-offerings during the day.
(17) Shek. II,5.
(18) Which was also a tenth of an ephah of fine flour.
(19) Lev. V, 11 referring to the sinner's meal-offering.
(20) Sc. the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest's meal-offering.
(21) It is no more fit for sacrifice but it must be sold and another burnt-offering brought with the price thereof.
(22) In the first instance; if, however, he did bring two, even Rabbi agrees that it is valid.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 108b

GEMARA. But have you not stated in the earlier [Mishnah]: [If a man said, 'I take upon myself to offer] an ox valued at a maneh', and he brought two together worth a maneh, he has not fulfilled his obligation? — It is different here where he said 'THIS OX', and it suffered a blemish.[1]

[IF HE SAID,] 'THESE TWO OXEN SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING, AND THEY SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING ONE OX WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. BUT RABBI FORBIDS IT. Why?[2] — Because it is like the case where he vowed a large animal and he brought a small one.[3] For even though they have suffered a blemish.[4] Rabbi does not permit it in the first instance. Should he not then differ in the first case too?[5] — Rabbi indeed disagrees with the whole teaching, but he waited until the Rabbis had stated their view in full and then expressed his dissent. This can also be proved, for [the Mishnah] states: [IF HE SAID,] 'THIS

RAM SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING', AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING A LAMB WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. [IF HE SAID,] 'THIS LAMB SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING', AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING A RAM WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. BUT RABBI FORBIDS IT. This proves it.[6]

The question was raised: What is the rule where a different kind is brought for the original kind?[7] — Come and hear: [If a man said,] 'This ox shall be a burnt-offering', and it suffered a blemish, he may not bring a ram with the price thereof, but he may bring two rams with the price thereof. But Rabbi forbids it, for one may not mix them.[8] This proves it.[9] But if that is the case, why two [rams]? [They should also permit him to bring] one, since according to the view of the Rabbis, where the original offering suffered a blemish,[10] it makes no difference whether a large or a small animal [is brought with the price thereof]! — Two Tannaim differ as to the view of the Rabbis.[11]

'Rabbi forbids it, for one may not mix them'. Now the reason [for Rabbi's view] is that one may not mix them, but if one were allowed to mix them it would be permitted;[12] but we have learnt: [IF HE SAID,] 'THIS RAM SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING', AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING A LAMB WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. [IF HE SAID,] 'THIS LAMB SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING', AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING A RAM WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. BUT RABBI FORBIDS IT.[13] — Two Tannaim differ as to the view of Rabbi.[14] As for unblemished animals,[15] [if a man vowed] a calf and he brought a bullock, or a lamb and he brought a ram, he has fulfilled his obligation. This is an anonymous teaching in accord with the view of the Rabbis.

HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING TWO WITH THE PRICE THEREOF etc. R. Menashya b. Zebid said in the name of Rab, This rule[16] applies only where the man said, 'This ox shall be a burnt-offering';[17] but if he said, 'I take upon myself that this ox shall be a burnt-offering', there is a definite obligation.[18] Perhaps he only meant: 'I take upon myself to bring [this ox]'![19] — The fact is that if such a statement was at all made it was made in these terms: R. Menashya b. Zebid said in the name of Rab, This rule[20] applies only where the man said, 'This ox shall be a burnt-offering'. or where he said, 'I take upon myself that this ox shall be a burnt-offering'; but if he said, 'I take upon myself that this ox or its value[21] shall be a burnt-offering', there is a definite obligation.[22]

MISHNAH. IF A MAN SAID, 'ONE OF MY LAMBS SHALL BE HOLY', OR 'ONE OF MY OXEN SHALL BE HOLY', AND HE HAD TWO ONLY, THE LARGER ONE IS HOLY. IF HE HAD THREE, THE MIDDLE ONE IS HOLY. [IF HE SAID,] 'I SPECIFIED ONE BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHICH IT WAS I SPECIFIED', OR [IF HE SAID,] 'MY FATHER TOLD ME[23] [THAT HE HAD SPECIFIED ONE] BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHICH IT IS', THE LARGEST ONE AMONG THEM MUST BE HOLY.

GEMARA. [THE LARGER ONE IS HOLY.] We thus see that he that sanctifies sanctifies in a liberal spirit. Now turn to the next clause: THE MIDDLE ONE IS HOLY, which shows that he that sanctifies sanctifies in an illiberal spirit! — Samuel said, It means that we must take into account the possibility of the middle one also [being holy], for that shows a liberal spirit as compared with the smallest.[24] What then should [this man] do?[25] — Hiyya[26] b. Rab said, He must wait until the middle one suffers a blemish and then transfer its sanctity to the largest one.[27]

R. Nahman said in the name of Rabbah b. Abbuha, This[28] applies only where a man said, 'One of my oxen shall be holy'. but if he said, 'An ox among my oxen shall be holy', then the largest among them is holy, for he meant thereby: the [finest] ox among my oxen.[29] But surely this is not right, for R. Huna b. Hiyya said in the name of 'Ulla, If a man said to his fellow, 'I sell you a house among my houses', he may show him an attic ['aliyyah]![30] Is it not because this expression implies the worst?[31]

— No; [‘aliyyah means] the finest of his houses.[32]

An objection was raised: If a man said, ‘An ox among my oxen shall be holy’, and so, too, if an ox belonging to the Sanctuary was confused with other [unconsecrated oxen], the largest one among them must be holy, and all the others must be sold to be used for burnt-offerings,[33] but the price thereof is free for common use? — This[34] refers only to the case where an ox belonging to the Sanctuary was confused with others.[35] But it says here ‘and so too’! — That refers only to the ruling that the largest one [must be holy].

A further objection was raised: If a man said, ‘I sell you a house among my houses’, and one [of his houses] fell down, he may show him the fallen house;[36] or if he said, ‘I sell you a slave among my slaves’, and one [of his slaves] died, he may show him the dead slave.

---

(1) Since he specified the ox, as soon as it became unfit for sacrifice the obligation of his vow has come to an end, and he is not bound to replace it by another; accordingly when it is sold and another offering brought with the price thereof it need not be quite the same as the original offering.

(2) Why does Rabbi forbid it?

(3) For generally speaking two oxen, even though together only equal in price to one, are more profitable than one.

(4) So that the obligation of this man's vow has come to an end.

(5) Sc. the first clause of our Mishnah which reads: [IF A MAN SAID,] ‘THIS OX SHALL BE A BURNT-OFFERING’, AND IT SUFFERED A BLEMISH, HE MAY, IF HE SO DESIRES, BRING TWO WITH THE PRICE THEREOF. According to Rabbi this, too, should be forbidden, for it is like the case where a man vowed a small animal and he brought a large one.

(6) For the last clause of the Mishnah, viz., the offering of a ram with the price of the blemished lamb, is on all fours with the first clause, viz., the offering of two oxen with the price of the blemished one; and as Rabbi expressly differs with the Rabbis in the last clause, he obviously differs with them in the first clause too.

(7) Where, e.g., an ox which had been assigned for an offering had suffered a blemish, may one bring rams with the price of the blemished ox or not?

(8) Sc. the two meal-offerings which must accompany the two rams. Each meal-offering must be brought in a separate vessel, accordingly the present offering with its two meal-offerings is quite different from the original offering which required but one meal-offering.

(9) That one may bring a different kind (rams) with the price of the original blemished animal (the ox).

(10) And the obligation of this man's vow has then come to an end.

(11) And one Tanna is of the opinion that even according to the Rabbis it is forbidden in the first instance to bring a smaller animal with the price of the larger blemished animal.

(12) To bring a different kind of animal for an offering with the price of the blemished animal.

(13) Notwithstanding that the present offering and the original offering are alike in that each requires but one meal-offering.

(14) One Tanna maintains that Rabbi insists only upon the present and the original offering being alike in the number of vessels required for the accompanying meal-offering; but the other Tanna holds that Rabbi insists upon the animals being identical.

(15) Lit., ‘clean animals’. This is a continuation of the Baraitha quoted above in answer to the question that was raised.

(16) That with the price of the blemished ox he may bring two.

(17) For in truth the obligation of this man's vow came to an end when the ox suffered a blemish.

(18) To bring one burnt-offering. The use of the expression ‘I take upon myself’ imposes an obligation upon the man to bring the offering according to the terms of his vow which was here one burnt- offering and not two.

(19) With the emphasis upon ‘this’. Therefore if the ox became unfit that discharges his vow.

(20) That with the price of the blemished ox he may bring two.

(21) I.e., if the ox suffers a blemish and is sold.

(22) V. p. 668, n. 8.

(23) Before he died.

(24) Thus both the largest animal and the middle one might be the one that was sanctified, for each can be regarded as a

liberal offering as compared with the smallest animal.

(25) In order to be allowed to use one of these two animals.

(26) So according to MSS. and Sh. Mek. Cur. edd. read: R. Hiyya.

(27) So that now the largest animal is the holy one without any shadow of doubt, for it was either holy in the first place or it has now become holy; on the other hand the middle one is now free for common use.

(28) That we must consider the possibility of the middle one also being holy.

(29) For so is the superlative degree expressed in Hebrew; cf. שיר השירים 'the song of songs', the finest song, קדש הקדשים, the holy of holies', the most holy.

(30) As the subject matter of the sale. Heb. עלייה, 'an upper room, an attic'.

(31) Similarly the expression 'an ox among my oxen would imply the smallest animal, contrary to R Nahman.

(32) The word עלייה is here taken in the sense of 'the finest', 'the most distinguished'.

(33) For we take into account the possibility of any one of the others being the holy one, thus contrary to R. Nahman who ruled that the expression an ox among my oxen' definitely indicates the largest one.

(34) The ruling that all must be sold for burnt-offerings.

(35) But where a man said, 'An ox among my oxen shall be holy', there is no doubt at all that no other than the largest one was intended.

(36) As the one that was sold.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 109a

But why? Let us rather see which [house] it was that fell down, or which [slave] it was that died![1] — You are speaking, are you not, of a purchaser? But it is quite a different matter in the case of a purchaser, for the holder of a deed is always at a disadvantage.[2] And now that you have arrived at this answer, you may even say that 'aliyyah[3] [means the attic, and] the worst [room was meant], for the reason that the holder of a deed is always at a disadvantage.

MISHNAH. [IF A MAN SAID,] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER A BURNT-OFFERING, HE MUST OFFER IT IN THE TEMPLE;[4] AND IF HE OFFERED IT IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS,[5] HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. [IF HE SAID,] 'I TAKE UPON MYSELF TO OFFER A BURNT-OFFERING BUT I WILL OFFER IT IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS'. HE MUST OFFER IT IN THE TEMPLE,[6] YET IF HE OFFERED IT IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. R. SIMEON SAYS, SUCH IS NO BURNT-OFFERING. [IF A MAN SAID.] 'I WILL BE A NAZIRITE'. HE MUST BRING HIS OFFERINGS[7] IN THE TEMPLE; AND IF HE BROUGHT THEM IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS HE HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. [IF HE SAID,] I WILL BE A NAZIRITE BUT I WILL BRING MY OFFERINGS IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS'. HE MUST BRING THEM IN THE TEMPLE, YET IF HE BROUGHT THEM IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. R. SIMEON SAYS, SUCH A ONE IS NOT A NAZIRITE.

GEMARA. [YET IF HE OFFERED IT IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS] HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. But he has only killed the offering [and not sacrificed it]![8] — R. Hamnuna answered, It is regarded as though he said, 'I take upon myself to offer a burnt-offering on the condition that I shall not be held responsible for it.[9] Whereupon Raba said to him, In that case will you also say the same of the final clause which reads: [IF HE SAID,] 'I WILL BE A NAZIRITE BUT I WILL BRING MY OFFERINGS IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS, HE MUST BRING THEM IN THE TEMPLE, YET IF HE BROUGHT THEM IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION, namely, that it is regarded as though he said, 'I will be a Nazirite on the condition that I shall not be held responsible for the offerings'? But surely a Nazirite is not released [from his vow] until he has brought his offerings! — The fact is, said Raba, that this man merely intended to offer a gift[10] [to God], saying to himself, 'If the Temple of Onias can serve my purpose, I will take the trouble [and offer it there]; but further than that[11] I cannot put myself out'. And with regard to the Nazirite vow, too, this man merely intended to exercise self-denial,[12] saying

to himself, 'If the Temple of Onias can serve my purpose, I will take the trouble [and bring the offerings there]; but further than that I cannot put myself out'. R. Hamnuna, however, says, With regard to the Nazirite it is as you say, but in the case of the burnt-offering his vow was intended to imply: 'I will not be held responsible for it'.[13]

R. Johanan is also of the same opinion as R. Hamnuna; for Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan, [If a man said,] 'I take upon myself to offer a burnt-offering but I will offer it in the Temple of Onias', and he offered it in the Land of Israel,[14] he has fulfilled his obligation but he has incurred the penalty of kareth.[15] There has also been taught [a Baraitha] to the same effect: [If a man said,] 'I take upon myself to offer a burnt-offering but I will offer it in the wilderness',[16] and he offered it beyond the Jordan,[14] he has fulfilled his obligation but he has incurred the penalty of kareth.

MISHNAH. THE PRIESTS WHO MINISTERED IN THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS MAY NOT MINISTER IN THE TEMPLE IN JERUSALEM; AND NEEDLESS TO SAY [THIS IS SO OF PRIESTS WHO MINISTERED TO] ANOTHER MATTER;[17] FOR IT IS WRITTEN, NEVERTHELESS THE PRIESTS OF THE HIGH PLACES CAME NOT UP TO THE ALTAR OF THE LORD IN JERUSALEM. BUT THEY DID EAT UNLEAVENED BREAD AMONG THEIR BRETHREN.[18] THUS THEY ARE LIKE THOSE THAT HAD A BLEMISH:[19] THEY ARE ENTITLED TO SHARE AND EAT [OF THE HOLY THINGS]. BUT THEY ARE NOT PERMITTED TO OFFER SACRIFICES.

GEMARA. Rab Judah said, If a priest had slaughtered an animal to an idol,[20] his offering [in the Temple] is a sweet savour. R. Isaac b. Abdimi said, Where is there Scriptural proof for this? It is written, Because they ministered unto them before their idols, and became a stumblingblock of iniquity unto the house of Israel; therefore have I lifted up My hand against them, saith the Lord God, and they shall bear their iniquity,[21] and immediately afterwards it is written, And they shall not come near unto Me, to minister unto Me in the priest's office.[22] Thus only if they performed service [unto idols are they disqualified], but slaughtering is no service.[23]

It was stated: [If a priest had] inadvertently sprinkled blood[24] [to an idol]. R. Nahman says, His offering [in the Temple][25] is a sweet savour; but R. Shesheth says, His offering is not a sweet savour. R. Shesheth said, Whence do I derive my view? It is written, 'And became a stumblingblock of iniquity unto the house of Israel'. Now this surely means either through stumbling or through iniquity; and 'stumblingblock' signifies an inadvertent act, and 'iniquity' a deliberate act![26] R. Nahman, however, says, It means a stumblingblock of iniquity.[27] R. Nahman said, Whence do I derive my view? From the following Baraitha which was taught: It is written, And the priest shall make atonement for the soul that erreth, when he sinneth in error:[28] this teaches us that the priest may make atonement for himself by his own sacrifice. Now how [did he minister unto the idol]? Will you say, by slaughtering before it? Then why does the verse speak of sinning in error? It is the same even though he sinned deliberately![29] It can only be that he ministered unto the idol by sprinkling before it.[30] R. Shesheth, however, can say. I still say by slaughtering before it, but it is not the same if he did so deliberately for he then became a priest to the idol.[31]

They[32] have indeed followed up these principles of theirs, for it has been stated: If a priest had deliberately slaughtered [an animal to an idol]. R. Nahman said, His offering [in the Temple] is a sweet savour; but R. Shesheth said, His offering is not a sweet savour. 'R. Nahman said, His offering is a sweet savour — for he had not performed a service [before the idol].[33] 'R. Shesheth said, His offering is not a sweet savour' —

---

(1) And if it was the best house that fell down or the best slave that died, only then should the purchaser suffer the loss, but not if it was not the best, for according to R. Nahman the terms of the transaction implied that the best was being

sold.
(2) It is for the purchaser who has the deed of sale in his possession to prove that nothing but the best was the subject of the sale, otherwise it will be assumed that the worst was sold. With regard to offerings for the altar, however, it will always be assumed that the best was intended.
(3) In the case stated by R. Huna b. Hiyya in the name of ‘Ulla, supra p. 670.
(4) At Jerusalem.
(5) The Temple erected in the neighbourhood of Heliopolis in Egypt by Onias IV. who had fled from Palestine 164 B.C.E. It was modelled on the Temple in Jerusalem, and the regular system of sacrifices was established there. It was despoiled and suppressed by the Emperor Vespasian about the same time as the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple; v. Josephus Antiquities. XIII, 3ff.
(6) For by his opening words ‘I take upon myself to offer a burnt-offering’ there rests upon him an obligation to bring a burnt-offering.
(7) Lit., ‘he must shave’. This expression is used throughout for the offerings which the Nazirite brings on the completion of his vow when he shaves ‘his consecrated head’. V. Num. VI. 18.
(8) For what is slaughtered outside the Temple is not regarded as the sacrifice of the offering, consequently apart from the liability that is incurred for slaughtering outside the Temple he does not thereby fulfil the obligation of his vow.
(9) Since the Temple of Onias is not different from any other place outside the Temple, his saying ‘I will offer it in the Temple of Onias’ clearly implied that wherever the animal was slaughtered that was the fulfilment of his obligation. He is, of course, liable for slaughtering it outside the Temple.
(10) And he did not pledge himself to offer a burnt-offering at all; accordingly there does not arise here the prohibition of slaughtering a consecrated animal outside the Temple.
(11) I.e., to have to bring it to the Temple in Jerusalem. We must suppose that he was living far from the Land of Israel but near to the Temple of Onias.
(12) But there was no Nazirite vow at all.
(13) And consequently he is in this case culpable for slaughtering a consecrated animal outside the Temple.
(14) In Palestine, but not at the Temple in Jerusalem.
(15) For slaughtering a consecrated animal outside the Temple. For kareth v. Glos. He has, however, fulfilled his obligation and need not bring another burnt-offering to the Temple, for by his saying, ‘I will offer it in the Temple of Onias’ he implied that wheresoever the animal would be slaughtered that would be the fulfilment of his obligation. V. supra p. 672, n. 2.
(16) In which the Israelites journeyed and where the Tabernacle was erected by Moses.
(17) A euphemism for idolatry.
(18) II Kings XXIII, 9.
(19) Cf. Lev. XXI, 17ff.
(20) And he afterwards repented.
(21) Ezek. XLIV, 12.
(22) Ibid. 13.
(23) For even in the Temple it may be performed by non-priests.
(24) This is, of course, an act of service.
(25) On a subsequent occasion.
(26) Thus whether the service in honour of the idol was performed inadvertently (through stumbling) or deliberately (through iniquity) the priest is debarred for all time from offering sacrifices in the Temple.
(27) I.e., a deliberate act of service.
(28) Num. XV, 28. The apparently superfluous expression ‘when he sinneth in error’ is interpreted as referring to a priest who, having sinned by ministering to idols, is now offering his own sacrifice and making atonement for himself (for the whole passage refers to the sin of idolatry).
(29) For slaughtering is no service.
(30) And as he did so in error he may minister in the Temple. for the Baraitha teaches that he may offer his own sacrifice; thus in accord with R. Nahman's view.
(31) Notwithstanding that slaughtering is no service.
(32) R. Nahman and R. Shesheth.
(33) For slaughtering is no service.

for he had become a priest to idols. R. Nahman said, Whence do I derive my view? From the following which was taught: If a priest ministered before idols and repented, his offering is a sweet savour. In what circumstances [did he minister]? Will you say, inadvertently? Then what is the point of 'and repented'? He has always been repentant![1] It must obviously be [that he ministered] deliberately. And further, if by sprinkling, then even though he repented it avails nought, for he had performed a service [before the idol]! It can only be by slaughtering [before it]. R. Shesheth, however, will say, I still maintain that he ministered inadvertently, and [the Baraitha] means to say as follows: If he had always been repentant, that is to say, when he ministered [before the idol] he ministered inadvertently, his offering [in the Temple] is a sweet savour; otherwise his offering is not a sweet savour.

If a priest had prostrated himself before an idol, R. Nahman said, His offering [in the Temple] is a sweet savour; and R. Shesheth said, His offering is not a sweet savour. If he had acknowledged an idol, R. Nahman said, His offering [in the Temple] is a sweet savour; and R. Shesheth said, His offering is not a sweet savour. Now all these disputes had to be stated. For if only the first[2] had been stated, I would have said that only there did R. Shesheth say [that his offering was not a sweet savour] since he had performed a service [before the idol], but where he had slaughtered [before the idol], since that was no service, I would have said that he agreed with R. Nahman. [Hence the latter dispute had to be stated.] And if the dispute regarding slaughtering had only been stated, [I would have said that only there did R. Shesheth say that his offering was not a sweet savour] since he had performed some service[3] [before the idol], but not where he had prostrated himself before the idol, for that was no service. Hence the latter had to be stated. And if the dispute regarding prostrating [before the idol] had only been stated, [I would have said that only there did R. Shesheth say that his offering was not a sweet savour] since he had done some act [before the idol], but not where he had merely acknowledged the idol, for that was a mere matter of words. Therefore all had to be stated.

NEEDLESS TO SAY [THIS IS SO OF PRIESTS WHO MINISTERED TO] ANOTHER MATTER.[4] Since it says here, NEEDLESS TO SAY [THIS IS SO OF PRIESTS WHO MINISTERED TO] ANOTHER MATTER, it follows that the Temple of Onias was not an idolatrous shrine. Our Tanna thus concurs with the view of him who said that the Temple of Onias was not an idolatrous shrine. For it was taught: In the year in which Simeon the Just died, he foretold them that he would die. They said to him, 'Whence do you know it?' He replied. 'Every Day of Atonement there met me an old man, dressed in white and wrapped in white, who entered with me [into the Holy of Holies] and left with me; but this year there met me an old man, dressed in black and wrapped in black, who entered with me but did not leave with me'. After the Festival [of Tabernacles] he was ill for seven days and then died. Thereafter his brethren the priests forbore to pronounce the Name in the priestly benediction.[5] In the hour of his departure [from this life], he said to them, 'My son Onias shall assume the office [of High Priest] after me'. His brother Shime'i, who was two years and a half older than he, was jealous of him and said to him, 'Come and I will teach you the order of the Temple service. He[6] thereupon put upon him a gown,[7] girded him with a girdle, placed him near the altar, and said to his brethren the priests. 'See what this man promised his beloved[8] and has now fulfilled: "On the day in which I will assume the office of High Priest I will put on your gown and gird myself with your girdle".' At this his brethren the priests sought to kill him.[9] He fled from them but they pursued him. He then went to Alexandria in Egypt, built an altar there, and offered thereon sacrifices in honour of idols. When the Sages heard of this they said, If this is what happened [through the jealousy] of one[6] who had never assumed the honour,[10] what would happen [through the jealousy] of one who had once assumed the honour [and had been ousted from it]! This is the view of the events according to R. Meir. R. Judah said to him, That was not what happened, but the fact was that Onias did not accept the office of High Priest because his brother

Shime'i was two years and a half older than he. For all that Onias was jealous of his brother Shime'i and he said to him, 'Come and I will teach you the order of the Temple service'. He[9] thereupon put on him a gown, girded him with a girdle, placed him near the altar, and said to his brethren the priests, 'See what this man promised his beloved and has now fulfilled: "On the day that I will assume the office of High Priest I will put on your gown and gird myself with your girdle".' At this his brethren the priests sought to kill him,[6] but he explained to them all that occurred. They thereupon sought to kill Onias; he fled from them but they pursued him. He fled to the King's palace,[11] but they pursued him there; and whoever saw him cried out, There he is, there he is. He thereupon went to Alexandria in Egypt, built an altar there, and offered thereon sacrifices in honour of God; for so it is written, In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord.[12] When the Sages heard of this they said, If this is what happened [through the jealousy] of one[13] who had [at first] shunned the honour, what would happen [through the jealousy] of one who seeks the honour!

It was taught: R. Joshua b. Perahiah said, At first[14] whoever were to say to me 'Take up the honour',[15] I would bind him and put him in front of a lion; but now[16] whoever were to say to me, 'Give up the honour',[17] I would pour over him a kettle of boiling water. For [we see that] Saul [at first] shunned [the throne], but after he had taken it he sought to kill David.

Mar Kashisha son of R. Hisda said to Abaye. How does R. Meir[18] interpret that verse[12] adduced by R. Judah? — As in the following [Baraitha] which was taught: After the downfall of Sennacherib Hezekiah went out and found princes sitting in their golden carriages. He adjured them not to serve idols, as it is written, In that day there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan,[19]

---

(1) For one who sinned in error has not transgressed the law that he should stand in need of repentance.

(2) Where the priest had sprinkled blood before the idol.

(3) Slaughtering, although not a priestly service, is indeed an essential service with regard to the offering.

(4) Sc. idolatry.

(5) V. Tosaf. Sot. 38a. s.v. הרי; and Yoma (Sonc. ed.) p. 196 n. 1.

(6) Shime'i.

(7) A light garment. 'The easy dress worn in the house and, under the cloak, in the street, but in which it was unbecoming to appear in public' (Jast.). According to Rashi: a leather gown.

(8) His wife.

(9) Onias.

(10) Of the High Priesthood. Lit., 'went down to it'.

(11) The King's Mount, Har ha-Melek (Tur Malka) v. Git. (Sonc. ed.) p. 254, n. 4.

(12) Isa. XIX, 19.

(13) Onias.

(14) The translation of this passage follows the text as found in cur. edd. and as established by R. Kalonymos the father of R. Meshullam. There is, however, another text found in MS.M. and quoted by R. Gershom, Rashi and Tosaf. which reads: בתחילה כל האומר עולה או מנחה אני מטיל עליו קומקום של חמין: Whosoever pledges a burnt-offering or a meal-offering first (i.e., without having first set apart the animal or the flour for the purpose). I would pour over him a kettle of boiling water. The reason for this denunciation is that later this man might not find an animal or flour available for his purpose and his vow will therefore be left unfulfilled. This subject, however, is entirely out of place here.

(15) Lit., 'go up to it'.

(16) Having taken a position of honour. R. Joshua b. Perahiah had been appointed to the position of Nasi, or President of the Sanhedrin, cf. Hag, 16a; he fled to Alexandria owing to Sadducee hostility but was recalled later by Simeon b. Shetah; v. Sot. 47a.

(17) Lit., 'go down from it'.

(18) Who considers the Temple of Onias to have been an idolatrous shrine.

(19) Sc. the Hebrew tongue spoken in the land of Canaan.

Talmud - Mas. Menachoth 110a

and swear to the Lord of hosts.[1] Thereupon they went to Alexandria in Egypt, built an altar there, and offered thereon sacrifices in honour of God, as it is written, In that day there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt.

One shall be called the city of Heres.[2] What is meant by The city of Heres? — As R. Joseph rendered it in Aramaic: The city of Beth Shemesh [the sun], which is destined to destruction, will be said to be one of them.[3] But whence do we know that Heres signifies the sun? For it is written, Who commandeth the sun [heres] and it riseth not.[4]

Bring My sons from far, and My daughters from the ends of the earth.[5] 'Bring My sons from far': R. Huna said, These are the exiles in Babylon, who are at ease[6] like sons. 'And My daughters from the ends of the earth': These are the exiles in other lands, who are not at ease,[6] like daughters.[7]

R. Abba b. R. Isaac said in the name of R. Hisda — others say, Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, From Tyre to Carthage the nations know Israel and their Father who is in heaven; but from Tyre westwards[8] and from Carthage eastwards[8] the nations know neither Israel nor their Father who is in heaven. R. Shimi b. Hiyya raised the following objection against Rab: Is it not written, For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My name is great among the nations; and in every place offerings are burnt and presented unto My name, even pure oblations?[9] — He replied. You, Shimi![10] They call Him the God of Gods.[11]

'And in every place offerings are burnt and presented unto My name'. 'In every place'! Is this possible? — R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Jonathan. This refers to the scholars who devote themselves to the study of the Torah in whatever place they are: [God says,] I account it unto them as though they burnt and presented offerings to My name. 'Even pure oblations': this refers to one who studies the Torah in purity; that is, one who marries a wife and afterwards studies the Torah.[12]

A song of Ascents. Behold, bless ye the Lord, all ye servants of the Lord, that stand in the house of the Lord in the night seasons.[13] What is the meaning of 'in the night seasons'? — R. Johanan said, This refers to the scholars who devote themselves to the study of the Torah at nights: Holy Writ accounts it to them as though they were occupied with the Temple service.

This is an ordinance for ever to Israel.[14] R. Giddal said in the name of Rab, This refers to the altar built [in heaven].[15] where Michael, the great Prince,[16] stands and offers up thereon an offering.[17] R. Johanan said, It refers to the scholars who are occupied with the laws of Temple service: Holy Writ imputes it to them as though the Temple were built in their days.

Resh Lakish said, What is the significance of the verse, This is the law for the burnt-offering, for the meal-offering, for the sin-offering, and for the guilt-offering?[18] It teaches that whosoever occupies himself with the study of the Torah is as though he were offering a burnt-offering, a meal-offering a sin-offering, and a guilt-offering, Raba asked, Why then does the verse say. 'For the burnt-offering, for the meal-offering'? It should have said, 'a burnt-offering, a meal-offering'! Rather, said Raba, it means that whosoever occupies himself with the study of the Torah needs neither burnt-offering, nor meal-offering, nor sin-offering, nor guilt-offering.[19]

R. Isaac said, What is the significance of the verses, This is the law of the sin-offering;[20] and This is the law of the guilt-offering?[21] They teach that whosoever occupies himself with the study of the

laws of the sin-offering is as though he were offering a sin-offering, and whosoever occupies himself with the study of the laws of the guilt-offering is as though he were offering a guilt-offering.

MISHNAH. IT IS SAID OF THE BURNT-OFFERINGS OF CATTLE, AN OFFERING MADE BY FIRE OF A SWEET SAVOUR;[22] AND OF THE BURNT-OFFERINGS OF BIRDS, AN OFFERING MADE BY FIRE OF A SWEET SAVOUR;[23] AND OF THE MEAL-OFFERING, AN OFFERING MADE BY FIRE OF A SWEET SAVOUR:[24] TO TEACH YOU THAT IT IS THE SAME WHETHER A MAN OFFERS MUCH OR LITTLE, SO LONG AS HE DIRECTS HIS HEART TO HEAVEN.

GEMARA. R. Zera said, Where do we find a Scriptural reference to this? In the verse, Sweet is the sleep of a labouring man, whether he eat little or much.[25] R. Adda b. Ahabah said, In the following verse, When goods increase, they are increased that eat them; and what advantage is there to the owner thereof, [saving the beholding of them with his eyes]?[26]

It was taught: R. Simeon b. ‘Azzai said. Come and see what is written in the chapter of the sacrifices. Neither el[27] nor elohim[27] is found there, but only the Lord, so as not to give sectarians any occasion to rebel.[28] Furthermore, it is said of a large ox, ‘An offering made by fire of a sweet savour’; of a small bird, ‘An offering made by fire of a sweet savour’; and of a meal-offering, ‘An offering made by fire of a sweet savour’: to teach you that it is the same whether a man offers much or little, so long as he directs his heart to heaven. And lest you say, He needs it for food, the text therefore states, If I were hungry, I would not tell thee; for the world is Mine and the fulness thereof.[29] And it also says, For every beast of the forest is Mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills. I know all the fowls of the mountains; and the wild beasts of the field are mine. Do I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?[30] I did not bid you to sacrifice so that you should say, I will do His will that He may do my will.[31] You do not sacrifice for My sake, but for your own sakes, as it is written, Ye shall sacrifice it at your will.[32] Another interpretation is: ‘Ye shall sacrifice it at your will’: sacrifice it of your own free will, sacrifice it with the proper intention. As Samuel once enquired of R. Huna, Whence do we know that the offering is invalid if the act [of slaughtering] was performed incidentally?[33] [He replied,] Because it is written, And he shall slaughter the bullock,[34] thus teaching that the slaughtering should be intended for the bullock. Said the other, This we already know;[35] but whence do we know that this rule is indispensable? [He replied,] Because it is written, ‘Ye shall sacrifice it at your will’, that is to say, sacrifice it with the proper intention.[36]

---

(1) Ibid. 18.

(2) Isa. XIX, 18.

(3) חרם has the meaning of ‘destruction’ and also ‘the sun’.

(4) Job IX, 7. Heb. חרם

(5) Isa. XLIII, 6.

(6) Lit., ‘whose minds are settled’. The Jews living in Babylon were for the most part less subject to persecution than their brethren in other lands.

(7) Woman's tranquil frame of mind is more readily disturbed by troubles than man's.

(8) Geographically this is difficult to understand, for westwards of Tyre is the Mediterranean Sea and eastwards of Carthage is that region which, according to the first part of this sentence, is inhabited by those people who recognize their Father who is in heaven. It has already been suggested by M. Schwartz, Dos Heilige Land, p. 274 that ‘westwards’ and ‘eastwards’ should be transposed. Cf. also Neubauer, Geographie. p. 294.

(9) Mal. I, 11.

(10) V. supra p. 186, n. 3.

(11) But they do not worship Him.

(12) So that he is undisturbed by impure thoughts.

(13) Ps. CXXXIV, 1.

(14) II Chron. II, 3. This verse implies that the altar-offerings will never cease.

(15) Cf. Hag. 12b.
(16) Israel's guardian angel; v. Dan. XII, 1. Cf. Yoma 77a.
(17) Sc. the souls of the righteous. V. Tosaf s.v. ומיכאל.
(18) Lev. VII, 37.
(19) The verse accordingly means: The Torah is for, i.e., in lieu of, the burnt-offering, the meal-offering, etc.: the study of the Torah makes atonement like the offering of sacrifice. Another interpretation: לעולה stands for לא עולה 'no (need for) burnt-offering'; cf. Ned. 11a.
(20) Ibid. VI, 18.
(21) Ibid. VII, 1.
(22) Lev. I, 9.
(23) Ibid. 17.
(24) Ibid. II, 2.
(25) Eccl. V, 11. Heb. עובד is here given the meaning of 'one who brings an offering' (cf. Isa. XIX, 21) and the interpretation of the verse is: Sweet is the sleep of the man who brings an offering; be it little or much, he shall enjoy the reward thereof.
(26) Ibid. 10. The interpretation of the verse is: When offerings increase there are many priests that eat them; but what advantage is the abundance of offerings to the Holy One, the Owner of all, saving the beholding of the heart that prompts the offering?
(27) Heb. אל and אלהים, meaning God. For these terms are also used in connection with idols (Maharsha).
(28) By finding support in Scripture for their heretical belief in the plurality of deities.
(29) Ps. L, 12.
(30) Ibid. 10, 11, 13.
(31) The ritual of sacrifice was an ordinance of God which was to be performed not in order to obtain a reciprocal favour from Him, but simply because He had willed it so.
(32) Lev. XIX, 5.
(33) If, e.g., a man was handling a knife, when it accidentally fell from his hand and it slaughtered an offering.
(34) Ibid. I, 5.
(35) Lit., 'this is in our hands'.
(36) Since we have two verses each directing that the slaughtering of the sacrifice must be intentional, this rule becomes indispensable, in accordance with the Rabbinic dictum: Wherever Scripture repeats an injunction in connection with holy things it is meant to be indispensable.